

MANAGING CRITICAL RESOURCES

Monday, 16 November 2009

Internet Governance Forum

Sharm El Sheikh, Egypt

>>NITIN DESAI: I welcome you to the -- Can we have the sound system or is the sound system only going to work on this?

Hello.

Can you hear me?

Hello. This one is working.

Let me welcome to you the first thematic substantive session of the fourth Internet Governance Forum.

The theme of this session is critical Internet resources.

The discussions in the Multistakeholder Advisory Group have suggested a four-part agenda.

I will just read out the four parts.

The first is the transition from IPv4 to IPv6.

The second is the importance of new TLDs and IDNs for development.

The third is the Affirmation of Commitments, the recent development in the relationship between ICANN and the U.S. government. The Affirmation of Commitments and the IANA contract.

(Scribes getting music in headphones)

And the fourth is enhanced cooperation generally and the internationalization of critical Internet resource management.

This is a very wide-ranging agenda, and I wanted to make two or three requests to the participants.

One, to the extent possible, we should try and stick to the sequencing.

(Scribes getting music in headphones)

We will ensure that we do cover all of the four topics in the course of the three R's that we have at our disposal. And there is a sense in which it would be helpful to go topic by topic.

(Scribes getting music in headphones)

What this also means is quite a few people will wish to participate more than once since we will be going sequentially from topic to topic. And this should facilitate that. And in order to do that, I would request people to keep their remarks short.

These are wide speeches. I realize you may have some complex argument to present, and you can certainly do that. But if it is a very long position that you wish to elaborate, I could certainly request the Secretariat to see whether a written submission can be put on the Web site.

But let us try to keep this as a conversation to the extent we can, because we do have to cover a lot of ground and a lot of people, many of whom will wish to participate more than once.

And the third thing that I wanted to suggest is that these are topics which we have discussed in the past. In particular, we discussed them in

Hyderabad. So I hope that your remarks will also focus attention very sharply on what has happened over the past year, which we need to discuss here in this forum in Sharm El Sheikh.

These are my requests to you in order to facilitate the conversation that we have to have on these four topics and the critical Internet resources.

We do not have a panel. There are no -- All of you are experts on this, so there is no need for us to have a panel.

All what we do have however in order to ensure the flow of dialogue to be able to identify people for speaking, et cetera, are two facilitators, both of them members of the MAG.

One is Chris Disspain, right here, just here, and that is Jeanette Hofmann. Both of them are members of the Multistakeholder Advisory Group. And they are the people who will, hopefully, orchestrate this debate and invite people to join in the conversation.

I'll be listening, and I hope towards the end, may say a few words. And if at any stage I feel that I need to intervene, I shall of course do that.

But now I will turn it over to Chris Disspain and Jeanette Hofmann.

>>JEANETTE HOFMANN: Thank you very much, Nitin.

Our first topic is IPv4-IPv6, the transition and the problems that are still in the way.

And we have asked Paul Wilson from APNIC to give us a brief overview about what has happened since we discussed this topic last year.

We will have that for all four topics that we cover today. One person introducing the topic and then it's up to you to comment and ask questions.

So please, Paul, go ahead.

>>PAUL WILSON: Thanks, Jeannette.

I should mention that Dr. Hofmann has asked me to help reinforce the democratic nature of this session by speaking from the floor, so that's what I am doing and I am over here.

Jeanette mentioned to me this morning that she thought the fascinating thing about this IPv6 transition is that everyone and no one is responsible for it. That is very true. There is no one who is responsible for the entire IPv6 transition. But, in fact, the same thing does go for many things that happen on the Internet. So it's in the exactly a new thing. This is why the Internet is referred to as an ecosystem, not as an enterprise or a machine.

But in the case of the v6 transition, there are quite well-known roles for a whole group of actors and stakeholders. They have got clear roles, they are well-known.

The stakeholders themselves know what they need to do. And many of them are actually active right now.

So I do appreciate this opportunity to be able to talk about what has happened in the last year. So just a few introductory comments.

It's important to understand, I think, that the v6 transition does require us all to be moving. And that's something that's possibly a little bit new about this process within the Internet. We have got a great number of

people who do need to move forward at the same time. It's not that they need to be strictly coordinated and dance terribly well together, but we do need to move forward towards this same goal. And the point I would like to bring here is that it is already happening.

We have, over the last year, a continuation of the transition to IPv6. We have IPv6 addresses being allocated in increasing and substantial numbers all around the world, and that's growing.

We have ISPs actively planning and deploying and providing -- even providing trial and production services for IPv6.

We have IPv6 in the operating systems, which are sitting on our desks and on our laptops. We have IPv6 in a lot of the infrastructure equipment that is operating on the Internet today and in a lot of the products that are available for those who need them.

We have got IPv6 being brought in, introduced to many parts of the DNS and being supported by registries and registrars.

We have IPv6 in software applications, in many major applications that we use.

We also have governments taking active interest in IPv6 and in the deployment of IPv6, and that's been increasing over the last year. And I would like to say a few more words about this later.

There are possibly a couple of areas which are a little slower in IPv6 development. We're not all carrying, unfortunately, IPv6-capable smartphones and PDAs in our pockets. That's something still coming. We might not all be using or in a position to use the IPv6 in our cable and DSL connections at home. But these things are coming.

We have seen IPv6 appearing in the Internet, on the routing system, and now, over 2,000 of about 30,000 autonomous systems which are in the routing system. And we see an increase in the IPv6 traffic on the Internet.

The reality is this has only just start, so in terms of traffic, IPv6 traffic on the Internet, we have really only a tiny proportion of the traffic, a fraction of 1% of Internet traffic is IPv6. So it's a slow start, but the good news is that this is actually growing at a very healthy and a rapid exponential rate at the moment. While, if you look at other IPv6 Internet measures, IPv4 in particular, the growth is tending to remain linear.

About the transition itself. The transition is something that is going to go on for some time. It's not an event. It's not like Y2K, although that's an analogy we hear. It's a process, and it's a process that will be under way for years, a decade or more in terms of the lifetime of IPv4 on the Internet. That actually also is not a new realization. It is exactly as the transition has been discussed and planned over the last ten years.

So wherever v6 is being deployed, where we have existing networks, clients, infrastructure, and services, v6 is joining IPv6 in a process that's known as a dual-stack transition. Dual stack is simply a reference to the fact that you have got v4 and v6 both running on a particular device or network.

The trick will be in a couple of years' time when we have rapidly reduced or greatly reduced number of IPv4 addresses to distribute, because new networks, in those cases, are going to need to be deployed with new infrastructure addressed with IPv6.

IPv4 in limited numbers will still be available, essentially private addresses. But in both those cases, a technique called network address translation is needed to allow us to reach from an IPv6 connection through to an IPv4 service or server. And this is where we hear that network address translation will not suddenly disappear with IPv6, but again this is something that is part of the transition and has been for quite some time.

As servers and services transition from v4 to v6, we're going to have a gradual shift over to v6, and your v6 connections will then magically access those services using IPv6.

The transition is something which will happen behind the scenes and very gradually over, as I say, the next ten years.

In that time, IPv6 is going to continue to work. And it's going to be useful and existing in the Internet for quite some time.

There's a perception that this transition is slow or it somehow should be faster. And it's sometimes said that the Internet has been unable, in some way, to transition to IPv6 so far.

It's actually not the case. It's a question of choice on the part of those who are in the position to transition to IPv6.

It's a choice that we will, at some point in future, transition when we're ready, when it's justified.

The fact is the Internet -- its success is based in the fact that it is a highly competitive environment. Business has to think very hard these days about where to put resources, about what will give better service and immediate value to customers. In commercial terms, to win market share.

And so far, there have been other priorities than deploying IPv6. So this is actually an informed, intelligent business decision that we see.

The fact is, IPv6 isn't necessary on today's Internet, but it's going to be very necessary in two years' time. And two years is a critical period for business planning. We are seeing a lot of movement in indicators. As I've said, addresses, routes, traffic on the Internet. We are also seeing a lot in surveys of intentions and plans on the part of ISPs.

So concrete planning was revealed by an APNIC survey in at least 40% of respondents within our region, meaning possibly 60% aren't yet giving enough attention to IPv6. But we do know the situation in terms of deployment and deployment planning is rapidly changing.

What happened since last time? Well, I would be happy to talk about that. I think I will hand over to -- back to Jeanette and take it from there.

>>JEANETTE HOFMANN: Thank you, Paul. There are two issues I want to point out. What I understand is deployment of IPv6 is still under 1%. So if I ask you what has happened since last year, we have to say not that much.

And the second thing I got from what you just said is, the transition will take place when it's justified. If I understand correctly, we will run out of IPv4 addresses, unallocated IPv4 addresses, in two or three years.

So is transition not justified for at least five or six years?

>>PAUL WILSON: Planning for the transition is justified and necessary now because in two years' time, an ISP that needs new addresses to build a new network is likely to get IPv6 rather than IPv4. And that's where a two-year planning horizon is really quite realistic.

On the question of numbers, the Internet is full of very, very big numbers and a fraction of 1% of anything on the Internet can still be quite substantial.

So the use of IPv6 according to several measures is growing. It's actually growing very rapidly and exponentially. And if you observe exponential growth, you can reach very high numbers very quickly.

And so over the next two years, we do expect there to be a really rapid increase in deployment.

>>JEANETTE HOFMANN: Thank you, Paul.
Please.

