

BEIJING – Roundtable on the ALAC R3 White Paper

Monday, April 08, 2013 – 11:00 to 12:00

ICANN – Beijing, People’s Republic of China

EVAN LEIBOVITCH: ICANN 46, Beijing, April 8th 11AM, function room six, roundtable on the ALAC R3 White Paper.

JEAN-JACQUES SUBRENAT: Good morning everyone. This is the session, the open session on the discussion of the ALAC White Paper on future challenges entitled, “Making ICANN Relevant, Responsive, and Respected. I am Jean-Jacques Subrenat, co-chairing this meeting with Evan Leibovitch, who is next to me.

And there are several facilities which are provided this morning. You can participate online and put in your comments, which would be read by Matt Ashtiani from staff. And there is also interpretation here in this room in several languages.

And it is being scribed. So I think that with all of those facilities, we do hope to have a wider participation than only those present in this room. This is how Evan and I have planned to conduct this session. First of all, Evan will be giving a brief review of the comments that we’ve received during the long-pay period, which was open for public comments, and to say in what manner we will react to those various observations.

Because there was no obligation to automatically integrate into this paper all the remarks or suggestions. And then, after that, I will open

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.

the floor first with a few comments on two aspects which I think are very important for the future. First is an exchange of views between us on the challenges for the internet and for ICANN, the future challenges.

To make sure that, in this paper we have drafted, the [sixth core 0:02:26] of us have drafted, nothing really important is left out. And the second theme of our discussion will be, considering the future challenges you have just outlined or reminded us of, what are the consequences that you see for ICANN, in terms of structures and procedures mainly?

So we have against... We have to work against the backdrop of a really important evolution within ICANN. As you can see from the R3 paper which was distributed now for several months, it dates back to the 17th of September, 2012. And it so happens that the new CEO of ICANN assumed his role officially in early October.

And since then, things have been going quite a pace with many, many innovations and many important initiatives taken by the new CEO. So if only for that reason, already there are parts of this paper which are no longer entirely valid or at least, if the reasoning is valid, then some of the recommendations are already achieved, or have been achieved.

So we will have to take this into account. So, that was the backdrop to the, to this morning's session. As you are aware, it is possible to speak in several languages which are provided for by interpreters in the cabins behind me. So please make use of that facility, both in this room and online for remote participation.

Now over to you, Evan, for the presentation of the public comments received, and your comments on those.

EVAN LEIBOVITCH:

Thanks Jean-Jaques. This is Evan for the record. We received a total of five comments during the public comment period. One was from the CCNSO. The other one was from members of the Non-Commercial Stakeholders Group. There was one, sorry, there was one submitted by Global Governance, sorry there was submitted by the Registry Stakeholders Group.

And a fourth one from an individual, Trevor Phillips. General speaking – oh sorry. And another that was received from the Latin American Region ROLO of At-Large, LACRALO. And generally speaking, the reception...

Unfortunately, this report on public comments that you see on the screen, is fairly recent. It's going to be made available to everybody who wants it. This will give a summary of the public comments that were received. I'm heartened to say that the responses generally have been positive.

The people are appreciative of taking the initiative to start to look forward, to start to recommend changes from within. Since the R3 paper was made, we had the WCIT Conference late last year that demonstrated that there's other organizations external to ICANN that would also like to see sweeping changes.

However, their proposed remedy, at least this was expressed by some of the participants in that conference, were not what I would consider

to be optimal, and they certainly do not include having a role for ICANN’s own particular brand of multi-stakeholder representation.

Our goal here is to try and reform ICANN from within, and the R3 paper tries to call attention to problems that are facing ICANN and global governance and tries to promote some remedies. Some of the comments that were received, even though they were very supportive, individual organizations had concerns what we said about their particular area.

The CCNSO commentary took issue with the fact that we even made mention of them and has requested us to take out any mention of CCTLDs and the CCNSO from within the White Paper. I can give some analysis of that. Frankly I do not agree with that particular assessment, and frankly, if there is anybody here from the CCNSO or from the CCTLD community, I would like to hear about the objections and I would also like to engage on finding out why that objection exists, and what we can do about it, and also to sort of explain why that was brought in.