>>CHRIS DISSPAIN: There are -- -- there are people with microphones wandering around, ladies and gentlemen. If you want to speak, put your hand up. They will bring a microphone to you.

Can you not hear me?

That any better? Good.

>>JONNE SOININEN: Hello. My name is Jonne Soinen from Nokia Siemens Networks and I represent also Nokia here. I would like to say calm of things. First of all, your comment, Jeanette, on not much has happened in a year, I think that the things that are happening are not always visible to the outsider right away. But there has been a lot happening during the last year.

A lot of more talk, a lot of more interest, a lot of operation. Vendors are getting even more prepared than they were before. And even parties that haven't been very active or haven't known about this are becoming aware of this IP version 4 depletion issue and are preparing for IP version 6. So actually a lot is happening. A lot has happened during the one year.

I also would like to comment on something Paul said earlier on, that the smartphones we have in our pockets wouldn't support IP version 6. But many of the smartphones that we provide do already support IP version 6. They don't get much use at the moment as the operators haven't launched their IP version 6 services widely yet, but we are prepared and we can use them as soon as these services come online.

>>JEANETTE HOFMANN: Thank you. There was a lady over there, I think, who raised her hand.

>>CHRIS DISSPAIN: Could we ask the microphone people if they could please move around quickly if they see a hand up, and wait by that person until it is their turn to speak.

Thank you.

>>NAOKO AMINO: Thank you. I am Naoko Amino, working for the Ministry of Communication, Japan.

I would like to talk about the steps we are taking on IPv4 address exhaustion.

This year we are holding a working group to reveal the methods of promotion of the ongoing IPv6 migration progress among Internet service providers to general users, business users and so on. And in order to promote the usage of IPv6, we are also holding a working group to study the Internet of things using IPv6.

We need more IPv6 engineers, and we believe government should support the train end, so we have educational programs for them through establishment of the IPv6 test beds so they can ensure the transition to IPv6.

We would appreciate if we can collaborate with many countries.

We also have a project in cooperation with the Japanese Internet and telecommunications industries which is called Task Force on IPv4 Address Exhaustion. We would like to continue sharing of information and cooperating with many countries to take the action to overcome IPv4 address exhaustion.

>>JEANETTE HOFMANN: Thank you for bringing this up. I wanted to ask there is actually a role for governments in helping this transition going, but there's another question I meant to ask you. Is deployment of IPv6 substantially higher in Japan than in other countries? Would you know that? Does she still have the microphone?

>>CHRIS DISSPAIN: No. Okay. Paul? Paul, do you want to pick up on the training, on the training --

>>JEANETTE HOFMANN: Wait, she's got it now.

>>CHRIS DISSPAIN: Do you want to pick up on the training question appear just respond to that and then we'll go to this gentleman here and then Izumi.

>>JEANETTE HOFMANN: I asked whether deployment of IPv6 is higher than in other countries.

>> I don't know the other countries.

>>JEANETTE HOFMANN: Thank you, then.

>>PAUL WILSON: This mic is not working too well.

The RIRs collectively, along with many collaborators in the Internet operational community have been involved with training, technical training of Internet operators for many years and IPv6 has been a priority for many years now, for several years now. I think it's our contention that the correct and efficient optimal operation of Internet networks, particularly in developing countries, is something that absolutely relies on human resource development, and it's something that is clearly crucial with IPv6. So we're spending a lot of time on that collaboration on IPv6 technical training as well as the broader outreach and information.

>>JEANETTE HOFMANN: Thank you. Please go ahead.

>>SAMI AL BASHEER: Well, thank you --

>>JEANETTE HOFMANN: Introduce yourself.

>>SAMI AL BASHEER: Yeah. Sami Al Basheer, the director of the development bureau of the ITU, the International Telecommunication Union.

Of course as the gentleman who introduced this topic said, this is a process and it will take some time. I mean, it will not happen overnight. We in the ITU, of course, took -- our council took a decision to form a group to work on this, to help our members for this very important transition, especially the developing countries in terms of capacity-building and in terms of know-how and so on and so forth.

I think the developing countries are very much concerned not to be left out in this, like happened in the start of the Internet where they had to wait for a long time.

As this process goes on, I think the international community, international organizations, business communities, civil society, will all have a responsibility to work together to make this transition happen as soon as possible and on an equal footing around the world to promote this very, very wonderful interaction and cooperative what you call process in the Internet.

I just want to emphasize, as our Secretary-General did yesterday, that the ITU -- and when we say the ITU, we mean our members, the telecommunication ICT administrations -- are open to work with everybody on an equal footing to make this transition happen and in this most -- in the manner as we do with all Internet governance issues. Thank you.

>>JEANETTE HOFMANN: Thank you. Izumi.

>>IZUMI AIZU: Thank you. Just to follow up my government colleague from Japan, I'm the member of the task force for the IPv4 depletion, as well as the government organizing study group on this issue and transition, and one is a simple question about dual stack to Paul, perhaps, that when you prepare the dual stack, meaning v4 and v6 and if the v4 is not available, then you cannot really have the v4/v6, unless you have the v4 already. So that it may accelerate the consumption or it doesn't really -- you know, it is not really the answer to the problem, as I understand.

If I'm -- if I'm wrong, please correct me.

On the penetration or the deployment of IPv6 in Japan, it used to be higher than others, and now we see a little bit saturation.

We did a survey last year to the ISPs of 107. Only eight are deploying the IP connectivity service -- IPv6 connectivity service, and -- for the RMV (phonetic) as well as some commercial use. 20 are planning. 80 are -- have no plan yet.

And this growing sort of attitude of "wait and see," we don't know exactly why this is happening, but somehow as the real consumption or use of the IPv4 is not known, so that there may be some other already the IPv4s are not used and they're relying on that, or they are just simply wait and see.

Because we -- I'm a member of the working group for the PR, the public relations, how to urge them to prepare, and it's very difficult to send a clear message because there's no economic demand and return in a shorter

range, so these are the challenges we are grappling with. Thank you.

>>JEANETTE HOFMANN: Thank you, Izumi. It would actually be nice to also get some impression from other regions, how the deployment is developing there. I think the next speaker is Ra'l. Please introduce yourself.

>>CHRIS DISSPAIN: Ra'l, just while you're waiting, I do have a list here of people who are speaking so far, so we've got Rod Beckstrom on the list, Mr. Tang, Fouad over there, Hiro Hotta from Japan, Ra'l is speaking. If anybody else wants to speak on this, please -- okay. You need to keep your hands -- I know it's a pain, so we'll try and make a list, if we can. And anybody from developing country who --

>>JEANETTE HOFMANN: Nitin.

>>CHRIS DISSPAIN: Yes. Anybody from a developing country who wants to address the ITU's point about addresses. Ra'l over to you.

>>RAUL ECHEBERRIA: Thank you. And Ra'l Echeberria. I'm from LACNIC. LACNIC is the regional Internet registry for Latin America, part of the Caribbean, and as is obvious, I come from a developing region.

And I agree with what has been said by the colleague from Nokia, that many things are happening, but probably are not very visible. One of the things that is happening is that the number of people that is trained on IPv6 is really big. In our region, LACNIC has trained this year more than a thousand people in hands-on training activities. It's not just to explain what is IPv6, but it is to train the people in how to develop and how to deploy IPv6 in their networks. And it is having also an impact on the number of IP addresses that is being allocated.

But the difference is that the people that receive the addresses now is starting to work immediately in deploying IPv6 in their networks, but let me tell you some other things.

For example, most of IXPs in Latin America are running IPv6. 75% of the Latin American ccTLDs are accessible by IPv6 by primary or secondary servers at this moment. This is today.

And so let me tell you, for example, what is happening in Haiti. Haiti is the poorest country in Latin American and Caribbean region and they have an IXP that connect a hundred percent of the ISPs in the country. What that means is that all the local traffic remain in the country where these are very -- with experience, very uncommon in other parts of the world and they run IPv6.

So this is -- these are things while I understand that people say that developing countries are concerned about this, I can give a different perspective, while regions like mine are getting too much progress on this field, so I'm very optimistic on this point.

>>JEANETTE HOFMANN: Thank you, Ra'l. Tang is next.

>> Good morning to you all. I'm part of the Chinese delegation. My name is (saying name). First of all, on the part of the delegation, I'd like to thank the Egyptian government and the Secretariat of the IGF for their warm hospitality and arrangements.

On the issue of IPv6 present, we're fully aware of the importance of IPv6

to the development of the Internet. The mobile Internet has witnessed great development in China. As of September of this year, the number of users of the mobile Internet users has reached 192 million, with an increase of 62.7%. And we predict the continuous rapid development of mobile Internet worldwide with the comparable rapid development of demand for IPv6 addresses strengthening the international cooperation and coordinated development for IPv6 is now the initial of the consensus on the part of the international community. We hope that all countries will strengthen the exchange and cooperation in the applications of IPv6 technology to the standards of the industry and networks to continue to develop the IPv6 in a sustained manner with great vitality.

>>ROD BECKSTROM: Thank you very much. This is a really important conversation, and there's a lot of confusion about how Internet addresses work and the allocations work, and IPv4/IPv6, and I want to address it because, again, ICANN is the central authority on Internet address allocations.

It allocates those through the regional Internet registries such as Paul and Ra'l represent, who distribute those addresses to ISPs and other parties.

There's some misconceptions that are very fundamental that need to be dismissed. Or, rather, let us put the truth on the table.

There is no difference in how emerging countries have been treated historically in IPv4 allocations than other countries. The addresses were available to parties when they needed them. The constraint is to use IPv4, you have to have the hardware and software -- you have to have the network routers and switches -- you have to install your networks, and need the addresses, and when parties did in emerging countries, like all other countries, those addresses were allocated through the regional Internet registries, through the ISPs.

If anyone in this room has a single example of a corporation or a NGO or a government not receiving an address allocation, please let me know, or Ra'l or Paul or others, so they're available.

With respect to IPv6, let us be clear: There are trillions of trillions of addresses available. Literally trillions of trillions. There's plenty of addresses. Addresses are not a constraint in IPv6. It's the hardware, the software, the upgrades to the network systems that take a lot of time and money.

So that's what we're talking about. The addresses are absolutely available. Every country's treated equally. If any country or any party feels that they've not been given an address for their computers, please come talk to Ra'l or Paul or me or others.

The addresses are available.

And I really appreciate the fact that Secretary-General TourÈ recognized yesterday that ICANN's role as the central authority on names and addresses, because that will also enable us to work more productively with all partners in the ecosystem including the ITU, whom we respect and value.

But I want to make it clear: IPv6 addresses are available. That's not a constraint. The constraint is upgrading networks. And I -- Paul, maybe you can help -- or can you or Ra'l just speak to the fact of how you can allocate IPv6 addresses when people are ready for them? Could you just speak to that, please?

>>CHRIS DISSPAIN: He probably would if he had a microphone.

>>ROD BECKSTROM: Thank you.

>>JEANETTE HOFMANN: Thank you very much.

>>PAUL WILSON: Thanks. Yes, Rod. The IPv4 and IPv6 addresses are being allocated actively by all of the regional Internet registries now, according to policies which are determined by the regional Internet communities. They're being allocated in the case of IPv6 at an increasing rate. We are allocating to more countries, more than 150 countries or ISPs in 150 countries have received IPv6 addresses. As I mentioned before, there are more than 2,000 autonomous systems which are separate networks appearing in the Internet routing tables.

The amount of IPv6 address space that is available is absolutely astronomical. 300 trillion, trillion, trillion addresses, if you like. An analogy is, if the address space of IPv4 were represented by a golf ball, then IPv6 would be approaching the size of the sun.

When we hear that the -- that addresses are being allocated rapidly wherever they're needed, it's -- I think it's natural to ask how many there are left, but there are literally trillions and trillions of addresses left.

We could take the highest density of Internet utilization or penetration in any part of the world, replicate that through the entire world. We could multiply that level of penetration across the entire planet by another factor of thousands and we would still not have scratched the surface.

So when we -- I hope that helps. Thanks.

>>CHRIS DISSPAIN: Thanks, Paul.

>>JEANETTE HOFMANN: Thank you.

>>CHRIS DISSPAIN: Can I just say -- can you hear me?

>>JEANETTE HOFMANN: Yeah.

>>CHRIS DISSPAIN: Okay. Hold on. This is ridiculous. Okay. We've got -- just so that you know, we have a speaker at the back of this row, then another speaker in the middle of this row, then a speaker over here. We're running out of time on this topic.

Now, the logistics of getting you to speak are quite -- are proving quite difficult so what we're going to do from now on is that the people with the white shirts on, and at the microphones, if you want to speak, put your hand up. They will come and they will take your name on a piece of paper and they'll bring it up to us, and we'll then know that you want to speak. So --

>>JEANETTE HOFMANN: But we have a list.

>>CHRIS DISSPAIN: Right now we do, so it's the person at the back here,

then here, then over here.

>>TOM WILL SANFORD: Yes. Tom Will Sanford from (inaudible) trade body in the U.K. Paul Wilson, in his opening remarks said that no one's in charge, and he's quite right. Of course there isn't. But I do think there needs to be one or more bodies in charge of marketing the concept. You didn't actually say what you meant by "in charge." We need somebody in charge or one or more bodies of marketing the concept.

If I talk about Internet and its members, which are technology bodies and in the U.K. the CBI, which is the general business confederation, the issue is below the radar. They don't know about it. They've never heard of it. They're not raising it as an issue. It's not in our top hundred -- top hundred issues. I think there is a distinct need for some marketing push. Not implementation and not -- not telling people what to do, but persuading.

>>JEANETTE HOFMANN: Thank you very much. The next speaker, I think, is Fouad over there.

>>FOUAD BAJWA: My name is Fouad Bajwa from Pakistan. I represent the civil society and the technical Internet community.

One thing behind the perception of IPv6 is that it offers a simpler, more resource-efficient infrastructure management and routing, and as the comments that come from the various people from the developed world and people from companies that make the infrastructure government. One thing has to be realized that as I've checked in the past with my Internet community in Pakistan, the biggest problem that we face with the IPv6 allocation, although the capacity-building has started, but what's going to happen about the equipment, the infrastructure that's required to do that?

First, it takes us nearly two decades to deploy in IPv4 infrastructure, and then the next thing we know, that the address space is going to be out soon, and then with the IPv6 coming in, we have that same issue of again building that new infrastructure to do that. Because it's going to require capacity-building, it's going to require new equipment. There's no secondhand equipment for IPv6 going to be available, so these kind of issues, which when we look into the economic aspects of IPv6, like we only find like one report helping us without on the GDP side of things.

So there's the requirement to have more information of how economically IPv6 is going to benefit a developing company because it's going to be directly relational to the economic benefit that a developing country is going to derive out of it if it's going to take and loans from World Bank or the IMF and so forth.

So this has to be realized: How do we make our infrastructure. Thank you.

>>JEANETTE HOFMANN: This hasn't changed much since the last year, so it's the same problem all the time, right? So --

>>CHRISTINE ARIDA: My name is Christine from the National Telecom Regulatory Authority of Egypt, and I want to bring the perspective from the developing countries again, so we have in Egypt an IPv6 task force. I had

a chance to attend some of their meetings, and they've been looking into how to enable a faster transition to IPv6.

Now, there are economic challenges, and when you look -- when you look at ISPs that are newly emerging in -- and especially when they're investing in infrastructure, so they've just put investment there, and then at a certain stage they realize some of them is not IPv6 maybe enabled, or they don't have IPv6 options in there.

So they have to put an initial -- an additional investment.

In that sense, it's a burden. It's a financial burden on them, and they have to see the benefit behind that.

Governments here can help. If -- if governments are making national networks, national projects like for example in Egypt, our NRN network, which is government funded was asked to be IPv6 enabled, so this gives the backbone builders the chance to put investment in IPv6 in that sense, and it makes it easier.

Now, with respect to capacity-building, we've had a very good experience. I don't know if someone from AfriNIC is here but AfriNIC has been single-letter active in capacity-building. We've had all through Africa so many IPv6 training sessions, two of them already in Cairo are very beneficial, so RIRs are helping very well here. Thank you.

>>JEANETTE HOFMANN: So do you think that one potential role of governments would be to hand out subsidies to companies that have financial problems with the transition?

>>CHRISTINE ARIDA: Not in that sense, but in the sense that when you're forward looking to an actual (inaudible) building, national network (inaudible) building, you have to put the IPv6 component in there in order to make it easier for the investment to come. After that.

>>JEANETTE HOFMANN: Thank you, Christine. Milton is next.

>>MILTON MUELLER: Yes. Can you hear me?

>>JEANETTE HOFMANN: Yes.

>>MILTON MUELLER: Yes. The dialogue is getting a bit --

>>JEANETTE HOFMANN: Oh, need to introduce yourself first.

>>MILTON MUELLER: I'm sorry. I'm Milton Mueller at Syracuse University and part of the Internet Governance Project.

The dialogue is getting a mixed up here. We're talking about two issues that are related but not the same. One of them is the problem of migrating to a new technical standard, which is always difficult, particularly when the old standard is so deeply embedded and the new one is not backwards-compatible.

The other is the issue of address scarcity. Now, obviously address scarcity is a factor in motivating the migration, but it's clearly not a sufficient factor until you reach a crisis point.

I would like to point out that the dialogue about address scarcity is embedded in an institutional rivalry between the ITU and ICANN, and for those of you who are not part of that rivalry, I just want to make it clear to you, that beneath the surface of many of these conversations, this

rivalry is going on. I think it needs to be acknowledged.

I think the dialogue about address scarcity policy needs to be extracted from this rivalry, so that we can have an intelligent and honest discussion of what is the best way to ration or allocate IP addresses without getting stuck in a debate about whether you're for or against ICANN or the ITU.

So just to give you an example -- and I'll try to wrap this up -- when Paul talks about the vast size of the IPv6 address space, he is correct, but he also knows -- and I know that he knows this -- that the units or the chunks of IP address space that would be given out routinely are also extremely large and there will be vast amounts of so-called waste or unused addresses, so we do have to worry about how many addresses we're giving out.

We do have to think about potential scarcity. We do have to think about overly liberal allocations in the early stages. And developing countries are correct to be worried about that. This does not necessarily mean that the RIRs are doing something wrong. In fact, I think they've been very attuned to this problem. It doesn't necessarily mean that the ITU should take over addressing or that ICANN is the sole central authority for addressing. It's simply a fact that scarcity could exist and we have to worry about how we allocate IPv6 addresses. It is not an un- -- you know, a problem we don't have to worry about. Thank you.