The... As I recall, the NCSG commentary that came in was also very complimentary of what we were doing, but it also suggests that sweeping changes to the existing policy making multi-stakeholder, does not undergo massive changes that it – proposing expanded roles for governance was not necessary something that they liked.

And again, we’re in a situation where one of the reasons we have this roundtable is to try and engage. I’ve asked as many people as possible to sit at the front of the table because we hope this to be an interactive session, not the standard kind of workshop that’s really a lecture as tends to happen at ICANN meetings.

So with that having said, we know that we need to make some revisions. As Jean-Jacques has said, looking forward we not only have to consider these comments, but we also have to consider the changing situation that we face. Both with external pressures, such as we saw at the WCIT, as well as some good internal pressures that we see, such as the change of CEO within ICANN, and what is widely to perceived to be a very good progress in terms of internal reforms that's being brought about by the change in CEO.

With that said, Jean-Jacques would you like to take the mic and look forward, as we engage in moving forward?

JEAN-JACQUES SUBRENAT: Certainly. This is Jean-Jacques Subrenat for the transcript record. Back to Evan, because I think you should say a word about the status of the comments received. What are the obligations, or lack of obligations, there on? Because it is a paper by six co-authors and it is an At-Large White Paper. So you should say something about that.

EVAN LEIBOVITCH: Sorry. Thank you for pointing that out. This being a formal public comment period, a form of public comment process that was engaged, one of the very few that the At-Large community has actually engaged in. We have committed to, once this summary was prepared, to actually prepare a response to it.

The response will appear in writing after Beijing, given that this summary was only fairly recently done. One of the reasons that I'm hoping too, sorry. One of the outcomes I'm hoping from this meeting is

to have some take away that will in fact help guide the response that we have to this.

As I mentioned, unlike some comment periods, we're not obligated to change the document because of the comments we've received, however we would be ill-advised if we did not take these into consideration and give reasoned explanations of why we accept or did not accept the recommendations.

I can give some personal view points and issues that I think will find their way into the written response. In the case, as I've said for instance, the CCTLDs, one of the things that concern the authors greatly about ICANN is the fact that the public understands that ICANN performs a very, very valuable role in providing governance over generic TLDs.

However, from the point of view of the end users, the end user does not know the difference between dot com and dot CO. The fact that one is governed by the RAA that ICANN has with registries and registrars, and the other one is governed by a sovereign government, Columbia, that has its own rules and regulations and that are not subject to ICANN governance.

This was a concern to the authors. And in the one line that we put into the R3, we're suggesting that ICANN, if possible, engage in at very least, setting some standards of best practices that would encourage not only good practice amongst these CCTLDs, but also a level of trust amongst the end users.

That if they went to a domain, whether it was a two letter domain or a three letter domain, and in generally speaking, the public does not know the difference between them. So if they're going to a dot com or a dot CO, it should not matter to the public whether one is a country and one is a generic.

Especially in the case of country codes that act like generics, such as dot CO, dot ME, and a number of others. So that is the reason why, although we appreciate the comments from the CCNSO, and I would like to engage with them, this is the rationale behind why that comment is in there, and why I'm hesitant to take the advice of the CCNSO to remove all references to CCTLDs from our document.

I do believe that ICANN has a role to play, not in trumping sovereign authority over CCTLDs, but in trying to build public trust by at least establishing some best practices for them. Unfortunately given that we are constrained by the time of this, going into a detailed response for all of the comments is probably beyond what we could do at this meeting, especially if we hope to have some interaction.

So we will commit to doing a written response to the summary. The summary itself, as you can see, is available on the screen at the front of the room. It will be made available publically, and we will commit to doing a written response to these comments in due course. Jean-Jacques?

JEAN-JACQUES SUBRENAT:

Thank you Evan. This is Jean-Jacques Subrenat again. Now before we go into a debate, an analysis, of the two items I suggested to start with,

which was first of all, what are the major challenges for the internet in general? And two, what are the consequences you derive from that analysis or from your analysis for the future of ICANN in terms of structures and processes.

So before we do that, I just want to make sure that there is not part of the community represented around this table, or online, which would have liked to put in a formal comment and for various reasons did not do so. The CCNSO has done that.