>>JEANETTE HOFMANN: Thank you, Milton. Two questions rising from that. First, how will IPv6 addresses allocated -- will it change -- will it be different in any way from IPv4 address allocation? That's one issue I wanted to bring up.

And another thing is, as I understand, RIRs are now preparing for the depletion of the pool of unallocated IPv4 addresses, so what will happen next when we run out of IPv4 addresses? How will we deal with the problem that there is still a high demand?

Perhaps somebody from the RIRs could speak up on this issue. There's no microphone again.

>>CHRIS DISSPAIN: Can we have a microphone over here, please?

>>PAUL WILSON: Yeah. Thanks. I mentioned earlier the policy processes which are underway continually in each of the regions in guiding and refining the address management system and the policies under which we operate, and that -- that system is very much one of balancing efficiency and responsibility, so Milton's reference earlier to the large blocks of IPv6 address space is, in fact, quite true. The blocks of address space which are being allocated are astronomical, in comparison with what is available through IPv4, and that is a conscious decision on the part of the community to ensure that there are no barriers to IPv6 adoption, that there is an efficient routing system and aggregation within the system that will prevent ISPs from having to come back regularly to the RIRs.

But what I said as well still absolutely stands in terms of the ongoing supply of addresses, which is -- which is available.

One of the major topics of conversation through the -- all of the regional

address policy processes has been the fate of the remaining IPv4 address supply. There is, at the moment, no rationing of IPv4 addresses. The projections that we have for the next two years assume an ongoing rapid rate of deployment of IPv4 addresses.

The -- however, each of the RIRs has policies in place for the last portion of address space that they will receive to ensure that there is an ongoing supply of small blocks, sufficient as Izumi mentioned before, to support dual stack transition for many years to come. And those blocks would be available for --

>>JEANETTE HOFMANN: Many means how many.

>>PAUL WILSON: -- minimal quantities for existing ISPs, for new ISPs, that could come along for years down the track during the ongoing transition to v6. Does that help?

>>JEANETTE HOFMANN: Yeah. Thank you. So...

>>VIV PADAYATCHY: Thank you. My name is Viv Padayatchy. I'm the chairman of AfriNIC. AfriNIC is the regional registry responsible for IP address allocation in Africa, and I just wanted to make a comment regarding the IPv6 support. AfriNIC has a support program for running technical training for network engineers for the uptake of IPv6 technology. We also provide training on IP address allocation for both IPv4 and IPv6.

If any of you in the African region here need some support, whether it's technical or whether it's just informational regarding IPv6 allocation or training, please get in touch with me or we have several board members who are present here. We also have our chief technical officer, who is present at this IGF meeting.

So please don't hesitate to get in touch with me. Thank you.

>>CHRIS DISSPAIN: Thank you.

>>JEANETTE HOFMANN: Thank you very much. Olivier is next.

>>OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you, Jeanette. Can you hear?

>>JEANETTE HOFMANN: Yeah.

>>OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you, Jeanette. We're speaking about the future -- I'm sorry. Olivier Crepin-Leblond, I'm an ISOC ambassador and I'm speaking on my behalf. My question is with regards to looking at the future and things that are happening right now. And as far as we're concerned, right now is it possible to get connected to the Internet using IPv6 from the main session room in Sharm El Sheikh, and is it also possible to get connected to the -- any of the IGF Web sites using IPv6?

>>JEANETTE HOFMANN: Thank you very much. I think it's about time to wrap up this topic unless there's something really urgent somebody wants to bring up.

>>CHRIS DISSPAIN: Do you want an answer to that question?

>>JEANETTE HOFMANN: Yeah.

>>CHRIS DISSPAIN: Paul, do you know whether we can connect on IPv6 out of this room? Paul? You're trying. He's trying. He'll get back to you. Alex? We really need to wrap this up. I know everyone has things they need to say and we'll come back to at the end if we can. Was this about

the question? Okay.

>>RAUL ECHEBERRIA: Yes, I would like to point out very quickly something. I don't know that it is of this network, but this is something that we usually do in all the RIRs meetings and IETF meetings. It is the IPv4 network is usually turned off as we continue working. Most of the things are possible while I -- there are still things that have to be improved, programs, surveyors, that are in progress to be corrected to work properly with IPv6.

Two very quick responses to something that has been said before. One thing is that the RIRs has remained always out of any controversy between ICANN and ITU, and it doesn't affect the allocation system, so we have been doing our work for many years since we have not been part of that controversy between ICANN and ITU, so it's -- there is no implication of that in this discussion.

The other thing is that I agree with Milton Mueller about what he said regarding the responsibility and the management of the resource. While this is a huge number of IPv6 addresses, it is true that we have to keep the way in which we allocate the addresses now taking care of the consideration of the resource by anything that could happen in the future that could demand more addresses.

Thank you.

>>JEANETTE HOFMANN: Thank you, Raul. I think Patrik also wants to speak. Please keep it very brief now.

>>PATRIK F<str^m: Yes. Hello. Patrik F<str^m with Cisco.

I just want to answer a couple of questions here that came up.

The first one regarding the economic and technical considerations, there is a workshop tomorrow that will discuss explicitly the issues that Christine brought up.

The second thing that I wanted to inform about is this is IPv6 on this network. As everyone knows, there was some problem with the wireless network yesterday. I was working together with the local host here to make it better. And now when it is stable, we will do some more test of IPv6. So you will probably see some IPv6 on this network shortly.

Thank you.

>>CHRIS DISSPAIN: Thank you, Patrick.

>>JEANETTE HOFMANN: Last one.

>>WILLIE CURRY: Willie Curry from Association for Progressive Communications.

I was interested to hear Paul Wilson talk about an ecosystem, and I think it would be quite useful to explore this concept further as a form of governance. And the question I would like to pose, is, is an ecosystem self-regulating. And is an ecosystem more than the play between regulation and deregulation. That has characterized the governance debate over the last 20, 30 years.

If it is more than a matter of regulation and deregulation, if it is some combination of regulation and deregulation, then should there not be some

consideration of public options in regard to nudging ISPs towards faster adoption of IPv6? If, as seems to be the case, there is a lack of incentives on a competitive grounds for ISPs to migrate to IPv6 because those that move first are at a competitive to those who do not.

So I just pose the question. Or should we not be looking at a new -- If ecosystem governance is the way forward, then how do the various components, public, private, fit into that?

>>JEANETTE HOFMANN: And do you have any suggestions regarding this form of nudging?

>>WILLIE CURRY: I am just thinking that in a way, the analogy is the economic recession, the economic crisis, where it became apparent that before the crisis there was a limited coordination between, say, between the central banks around the world. After the crisis, they realized they needed to coordinate more effectively.

Are they analogies which could work here?

If one looks at climate change and we say, okay, we shouldn't worry about climate change because an ecosystem is self-regulating, then maybe the ecosystem will self-regulate in a way that is to precipitate a disaster. And is there an analogy here that one could look at.

>>JEANETTE HOFMANN: And self-regulation is always a contested issue. So Rod Beckstrom wants to comment on this.

>>ROD BECKSTROM: I just wanted to quickly take on the question of how can the nudging be done.

I had some interesting conversations with Vint Cerf and others in Washington recently because Vint, of course, cares a lot about IPv6, being one of the authors and developers. And he is so frustrated it won't happen. And I said it's a network effect problem. Until everyone else does it, you don't have a lot of advantage being a first mover unless you are building on a whole new network, and of course you are probably going to build it in because you might save time.

What we talked about is, many of you might have heard of "Cash for Clunkers." It's a program in America where you could trade in cars, old gas-guzzling cars and get new small cars and you got a lot of money for it. So the idea I came up with was a crazy idea of doing network cash for clunkers, which is if your routers and switches are so old they can't support IPv6, let the government have an incentive structure to trade those in and upgrade to IPv6.

In fact, it's not -- In the case of cars, cars are pretty much hardware. They are these big steel things. In the case of IPv6, as you know, it's actually more about the software and the configuration.

So there is actually a lot of work that has got to get done.

But what we want to think about are national programs. Each country could consider national programs to incentivize the adoption of IPv6 with DNSSEC. So there's a security benefit as well.

And those programs could be in the form of tax credits, they could be in the form of accelerated depreciation on the assets, which is similar to a

tax credit. Or they could be in the form of subsidies or other development grants. But there's many different formats that can be used, but if the countries of the world could look at using stimulus funds to upgrade network infrastructure to move to IPv6 and DNSSEC, it would be really great for the world.

And by the way, this is a great world where ITU can help out so many parties because ITU has the relationships with the ISPs and the telecom providers for that physical layer of upgrade. And again, ICANN's little role in this is the network addresses that we allocate to the RIRs, they are available. There are enough addresses for everybody. There is no limit on IPv6. And if anyone in the room has heard of anyone who couldn't get an IPv6 address, please raise your hand.

Okay. I don't see any hands. So there is enough addresses, there's trillions and trillions. But we have to get the infrastructure upgraded so let's all partner.

You know someone who didn't get an IPv6 address?

>>SURESWARAN RAMADASS: Actually, Rod, it's different. Since there are so many IPv6 addresses, why can't we have additional organizations giving it out?

>>ROD BECKSTROM: But you got what you wanted, so what's the issue?

>>SURESWARAN RAMADASS: Exactly, what's the issue? Why can't we have additional organizations giving it out?

>>ROD BECKSTROM: Someone who knows how the router system and BGP works can probably help me. The reality is you want the addresses allocated in a fashion that makes some sense because the border gateway protocol assignments are important. Anyway, there's routing implications.