Is anyone from the CCNSO present here? I see no hands raised, so I guess not. So is anyone keen to make a general comment on the process and on this comment period which was opened on this particular paper before we go into the debate?

I see none. So now I will open the floor, very broadly actually, to the two items Evan and I identified as being central to this issue. First, and this may surprise you, we are not talking about ICANN, we are talking about the internet, from the user perspective, from the perspective of the general internet user.

And we would like to know what you think the probable major developments for the internet, whether good or bad, whether they be in economic terms of technology, or any other aspect you may wish to bring to the floor? And I suggest that we give about 15 minutes to this first item as a debate. Alan promised, sorry. Evan was kind of enough to say that he would be taking notes of this, so that we can give feedback in the next part of our process.

So the floor is open for this first item, which is how do you see the major challenges to the internet in the coming months and years?

[AUDIO BLANK SPOT 0:16:25 – 0:16:34]

JEAN-JACQUES SUBRENAT: So [? 0:16:35] and then [? 0:16:38]. And please state your name and your affiliation when you start.

WOMAN: [? 0:16:50] for the transcripts and ALAC. Can you hear me? Just to clarify, very quickly, this is – you’re talking about just within the context of ICANN or just globally?

JEAN-JACQUES SUBRENAT: Well not just the whole trick, that’s why you seemed surprised [? 10:17:12] to globally, it’s not only about ICANN. You know it’s not only about what will be the office address of the hub in Singapore for ICANN. No it’s beyond that.

For instance, will voice come to a point where it will supplant the keyboard? And what re the impacts for the general user? That kind of thing.

WOMAN: I’ll just give you, just a quick list on categories, and I can email you some standard responses later. Firstly is, the actual regulation of the internet, and the perceived regulation of the internet, and also propaganda

regarding the regulation of the internet, and the [control policies 0:17:52] around that.

The second one is central to global public interest, is the issue of legitimacy, particularly in the context of multi-stakeholderism and what that connotes, and distinction made between that of an institution and that of other external [forests 0:18:13].

The third one is, in my mind, critical internet resources, particularly in terms of transitioning to IPV 6, and the challenges of the developing world. We heard today that 560 billion, sorry, million, was it? I can't remember. Internet users. So just the constraint, the resource constraint. I'll stop there.

JEAN-JACQUES SUBRENAT: Well, before you stop there [? 0:18:40], I would invite you to develop at least a little bit, two of your themes, which are regulation. Why you see that, first as a major challenge? And what are the possible implications for the general user which ALAC purports to represent?

And the second part is legitimacy, because I think that we see what you're aiming at, but perhaps it would be necessary to have a slightly more precise definition. As for your third point, which is critical internet resources, especially IPV 6, I think we're all up to date on that, so that's okay.

WOMAN: Thank you Jean-Jaques. [? 0:19:17] for the transcript. In relation to the first category that I put forward, one of the challenges the world is

seeing, particularly [pre-wicket in the buy in and post-wicket 0:19:28], is the global turf war between and amongst stakeholders, especially in the area of internet governance.

It was heartwarming to see [Fadhi Ja-Ha-dee 0:19:40] talk about engaging in this particular forum and that sort of thing. And I think it's very critical, particularly in this season, globally, that all stakeholders particularly in situations have clear demarcated rules. Because there is a sort of sense of alienation, and so there is [MT this 0:20:03].

And so, just moving away from that and moving to... And I think, in order to address that question, we need to discuss what are perceived regulations, what are threats of regulations, and what is actual propaganda, so that we distill the issues.

And I'm happy to send you a whole email in relation to that. In terms of the second category, what is it that I said? Legitimacy was it? There is a huge question of legitimacy particular as far as global public interest. And you can have this in two categories, one is within the context of ICANN.

If At-Large purports to be the voice of two point something billion end users, then there are questions of issues of representation and that sort of thing. But moving beyond ICANN, moving into other forums, particularly say that of the IGF or [I Sock 0:21:08], IATF, or IPUT, where standards are being developed in [I Sock] or IATF, and that sort of thing.

So in terms of issues of legitimacy, the questions are representation and representation has to transcend just regional representation, but also it

has to be linked to meaningful participation, which – and that sort of thing. I can go further into that in an email.