Do you have a problem with the RIRs? Is that what you are saying?

>>SURESWARAN RAMADASS: No. I am saying there should be an alternative for someone to seek.

>>ROD BECKSTROM: Why?

>>SURESWARAN RAMADASS: Because right now there is only one organization

--

>>ROD BECKSTROM: If you get what you need, why do you need something else?

>>SURESWARAN RAMADASS: Not in the way I wanted it.

>>ROD BECKSTROM: What way are you not getting it?

>>SURESWARAN RAMADASS: If I multiple organizations to choose from. That would be good.

>>ROD BECKSTROM: We have five RIRs. Go wherever you want in the world.

>>SURESWARAN RAMADASS: I can't go to the other RIR, can I? Can I? Can you answer that? Can I go to AfriNIC?

>>CHRIS DISSPAIN: Yesterday I threatened to put new a box with somebody and have you sort it out in a box.

>>JEANETTE HOFMANN: I think the first thing we should notice is ICANN suggested the ITU as one potential forum to discuss the future role of governments in the transition process. If that isn't good news, I don't

know what good news is.

>>ROD BECKSTROM: And let me make clear. What you are saying is, even though you are getting what you want, you want a different political body.

I just want to say you have a political issue. You do not have a functional issue.

>> I want an option to be able to choose between A or B to apply for IPv6 addresses.

>>ROD BECKSTROM: Why? Give me a business reason. Not a political reason, a business reason.

>> Okay. It's called nonmonopoly. It's called why we also decided that telecommunication companies should be many. Why ISPs shouldn't be just one in a country but many.

That same reason is why there shouldn't just be one RIR giving out IPv6 addresses.

>>ROD BECKSTROM: It doesn't make any sense. You are getting it for free.

>> I am not getting it for free. That's the whole point. I am paying for it.

>>NITIN DESAI: Can I just interrupt? We need to wrap this up. This conversation with continue a little later.

>>ROD BECKSTROM: Yes. Let us do so. Thank you.

>> Can I say something? I want to comment because the ITU was mentioned many times here.

So I have to comment.

>>NII QUAYNOR: My name is Nii Quaynor. I'm from Ghana. I am an operator.

I am very, very happy with the way the number systems work. I am extremely pleased with the opportunity Africa has to participate in making its own policies regarding address assignments for its operators.

We like the fact that it's an open process, and we can all participate collectively in a multistakeholder environment to achieve that.

And we believe that any form of change that takes that opportunity away from Africa is not in the interest of Africa; therefore, not in the interest of developing countries.

We would like to all participate together to make policies which are localized, that benefit all of us in the development of a single Internet, not multiple Internet.

Thank you.

[Applause]

>>JEANETTE HOFMANN: Thank you, Nii.

>>CHRIS DISSPAIN: The last, the last speaker on this topic, the absolute last speaker on this topic.

>> Well, I will be very, very short. Actually, the ITU was mentioned many times. I just want to make sure that we don't misunderstand this.

There is no intention in the ITU to do what the ICANN does. It's very clear.

What we are saying, we don't want the ICANN to do what is the mandate of the ITU.

You see? This is exactly --

>>CHRIS DISSPAIN: It's the same thing.

>> The ITU -- I repeat if it's not clear. The ITU, and from this conversation, it's very clear, and I agree with the ICANN. There is no intention in the ITU administrations -- And we are not talking here about any Secretariat position in this. It's membership driven. We have no intention whatsoever to do the business of the ICANN, what the ICANN is doing best.

Now, I think --

>>JEANETTE HOFMANN: Thank you.

[Applause]

>> What everybody is talking about, and this is the argument I think, within the ITU and for around the world, everybody doesn't want the ICANN to do what is the mandate of the ITU of policy-making, public-policy issues and so on.

Thank you very much.

>>JEANETTE HOFMANN: Thank you for this clarification.

I think we really need to wrap up this topic now because we have more on the agenda.

>>CHRIS DISSPAIN: Thank you, Jeanette.

So one of the things that we -- Jeanette and I agreed is that we would try to make sure this session didn't just become about ICANN. So we have done really well so far.

And we are moving on now to new IDNs and new gTLDs.

There are a couple of starting points for this. We are going to talk about -- briefly, we are going to talk about IDNs, we are going to talk about the introduction of new gTLDs. And because the introduction of IDNs and new gTLDs has an effect on the root of the Internet, we are going to talk about the root scaling study and what should happen with that.

Just before I pass you over to Patrik F<str^m -- he is going to do the introduction on this -- there is just one piece of news that I have for you. I have been asked by the Egyptian government and by the Russian government to tell you that as of today they have both put in an application for their IDN ccTLD.

[Applause]

>>CHRIS DISSPAIN: Now, apparently there was some kind of competition going on about who was going to get in first and who was going to get in second. And I don't know who got in first, but I do know that Manal was in the office until 2:00 this morning to make sure that Egypt's application got in on time.

So I think you deserve a round of applause for that.

[Applause]

>>CHRIS DISSPAIN: So on that note, I will pass you over to Patrick who is going to do the introduction.

Thanks, Patrick.

>>PATRIK FfLTSTR:M: Thank you very much, Chris.

So I am going to do a brief introduction on what is currently happening and specifically what has happened since we met in Hyderabad.

Let's start by looking at what kind of changes have been made and what changes are happening at the moment.

There are four large things that have happened with the DNS system in the world. The first one that we just heard mentioned is the additional internationalized ccTLDs. And that is, from a technical standpoint, not much more than adding a couple of new TLDs, but for the users, of course, that has big impact. And for the various protocols that use domain names, that has a big impact.

But it will still be some addition of some TLDs. So the size of the root zone will increase. There will be some new registries added. There will be some more policies added to the global system. And that of course right create some stress.

The second change that is happening is that we are going to add DNSSEC to the root zone. There are some ccTLDs and other TLDs that are working on using DNSSEC. The country where I am coming from, Sweden, was the first one that signed our zone a couple of years ago. But more countries will follow, and the signing of the root zone that is currently scheduled to happen during the first half of 2010 will, of course, create some issues.

The size of the responses will be larger. There will be more stress on the root system itself. There are some key management issues. We need to know how we are going to handle the request for key management from the top-level domains, et cetera.

So DNSSEC addition will require changes in various places, specifically for the people that also want to verify those signatures on the DNS responses.

The next thing that is happening, the third is that we are adding IPv6 addresses for the DNS servers in the world. This is something that is called glue records in the DNS.

This is also something that creates some changes. The DNS servers in the world can no longer only use IPv4 but also IPv6 when they are issuing queries. The root servers need to respond to IPv6 queries. The TLD servers need to be able to respond. And clients need to know whether they are going to use IPv4 or IPv6.

And this is something that also is a big change.

The last thing that is discussed are addition of other TLDs, both international TLDs, international gTLDs and other top-level domains. And the question there, of course, is whether we are going to add, like, one, three, or three million of them. When you hear me talking about all of these changes, myself and many of the others, of course we are a little bit nervous. We have not changed to the DNS much the last couple of years, and then suddenly we are going to make four changes within like six months or something. Of course coming from a technical environment, we know that

when we say something is going to happen within six months, it normally takes ten years, but it is still a very short time period.

Because of this, there have been a couple of reports written. I was myself part of writing one report regarding root scaling, the implications on root scaling, implications on the stability of the DNS system.

The other report is written as well. And the conclusions from those reports is that the number of root zone TLDs that are added doesn't have so much impact. It is the rate of which the TLDs are added which is the problem.

It is the speed of -- the rate of the changes we make. Those are the changes themselves that make -- creates the stress.

The root system is -- can accept lots of changes, and over time it is possible to change all of it, if we have to.

But it takes time.

Let me give you a couple of examples.

When a top-level domain want to change something in the root system, it could be anything from changing the e-mail address of a contact to changing the IP address of one of its name servers, they contact IANA. IANA is authenticating and authorization -- they are authenticating the request and make sure it is the request party that has sent in the request.

The change is implemented, and then published in either the WHOIS servers or in the root zone itself. So there are several steps there from the provisioning to the publication step. So there might be changes and stress on the -- and changes needed on the provisioning side, on the publication side, in the name servers of the TLDs, and finally on the name servers of the end users.

And those changes, regardless of where they are, might have impact on the amount of staff, human resources needed, name servers, hardware, routers, switches, and finally budget processes for the organizations that actually are paying for this. Because even the root system is something that is run by Milt Tim organizations, each one having their own business case. And if they have to change lots of things that they are doing, that takes some time.

So the rate of change is what has greatest -- much more impact than the actual changes themselves.

So the last thing I wanted to talk about is the -- go back to the IDN issues and specifically look at developing countries. And once again, I think we see at the Internet that the developing countries actually have it much easier than what the rest of us have, because they don't have so much old things. They can immediately jump into a system where they use IPv6 in internationalized domain names.

Myself, at home, it has been very, very difficult just being able to handle the characters -- few characters we use in Swedish, which are only three. Being able to do a presentation that I held yesterday morning where I tried to include some Arabic in my PowerPoint presentation, that was not easy.

So all of us have to work together because we share the responsibility to ensure that the Domain Name System continues to become stable. And we have to be careful with the changes we are making and adding them in a cautious and careful way because we don't want to break the DNS because the DNS is what we have and we need the DNS for the Internet.

Thank you.

>>CHRIS DISSPAIN: Thank you, Patrick. Don't give me that. It will explode my microphone.