But that's all [for nothing, thank you 0:21:39].

MAN: Okay. Next in the queue I have [? 0:21:45] and then Alan [for the matter 0:21:47], and then [AUDIO CUTOFF 0:21:49 – 0:21:53]

WOMAN: Thank you. [? 0:21:54] for the record. As you're talking about internet and not ICANN, the major challenge I can see, mainly for developing countries, is access. I mean, easy and meaningful access. And when you think access, we think about maybe two major issues, availability of the infrastructure. I'm thinking about bandwidth.

And today we're in the mobile star, stars. And also regulation, freedom of access, freedom to communicate using the internet. Those are, this is the main thing, which is access, mainly for developing countries. Thank you.

MAN: Okay. Next in the queue is Alan Greenberg.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you. Alan Greenberg. I just wanted to react to one statement that [? 0:23:17] made, that I cannot hear without commenting on it. [? 0:23:22] made reference to At-Large being the voice of two billion internet users.

I believe anytime that we use terminology akin to that, we are both dreaming and asking to be knocked off at the knees. I believe the terminology that we should be using is we represent the interests of the two billion internet users.

There is no way we could ever claim to represent them. And how is it that we solicit the information from all two billion and consolidate it? So I think we really need to be careful in any venue of using the latter term and not the former, at least in my mind. Thank you.

EVAN LEIBOVITCH: Okay Alan. Thank you. Next Eduardo Diaz.

EDUARDO DIAZ: It's Eduardo Diaz for the record. I will say that one of the challenges for the future for the internet would be with this new top level domains. There will be so many out there, that I think at one point, and I agree with some of the statements that Evan said before, that the domains will be irrelevant in the future because basically you're going to go in search for what you're looking for and you will get there.

So I think one of the things that are going to happen, and I foresee this happening, is that there will be a competition out there where when you need a domain name, you will look for the cheapest one, period.

You pick it up, put it in, and then you're on. Thank you.

EVAN LEIBOVITCH: Okay. Thank you Eduardo. Next in the queue is [Flood 0:25:12].

MAN: Thank you Evan. [? 0:25:17]. I'm the co-vice chair of [KP RALO 0:25:20] from Pakistan. I think my initial reactions were a bit, like Alan's statement, in response to [? 0:25:35]. We do not represent the end users, we can only bring interests to ICANN.

And that then brings us to the limitation for our scope as well. That sitting in ICANN, and talking about the bottom up process that ICANN, that is relevant to ICANN. And when I say scope limitation, I tend to mean, and I tend to raise the issue, look at ICANN's new engagement strategies.

The way it's going to approach its global partnerships, and the way it's going to approach intervening into the various regions, gives you food for thought and gives you a lot of work. I got the opportunity to work on the Middle East Strategy Working Group, and today we have a meeting in which the presentation is being presented shortly, and also circulated on the email list, the presentation which is going to happen because many of us won't be able to make it over there.

But you will be amazed to see, Tijani was there with me as well on that working group, that we – that strategy is spanning across point of entries. And the new delimitation which has been done by ICANN for that, is that of Afghanistan, Pakistan, and Iran.

And on the other side, Algeria, Morocco, Bolivia, Asia, and Tunisia, right? These are part of that strategy. So this strategy is fortunately linking into South Asia, there is the whole of the Middle East, and touches into Northern Africa.

So new geographical approach, which is not in the tradition of the geographical – the limitation that ICANN is already following. This is a new approach. Gives you a new challenge. We building the working group, the people from Pakistan, some of the people from the adjoining countries, we ran to the first blockade, what are we going to call this strategy? We're nothing but a list.

Question number one, the Africans are very straight about their choice of being African. The common language is not as common, it's not Arabic for our part of the world. We have Persian for Iran, and we're also speaking Persian. And we have like four national languages.

Very rich people [? 0:27:59] and the [push-toe ? 0:28:01], and these are like very large languages, and we're talking about 180 million people that are speaking within these languages. So the challenge for us comes down to, who is going to serve us?

There was a discussion about a RAR for the Middle Eastern region. And we had the RAR, we had, [Ripe and Cecile 0:28:17] were there, and I had continuous dialogue with them, that can this concept actually exist?