Patrick is here, and he will be able to answer any questions. Just so that we are clear about questions, so we get this organized, this is how it's going to work. If you want to say something, if you want to make a comment, if you want to ask a question, please raise your hand. Please keep your hand raised until one of the lovely staff people comes to you and takes down your name and brings it -- and once they have got your that I am you can put your hand down. That way we will know who wants to speak.

So news is coming in thick and fast. We have an application for an IDN ccTLD also this morning from Saudi Arabia. So congratulations to Saudi Arabia.

[Applause]

>>CHRIS DISSPAIN: I have the firsthand up at the back. Given that we don't have a list yet, we will start with that one. The gentleman there with his hand up, can you give him a microphone, please. Thank you.

Don't forget, we are here to talk about IDNs, we are here to talk about new gTLDs, and we are here to talk about root scaling if we need to.

Did we lose the microphone at the back there?

Okay, Alex, do you want to start?

>>ALEJANDRO PISANTY: Thank you, Chris. Thanks, Patrick, for this wonderful presentation.

I would like to drive a point of caution and recognition.

The start of IDN -- sorry. The introduction -- My name is Alejandro Pisanty. I am from the Internet society and the National University of Mexico.

The introduction of IDN ccTLDs has one important opportunity, to make a recognition of the management of ccTLDs that has taken place in this is continuously evolving at the present.

Many ccTLD managers have started in research organizations, in small community organizations, and have done an heroic job in expanding the Internet in their own countries for many years.

The IDN ccTLD should not be used, as much as possible, to cut off this recognition by starting a new official mandated ccTLD registration. And one would encourage every government to -- and society to be respectful of their ccTLD in this transition.

>>CHRIS DISSPAIN: So you are suggesting there is a possibility that a new IDN ccTLD could lead to the retirement, closure of an existing --

>>ALEJANDRO PISANTY: My nightmare scenario is that a policy-making body which were not well informed or which were captured by some interests could

create and mandate registrations and do things that cannot work very well but can seem to work, like only do business with organizations that are registered in the new IDN ccTLD and, therefore, stab in the back a community operator who has been working, as I said, in many cases, heroically.

>>CHRIS DISSPAIN: Thank you, Alex.

The next person is Milton.

Where has Milton gone. Milton accountability frameworks we have a microphone over here, please? Yeah, you are now.

>>MILTON MUELLER: Hello. Milton Mueller again.

I wanted to talk about the impact of the root signing -- the root scaling study on the new TLD process for ICANN.

Now, as you know, ICANN's fundamental function is to essentially make policy regarding which new top-level domains are available. And many people have been very disappointed that for after ten years, it had still not implemented an ongoing process for the addition of new TLDs.

Starting in 2006, it seemed to solve that problem. It developed -- It went through a very extensive policy-making process to add new top-level domains.

And now the root scaling study comes along and has sort of suggested on the part of some people -- some people have interpreted it to mean that the new TLD process should be deferred because of the impact on the root zone administration and provisioning.

Now, what I would like to point out is that the real issue here is that somebody has made a decision that the root zone will be signed in July of next year, 2010. And I have to ask, where did this decision come from?

I can tell you it did not come from an ICANN process. It did not come from an IGF process. It did not come from any bottom-up process. It came from negotiations among the United States government, VeriSign, and, secondarily, ICANN. And the process of root signing that is being imposed in this way is really sort of an arbitrary constraint that's been thrown into the middle of the new TLD process.

So whether -- You know, I think that's something we have to discuss, because it's very important. And ICANN created a lot of expectations that there would be an ongoing new TLD process, and then all of a sudden this interruption came from nowhere saying that there's going to be a root signing at a fixed day and that this root signing makes it possibly impossible to proceed with these new TLD plans.

>>CHRIS DISSPAIN: Thank you, Milton. Does anybody want to comment specifically on that point or question at this stage that Milton has raised?

Do you want to comment on that, Chuck? Okay.

>>CHUCK GOMES: Chuck Gomes from VeriSign.

I have a question for Milton, because I don't see the signing of the root as a constraint in introducing new gTLDs or other TLDs for that matter.

It will be done in July. What's the constraint?

>>CHRIS DISSPAIN: I'm sure Milton will respond, but it might be at least in part, Chuck, that the root scaling report suggests you should do DNSSEC first.

>>MILTON MUELLER: Yes. The suggestion is, by some people, that it is impossible to both have new TLDs and to have the DNSSEC happening at roughly the same time.

>>CHUCK GOMES: That's exactly my point, Milton.
The report did say that if you have to make a decision, DNSSEC should be done first.

Well, it's naturally going to happen first because there will not be any new gTLDs introduced before July.

So what's the constraint?

That condition will be met, as I understand it.

>>MILTON MUELLER: So you are saying that the new TLDs will be deferred for another year.

>>CHUCK GOMES: Well, that's a different issue --

>> That's a totally different question.

>>CHUCK GOMES: -- and with different parameters. But what I am saying is, the plan right now is for the roots, all 13, to be on board with DNSSEC, signing the root by July; okay?

That will not cause any delay with regard to new gTLDs.

There may be other factors that do, but I don't believe that does.

>>CHRIS DISSPAIN: So, thank you. We can bounce that backwards and forwards forever. Patrick, one quick comment.

>>PATRIK F%LTSTR÷M: Patrik F%ltstr÷m again. I was part of the group that wrote this report. Let me emphasize what Chuck just said.

What we found was that it is the rate of the changes to the root zone which is the issue here. And if it is the case -- Sorry. And when we add DNSSEC, that might multiply the size of the root zone with a factor of four.

Because of that, it's better to add DNSSEC first while the zone is small instead of first increasing the size of the zone and then adding DNSSEC, because the multiplicative effect of the change of the actual number of bytes of the size of the root zone will be four times larger if we do DNSSEC large -- sorry, after. That was the finding.

But then, of course, it's up to anyone to read our report and other reports and draw their conclusions. We try to be careful to write about the findings we found.

>>CHRIS DISSPAIN: Thank you, Patrick.

>>JEANETTE HOFMANN: Let me just clarify. From a technical point of view, how long would that further delay the introduction of new gTLDs?

>>PATRIK F%LTSTR÷M: It's not a technical issue. It also had to do with human resources issues, budget issues, et cetera.

What we suggest in our report -- other reports say different things -- is that we need to have a system where we have better communication and an early warning system that can say, okay, we add one thing, we look at this

system how the change is adopted. Then we can calculate when we can take the next step. So we take one step at a time.

It's very hard to extrapolate far in the future.

>>CHRIS DISSPAIN: Thank you. Now we are going to hear from Bob Kahn and then the next speaker is going to be Andrei Kolesnikov. Andrei, can you put your hand up so they can bring you a microphone please.

I have a list of speakers here. If you are not on the list you need to hold up your hand until somebody comes and takes your name.

Bob.

>>BOB KAHN: Okay. Thank you. We're hearing a discussion today about some rather specific operational concerns. I think this is all a helpful dialogue and discussion, and I hope it continues. However, I felt that in the interest of all the parties here in the room, it was really important to point out that this is a discussion in a context of a much larger set of diverse possibilities that we're going to have to deal with in the future, and I wanted to make a plea for everyone in this room to remain open to diversity of choice, going forward.

The Internet is not a stable, locked-in system that has only one approach to doing things. It's going to change in the future. The networks will change, the technology will change. Maybe even every aspect of it will change as we go forward, and this is healthy.

But I don't think we need to think about locking into one particular approach and we certainly don't want to go down a path that will cause the Internet to fragment. Part of the discussion about IPv4 and v6 is to assume that we have some kind of continuity going forward.

More specifically, I think the roles that ICANN is playing and the DNS are playing are important, and will continue to be important. So this is not about either those approaches or those organizations.

But, rather, to point out that what we have here will a set of possibilities going on in parallel. One has to do with how we develop process. This is a -- the IGF is a way of having good discussions about process. ICANN implements process. Many organizations implement process.

And the other part of it is authentication. Whether we're authenticating systems, whether they're authenticating content, whether we're involving individuals or actual systems and those can be separated as well.

So my whole motivation here was to essentially not take on existing process, but to give us some independent ideas.

For example, the publishers worldwide have adopted an approach using unique identifiers which they call DOIs. It's based on something called the Handle System. And this is literally a parallel to ICANN working completely in parallel with it. And it works extremely well.

It really has multiple agents, it's got the equivalent of an unlimited number of equivalents to domain names and it's been fully secure for ten years.

The choice of the DNS was made back in 1984, and it was intended basically to simplify things, so people didn't have to remember IP addresses. It was

not to lock in any particular method. In fact, my plea has been to remain open. If people have better ideas than DNS, let's move to them, and so forth.

But if you think about giving identifiers to things, you can literally identify everything in a network with an identifier. People have tended to focus on content for the most part, but, you know, we've worked with places like Cisco to demonstrate that you can identify a router with an ID and a router can be a mobile program that can move from place to place. If you identify a mobile device a unique identifier, then that mobile device identifier can resolve to the protocol it's willing to use, and in fact, I think devices in the future will have multiple protocols, so they'll be able to work on multiple systems.

So my plea is to remain open to these new approaches, even though this discussion is about one particular approach. Don't lock into that approach, because we will have new ideas and new capabilities in the future. Some are already working in parallel with them now, and that we want to just enable research to take place in whatever dimension we can, going forward. Thank you very much.