There are new RAR be decided. And guess what the IPC people and the other stakeholders said? This has to come up, bottom-up demand from the members of the RARs. And when you look at the membership, they were not even sitting at the table. We didn't have a single ISP sitting at the table.

But there was a continuous demand, even from [? 0:28:45] and other Arabian groups, Middle Eastern groups, that there should be a RAR. In true logic, it's not possible, because the demand isn't there. Why would

45 hundred members suddenly shift from – out of this, only 600 or 400 members are for the ICCP for the Middle East?

Why would they suddenly shift over from an organization which is already contemplating good enough for them to a new system? So the challenges we're facing is, number one, scoping. We're not out there to create every internet governance issue. There are global settings, and there are processes in place, or they are evolving at the moment, or the debates are happening.

What happened at the ITU was a very big moment in telecom history. But I would also mark that as a milestone within the evolution of the internet governance, the public policy discourse, history and future. We have to keep that in mind.

I mean, the plan you saw, look. This is another divide that you can look at. The way our countries think, the people who were signing that statement, and the people who walked out, that shows you one of the major challenges. There is no one model that is going to fit the mold, number one thing.

Number two thing, I will always be, and with my colleagues from Pakistan, they are always in a constant struggle to build up their TS industry in Pakistan. To move them, that one registrar to many registrars. From users to understand what their rights in the domain name system are.

So the challenge over here is, aiming too high, right, number one thing. Number two thing, scoping. Number three thing, look at what ICANN is doing within. And we have to bridge that. Our future evolution

strategies should not have closed eyes on that. We need to reengage with ICANN.

If they're delaminating themselves and forming new technologies for geographic, they call it the Middle East and adjoining countries now. We are not working like that.

EVAN LEIBOVITCH:

Okay. Thanks [Flood]. And specifically your issues about scoping are taken to heart. We're not the IGF, and we shouldn't try to be the IGF. ICANN has a very specific role to play. And regardless of what we do, we're not trying to go into those other territories. I hope that was made clear in the document itself.

Okay. Next in the queue is Victor and then I have Shiva, Zumi and Holly.

VICTOR :

Thank you very much Evan. I'm Victor [? 0:31:29] from [I Sock] command chapter. I will start my comment by [coat 0:31:37] the vice president of [I Sock] was here yesterday. The internet is not just about ICANN, [I Sock], or any other organization.

It's about collaboration. So for me, the next challenges we facing, is to keep the internet unique, one internet, one world, one internet. That will be the main challenges. To face that, we need more collaboration.

For me, the second challenges would be about content. Specifically, content, local content from developing world because if local content from those part of the world, I can just say, we will be dying. We will

not be a part of the internet. We will be consuming content from other part of the world.

We have to produce... More and more people from developing world, we can't rely on that we need content, local content. And the type one, for me, is important also is about security, because the internet basically was developed unsecure. Because the internet [? 0:33:09] was excited to be connected, all the time share.

But today internet is central our day to day life, especially economy, politics. And then the main challenges for the future is will be about securing the internet and make it safe for user. So that is for me three challenges that will be facing the upcoming years. So thank you.

EVAN LEIBOVITCH:

Thanks Victor. And in fact, I've got a follow up question or two for you based on what you were saying. You talked about content. Is there a role for ICANN to play in that? Because traditionally, ICANN has been deliberately trying to stay away from content and maintaining itself as being totally about domain names, and registrants, and where the location is.

There is a concern, and I think I heard that a bit in [Flood's] comment about scope. About not trying to get ICANN into areas where it doesn't exactly have core competency. And I just add to your comment about security. In the WCIT, we had government saying, "Well in order to do security, we need to do de-packet inspection, and we need to do anti-spam, which could have been a way to get into other things which we may not consider to be security issues."

So I'm just curious to know your views on those kinds of things.

JEAN-JACQUES SUBRENAT: This is Jean-Jacques Subrenat. I suggest that we take up Victor's answers and others, please, and forward the matter to the list. When we come to the second theme which is, what consequences do we see possibly for ICANN and other organization possibly as mentioned by Victor? So that's the second part.

Let's finish this first part. Is there anyone else on this list for the first part about the global issues?

EVAN LEIBOVITCH: Yes. We'll close the queue at this point. Right now I have on the list, I have Shiva, [A Zumi 0:35:20], Holly, and [? 0:35:22]. Okay. So next is Shiva.

SHIVA: Yeah I'm [? 0:35:30] from Internet Society [? 0:35:32] ALS. I want to add to what Alan said about, as acting in the best interest of the internet user and not representing them. So there is one thing that we have to be clear about that the act – we say that we act in the best interest of the internet user, or two billion users.

We gather the issues and then we decide to prioritize, act upon, or not act upon an issue. And we decide on how to act upon an issue. And this process of the system within the internet community, there is element of rough consensus. So while we talk about our role as that of acting in

the best interest of the user, we also define or explain, how we act upon the issues.

Let's define rough consensus in a document, and explain how our consensus works. I think that should clarify a lot of the doubts about the way we work. Thank you.

EVAN LEIBOVITCH:

Okay. And the last word on this round goes to [? 0:37:12].

MALE:

Thank you. [? 0:37:13] from Tokyo, or Internet Users Networking Tokyo ALS. Perhaps, in the short term, I see the challenges of balance. I see the center of gravity of who ICANN communities shifting into more of the domain name industry. The industry in which was... Especially perhaps with introduction of the new GTLDs, and those of CC space as well.

And so that relates to the importance of the definition of the public interest. How do you define that? We may need a clear guideline of what constitutes public interest and what is not inside ICANN context. And maybe the, interrelated to the status and operation of the ALAC as an advisory committee, and GAC as a committee. Both are more or less claiming to represent, or at least, input the public interests.

So interestingly, the transparency and accountability as was clearly mentioned this morning by the vice-minister of China, of Chinese government.

So how do you really interpret accountability and transparency in the ICANN context, which can also be accepted by the governments and the public, or the end users? Thank you.

JEAN-JACQUES SUBRENAT: Thank you very much. So I would have liked to make some comments myself on this, but the sake of time I'll restrict my comments on your comments simply to two or three things. That doesn't mean that all the other comments are not important, we have taken note of them and you will find them later on in the report on this session.

But I would like to take up two things. One is scope. This has been mentioned by several of you. I want to make perfectly clear that neither ALAC, nor the small group of co-authors, certainly not, nor anyone in the At-Large community purports to represent two something billion users.

We are perfectly in agreement with Alan and others in saying that it is our duty to defend the interests of. And that's why we introduced, a few years ago, the President's Strategy Committee, a very strong element centered on the global public interest, as a central notion. And that has been taken up, including in the affirmation of comments, etcetera, later on.

That lesson has been learned. The second thing was pointed out by [Flood] actually. It is the shifting geography. I feel personally very ill at ease with the continued scheme of five geographic regions which do not correspond to either natural boundaries, or language boundaries, or social, or political boundaries. They are just like that.

So that has to be revisited very soon. And of course, from the internet user perspective, that is even more important than for the business community or others in the ICANN world. So now I open the floor for the second round of considerations. As I said, considering what you have just pointed out as some of the major trends or problems for the future, what do you see as the likely consequences for ICANN and for the internet structures in general and therefore on internet governance?

And again, I would emphasize that you are requested to discuss this from the perspective of the general internet user. The floor is open. Could you take note? Who is faster? Was it ? or was it ? 0:41:05]? [Laughter]

EVAN LEIBOVITCH:

Sorry. Okay. We're just checking online. As of right now, there is no comments online. If you are on Adobe Connect and have something to say, please raise your hand on it and we will make sure you are put in the queue.

Right now, and maybe this is a function of my own aging eyes, I have the order of [? 0:41:30], Victor, and [Flood 0:41:31] at this point. And then Holly and [? 0:41:35].

WOMAN:

[? 0:41:39] for the transcript. One of the first things that come to mind is some of the pending bills that are currently before Congress in the US, that could potentially effect the internet infrastructure pertaining to like things with issues of privacy, issues of filtering.

As you know, the technical community within ICANN, particularly SSAC, will put a couple of papers, not so much – I’m not sure whether it was from SSAC, but certainly members of SSAC, particularly in relation to on issues – positions on issues on DNS [sec 0:42:20] filtering, that’s never going to happen and that sort of thing.