>>CHRIS DISSPAIN: Thank you, Bob. The next speaker is Andrei. After Andrei, I'm going to call on Maria, who is over here. If I could have a microphone over -- Maria, if you could put your hand up, please. If you could put your hand up.

If you could bring a microphone over here. If your name is not on my list already, you need to hold your hand up until you're on the list. Andrei.

>>ANDREI KOLESNIKOV: Hello, everybody. My name is Andrei Kolesnikov. I'm representing Russia, the ccTLD for dot ru, and I'd like to see that we applied the fast-track application exactly at the time when it was opened, so we are kind of competitors with our host in Egypt. I say hello to Manal. What I should say is that these new things are putting the developing countries -- basically all the countries, because, you know, IPv6 and DNSSEC and IDNs -- basically making equal all the stakeholders around the world.

There is no -- there is no sustainable countries in the Internet, and there is no developing countries, because we are in the same boat doing a new thing, which is very exciting.

I'd like to thank ICANN for the fast track. I'd like to thank the international community, the international Internet community, in making the fast-track procedure real. It was relatively fast, okay? Even though some people called the fast track not very fast. But, you know, on the scale of the Internet life, it's really fast.

And also I should mention that I like the numbers assignment for the order of the fast track. ICANN did a very good job assigning the random number so nobody knows who was the first, who was the second in the application.

[Laughter]

>>CHRIS DISSPAIN: We're not going to check.

[Laughter]

>>ANDREI KOLESNIKOV: No, don't.

And also, I'd like to mention that work on the internationalization of the address space has just been begun because, you know, IDN domain names will work, there's no question about it, but, you know, the different applications who is using the different languages, I think it will take a few years until the different applications will understand the charter even though they will use the different languages.

So one example is e-mail, which is the next -- from the IDN domains. It's not an easy one, because, you know, we run some tests and it's like -- so my estimation is one year, at least, in this one.

So again, thanks everybody. Thanks for the support from the international community making the fast track, and I'm done. Thanks.

>>CHRIS DISSPAIN: Thank you, Andrei. Maria? The next speaker after Maria will be Izumi. Maria.

>>MARIA HfLL: Thank you so much. My name is Maria Hfll, and I work for the Swedish government offices and also representing the Swedish E.U. presidency. I would like to say from our side that of course we are very concerned over the stability and security of the Internet. Also, not only for a public policy side, but also like from the multistakeholder perspective. And, therefore, of course we -- I mean, the Internet stability and security also includes, of course, the DNS and the root, and the root zone, so therefore, we also very much hope that you're going to take into account, no matter what decisions are taken with the DNSSEC signing or the IDN introduction and also the gTLD, all these decisions need to take into account the concerns that actually was raised by Patrik. And I would like to say that also from a Swedish point of view, we were the first one to sign the root with DNSSEC. That was very important for us, and also taking into account the fact that signing the root zone with a small root is going to be much different than if you do it with a big root, so to end this, I would like to say please take into account all these issues when you take decisions whatsoever. Thank you.

>>CHRIS DISSPAIN: Thank you very much, Maria.

Izumi, followed by Khaled. Where's Khaled Fouda? Where are you, Khaled? Okay. You're next. Not now. In a minute. Izumi.

>>IZUMI AIZU: So may I? Chris?

>>CHRIS DISSPAIN: I'm sorry. I'm sorry.

>>IZUMI AIZU: May I?

>>JEANETTE HOFMANN: Yeah. Please go ahead.

>>CHRIS DISSPAIN: Go ahead.

>>IZUMI AIZU: Yeah. My name is Izumi Aizu. I have multiple hats -- civil society, member of the ICANN's at-large community -- but this time I speak -- I'm the member of the Japan Internet Domain Name Council, but just speaking for myself strictly.

First, I'd like to congratulate Egypt and Russia, to apply for the fast track, and also congratulate and appreciate ICANN for allowing us to apply for the IDN ccTLD in the fast track.

In Japan, we try to apply for, but we decided not to. We deferred. With some good reason.

The fact is that our government convened the telecommunications council for the policy process for the selection of the new IDN ccTLD, dot Japan or dot (non-English word) in the Chinese or Japanese characters.

In a manner that allowed some kind of a multiple application, although the existing registry manager, the JPRS, is also welcome to apply for the new management of the ccTLD IDN. However, any others who want to are welcome to. That was the conclusion of the almost one-year policy process with the public comment, and many meetings that the many stakeholders -- not only the industry or the domain name industry, but ISPs, the businesses, the consumer bodies and some others, users are also invited -- and we concluded with a consensus to have this selection process.

So now we are working on how to set up the selection process on level playing, open and transparent field. On the won hand, just like the IPv4/v6 address debate indicated, that we need some choice. We need some better choice for the consumers. Diversity.

On the other hand, we need to keep the Internet as one single global united. So we are facing a challenge domestically that we have two different ccTLDs. If the -- if the existing operator wins, then there will be one operator, but maybe two different policies. This council is tasked to do the oversight as well, and so these are the areas which may not happen to the -- many of the ccTLDs, and as some said, like Alex said, we should respect all the pioneering work of the existing ccTLDs, yet there are certain calls to open up, just like Bob Kahn said, to see more diversity in a manner that keeps the unity or the global one Internet, but still expand furthermore of the greater choices.

So our task is very difficult, even in Japan, so that I'd like to just share this new sort of development. Thank you.

>>CHRIS DISSPAIN: Thank you. Thank you very much. So the next speaker is Khaled, followed by Manal. Manal, if you could put your hand up so that they can bring you a microphone. Khaled you're first, then Manal. Now, we're going to -- I've got a few more people on my speakers list here. If anybody else wants to speak, now is the time to put your hand up, if you're not already on this list. So...

>>KHALED FOU DA: Thank you, Chris. My name is Khaled Fou da. I work for the General Secretariat for the League of Arab States, and actually in response to a decision -- decisions and resolutions by the Arab Telecommunications and Information Technology Council of Ministers, we have been working for quite a while now on a project to apply for new top level domains, basic-hoe in cooperation with other -- or with the assistance of other regional and international organizations. We intend to apply for the dot Arab top level domain and its equivalent string in Arabic, dot arabie, and actually though our string is unique and well identified all over the world, we have two concerns.

Our first concern maybe is that new gTLDs might -- seems like might be

delayed for quite a while and we want to move forward with this issue as soon as possible. And our second concern is that new gTLDs, commercial and noncommercial top level domains might be treated similarly, and we don't believe that we should be treated like a commercial entity who is applying for a generic top level domain to actually financially benefit from it.

So we heard that there might be a new approach to maybe geographic top level domains and we want to know how can we go into that track or maybe how can we apply for cc top level domain through the fast track if that can be applied for by the League of Arab States. Thank you, Chris.

>>CHRIS DISSPAIN: Khaled, that's a very interesting question. I can just very briefly address one issue on that and then -- as far as the geographic names are concerned, there's a lot of discussion going on within ICANN, within the Governmental Advisory Committee, about what the position of geographic names should be, be they country names or regional names, and so on. And I think that anyone who is involved in that would encourage people like you and the people that you work with to get involved with that -- with that debate.

So that's -- I mean, from that point of view.

Does anyone else from ICANN or from the governmental side want to comment? Rod, you want to say something? If we could just give you a microphone.

>>ROD BECKSTROM: Or I can borrow yours.

>>CHRIS DISSPAIN: No, probably best not so -- so microphone is coming for Rod. Manal, you're next. I'll get to you in a second.

>>ROD BECKSTROM: Yes. The policies for names and addresses on the Internet, domain names and addresses, are developed through a bottom-up process in ICANN involving the whole stakeholder -- multistakeholder community.

Chris is the chair of the Country Code Name Supporting Organization, which is the formal global body where those policies are developed for country codes. Avri Doria, who may or may not be in the room, is the chairperson -- or was, I'm sorry, she just -- for the Generic Names Supporting Organization.

These are very subtle and sophisticated issues because, of course, other commercial interests that have a gTLD want to be treated similarly with new gTLDs because whether they're under an international domain name or they're under the traditional -- Latin characters really doesn't matter. They're generic top level domains.

So there is still a healthy dialogue in the ICANN community -- and, again, please engage. Please come to the ICANN meetings. There are multiple standards bodies involved in the Internet. There's not one. There's at least five I can think of.

ICANN's only role is our four things that we do: Names, addresses, the domain name system, and we simply publish the protocols and parameters that IETF develops.

IETF, of course, is the standards group, or the technical group that developed IPv4, IPv6. They also developed DNS. HTML was developed by the

W3C, which is a terrific organization. There's also OSI and of course ITU is a very important standards body in telecommunications.

So none of us has a monopoly on standards but we tend to have our little niches.

If you want to get involved in this issue, sir, we please ask you to engage with the ICANN stakeholder community. Thank you.

>>JEANETTE HOFMANN: Does that mean it's still an open question whether commercial gTLDs will be treated differently than noncommercial gTLDs?

>>ROD BECKSTROM: The -- well, first, the gTLD process hasn't been opened up yet.

>>JEANETTE HOFMANN: Uh-huh.

>>ROD BECKSTROM: So there are other gTLDs than there are today, with the exception of dot post. We have just reached agreement in postal with the Universal Postal Union with dot post but that's been in process from the 2006 round.

The new gTLD process is proposing that there's very similar treatment between the two. There's some differentiation, but fundamentally similar.