But I think the issues of privacy, surveillance, issues of access to information without warrants, these are sort of issues that would concern the global public community, that I thought we should factor in. I can email that later to you.

EVAN LEIBOVITCH:

Okay. Next I have Victor.

VICTOR:

Thank you Evan. Victor [? 0:42:54]. So my development on the first – on the point concerning local content, how ICANN can help since that its mission is not about content. It’s about mainly internet [advancing 0:43:16] domain names.

Domain name is, for me, the foundation of the online content. When you are put your content online, put the website online, you need a domain name. And today, when the [? 0:43:37]... near 1,000 ICANN accredited registrar. And for Africa, we have just five. And really up to just four.

And from that you can see how difficult for a consumer from Africa to have a domain name. We have to produce a content to put [? 0:44:10] online, you need a domain name. You will got to a registrar in Europe or

in US, which is in another bigger content than you, so if you have a problem you cannot easily deal with that registrar.

So from the ICANN, can develop a strategy to have more registrar in other regions world, not just in the western world. And to make that, I'm proposing that we need another [ALAR 0:44:54] for developing world. Because if you read [ALAR], financial insurance requirement on that [ALAR] cannot easily be fulfilled by a company from Africa, or from other developing country.

And when I say challenge will be security, I'm not talking about featuring a content or things like that. During the opening ceremony, we seen the video dimension of the internet of things, so the internet is evolving. Soon we will have not only people connected, but also things, your appliances and more.

So we need more security measures to be taken. For me, that security is about securing protocols, not about content.

JEAN-JACQUES SUBRENAT:

Excuse me. I'm afraid we have to ask those who are intervening to be very brief now, because there are only, less than ten minutes left for the close of the session. And there is a session of another team immediately afterwards at 12:00.

So I'm sorry to be so rude, but please bear with that. Even have you taken note of other requests to speak?

EVAN LEIBOVITCH: Yes I have right now. So I've got [Flood], Holly, [? 0:46:37] and Garth. And we'll probably have to close it at that, and even so please keep your comments brief so we can wrap this and perhaps also have some concluding comments. Thanks. Okay [Flood].

MAN: Thank you Evan. [? 0:46:54] from [AP RALO 0:46:55]. One of the things as part of ICANN's Middle Eastern strategy is three year admin, with a one year action plan. And it was subdivided into three groups, being the security and stability, domain name industry, the internet governance.

There was a fourth one, community engagement, but that was incorporated into governance. And if we look at what has been demanded from the grass root, or at the bottom level, is that they want to see changes in accreditation processes, the wanted used fees guarantees. They want the opportunity to include this region, regions financial capacity, in ICANN planning.

The consequence of ICANN's current strategies are that there are very few registrants from that part of the world. And that gives you the idea of why you don't have participation at the level which is expected from this region, because you don't have the industry. That is there was a strong emphasis on developing the industrial...

I just relate to you the metrics which they're looking at in this one nine. They want to see an increase in the number of [ask-e 0:48:13], the NCCT league, registrations, [ID NCCT league 0:47:16], Arabic script...

[AUDIO MALFUNCTION 0:48:19 – 0:49:39]

JEAN-JACQUES SUBRENAT: ... restricted to ICANN. Now my last word is a recognition of what has been achieved since we brought out this paper in September 2012. As I said in opening this session, this corresponded almost with the assumption of duties by [? 0:50:03], who started officially as work in only October 2012.

And in a very few short months, he has managed, I think, this is my personal opinion, to change some structures and some processes. That already is a contribution. But I think more importantly, to reestablish a very strong notion of trust and confidence and cooperation, including with those who were pointed out by some members of the community, as the enemy which was totally ridiculous and not acceptable.

So he has engaged. And I think that we, in the next phase of our work together on this paper, will have to factor in the progress made, not only the progress which has been announced this morning, but throughout this session in Beijing and in the coming months.

So with that, I'd like, in my turn, to thank you all for this active participation. And as I said, the important thing is that this is only one step in the process. We want to continue this with you, and the very next step will be to report back to you, and to make a document which will be published elsewhere than ICANN only.

But of course, it will be also on the ICANN website. Thank you very much for your attendance and your participation.

WOMAN: Thank you Jean-Jacques.