The real issue in question here is contractual. ccTLDs or country code top level domains such as dot eg and the new one that Egypt is applying for, those have no contractual relationship with ICANN, usually. There's a working relationship. There may be an exchange of letters. In some cases, there's a framework that's signed.

It's not the same ironclad contract that we have, for example, with Chuck Gomes from -- with VeriSign or that we have with the operators of dot info, et cetera.

So we have contracts, clear commercial contracts, with generic top level domain operators.

ccTLDs we don't because of the sensitivity of sovereignty issues.

Obviously, people around the world would like to say, "Well, give us the new IDN gTLDs, you know, no contracts, we want to go do what we want to do," but that is not accepted by the community of all the stakeholders because there's issues of equities that are involved.

So without, you know, taking you into thousands of pages of debate, analysis, and policies, the issues are not finally settled. There's discussions underway for IDN gTLDs, and the gTLDs still underway.

ccTLDs are quite well established, although actually one last note.

>>CHRIS DISSPAIN: Yes, Rod.

>>ROD BECKSTROM: These IDNs are fast tracked. Fast track has gone around the policy development process in some sense. At the same time fast track is happening, so Egypt can have their Arabic country code, the policymaking group is working on the long-term policies for the international domain names ccTLDs. Don't mean to get into too much policy wonk stuff, but there's no review.

>>CHRIS DISSPAIN: That's fine. Okay. So as you can see -- as you can see, for those of you that may not yet be involved in the glorious policy development process, the new gTLDs, it's probably time that you were.

There are all sorts of questions that need to be answered.

I was thinking the other day I wonder how people -- some people would feel -- some cc -- some new gTLDs might be brand names. There might be a dot ibm, and I wonder how some people would feel if a cigarette company, for example, or tobacco company decided that they would like to come get a gTLD. So there are all sorts of areas and issues that need to be sorted out in this particular minefield.

Manal, you were next. Yes.

>>MANAL ISMAIL: Yes. Thank you, Chris.

Allow me first to congratulate my colleagues from Russia and Saudi Arabia for submitting their applications.

>>JEANETTE HOFMANN: Could you introduce yourself, please?

>>MANAL ISMAIL: I'm sorry. Manal Ismail from the National Telecommunication Authority of Egypt, and I also represent Egypt at the GAC meetings.

I wanted to congratulate my colleagues from Russia and Saudi Arabia for submitting their applications, and of course you know more than I do the amount of effort that this has been put, and the -- how this worked in a really multistakeholder approach, and the cooperation and coordination between the different supporting organizations of the ICANN.

I would like also to thank the ICANN for all their listening, understanding, and all our recommendations were reflected in the final plans. It's also been a lot of cooperation between all the Arab countries on a regional level, on one hand, and also with other countries that use the same script on the other hand, so it's still more cooperation and we need more. Now it's on our side, and this is not the end of the --

>>CHRIS DISSPAIN: Just the beginning.

>>MANAL ISMAIL: -- the trip if we see.

This should trigger more local content, more applications, and tools, multilingual applications and tools, to really have a multilingual Internet, because the IDNs only are the key, so if we have an empty room, we won't find anything again, so...

>>CHRIS DISSPAIN: Thank you very much.

>>MANAL ISMAIL: Thank you.

>>CHRIS DISSPAIN: We're going to wind this up. I have two or three more names. I'll call on those people, no more, and I ask you please if I call your name, could you please keep your comments really short because we need to move 0.

I have Willie Currie over here. I have -- I think this says Guru. Guru? Thank you. Here. And I have Sammy Buruchara. So can you keep your hand up, Sammy, please? Guru. Okay. Willie, over to you.

>>WILLIE CURRIE: Okay. Thanks, Chris. Willie Currie, Association for Progressive Communications.

I don't think Milton's question has really been answered, which is: Who has the policy authority to make the decision on the signing of the root by July next year?

And it seems to be a combination of the U.S. government, VeriSign, and ICANN, but the same point he's made, is that has ICANN had a policy process around this matter, or is it subject to the root scaling study being discussed further?

It's just unclear to me where, exactly, the policy authority is happening. If we want to see Internet governance here as a rule-based system.

>>CHRIS DISSPAIN: Thank you. I mean, I offered the opportunity for people to address that. They've chosen not to. We'll take it out of the room and deal with it then. Guru? The gentleman here.

>>GURUMURTHY KASINATHAN: Guru from IT for Change, India.

I just heard Rod say that the difference between the commercial and the noncommercial gTLDs is not that much, and my question was: If a group of pharmaceutical companies wanted to create a dot medicine, or maybe even a -- Glaxo wanted to do a dot Glaxo they would have the resources and the capacity to go through -- pursue applying for the gTLD and go through it. But if a group of let's say civil society organizations want to create a dot public health or a dot civil society, the capacities that they have would be dramatically different from a large company, so the whole gTLD process, how does it --

>>CHRIS DISSPAIN: That's actually not what he said. What he said was -- he didn't say that there was not much of a difference between a commercial gTLD and a community gTLD. What he said is that there's not a lot of difference in the process for creating a commercial or a noncommercial gTLD.

And that it is still the subject of ongoing discussion.

>>GURUMURTHY KASINATHAN: So there is a possibility that it will discriminate in a way that doesn't --

>>CHRIS DISSPAIN: Absolutely, yes.

And lastly on this topic, Sammy.

>>SAMMY BURUCHARA: Thank you. My name is Sammy Buruchara. I'm the chairman of Kenya ccTLD KENIC.

And my concern really is that we've been talking about the digital gap, and for me, I think that there is a need to support ccTLDs in developing countries, especially like in Africa. We still have very few ccTLDs that are fully in operation, and my concern is that the new -- the new gTLDs and especially geographic names and -- in Africa, we have a lot of cultural values and heritages, and my concern is that there would be a danger in people's values and cultures being managed by entities from established regions simply because they are -- their countries or ccTLDs are not developed enough to apply for -- for management of those names, and I just wanted to know if there is a way, a provision to ensure that as they try to build their capacities, that those values and names will protected so that we do not have scramble, as it were, for certain values on names that are specific for a people or a region that are being managed by people that are not representative of them. Thank you.

>>CHRIS DISSPAIN: Thank you very much, indeed, Sammy. We're going to

call this particular bit of the critical Internet resources session to a close and move on.

Having -- we're now going to move on to a topic that's definitely got nothing to do with ICANN at all.

>>JEANETTE HOFMANN: That's good affirmation of commitment.

>>CHRIS DISSPAIN: The affirmation of commitment and the IANA contract. Jeanette.

>>JEANETTE HOFMANN: Yeah. Thank you. As some of you know, the affirmation of commitment arrangement replaces the Joint Project Agreement between ICANN and the U.S. government, and we asked Rod to explain to us what it actually means. Yeah, he should have a microphone, actually.

What it means, what the impact might be on the internationalization of ICANN, and how it is implemented.

>>ROD BECKSTROM: Great. Thank you for this opportunity. And, again, thank you for being the catalyst and the source of change for the affirmation occurring in the first place. IGF has had a tremendous impact in your previous meetings, and this one as well, but certainly in the previous three meetings, in shaping the environment that led to the affirmation document. Namely, your concern that ICANN was too U.S. based, and should become much more of a truly international entity, which it clearly is in all the stakeholder groups that are involved.

So let's talk about the affirmation.

The affirmation has 11 paragraphs on four pages. It's, of course, publicly posted. What I want to talk about is most people have focused on one paragraph, Paragraph 9, which is about reviews, but there's -- there's, you know, 10 other paragraphs, so I'd like to just mention the highlights of what's in this agreement and talk about it what it means.

So the first paragraph, here's some very significant words. So it constitutes -- this document constitutes an affirmation of commitments to institutionalize and memorialize the technical coordination of the Internet domain name and addressing system.

So this is all about the DNS again. ICANN does four things, you know: Names, addresses, DNS that tie the two, and these publishing.

But note again, "to institutionalize and memorialize the technical coordination."

So the nature of the document's long-term and clearly it's institutionalizing and memorializing this relationship in coordinating the DNS.

The second paragraph talks about how critical the DNS is to the global Internet, and its protection, and also supports the multistakeholder model.

This is very significant. The U.S. government is making two commitments in here to ICANN and to the world: Committing to the multistakeholder model in writing; and committing that public interest that ICANN must serve is global.

Previously, if you'd looked at ICANN's incorporation, you could have argued, "Well, ICANN, because it's legally in the United States of America,

in California, legally the public interest is the citizens of those countries," even though ICANN's always been focused globally. This makes it absolutely clear that ICANN's focus and public interest is global. It's in writing, very significant in the document. It's been missed by most reviewers, so that's -- that's in there.

We move to the third paragraph. The third paragraph talks about how ICANN makes decisions. These decisions have to be made in the global public interest and they've got to be accountable and transparent. That's a big discussion and debate and dialogue all of us need to have is how do we continually become more accountable and more transparent.

And also, that we promote competition, consumer trust, and consumer choice of the DNS marketplace. Sometimes people ask, you know, "Why is ICANN new gTLDs?" Paragraph 3 of the affirmation signed in October, Subsection (c), "promote competition, consumer trust, and consumer choice in the DNS marketplace." Okay? That means as an entity, ICANN is committing in the affirmation of commitments to add more consumer choice.

We're so delighted, and honored, that Egypt is moving forward with your Arabic IDNs and pioneering the way in Arabic. That's one form of choice. New gTLDs. There's many forms of choice but we have to do it in the global public interest.

Paragraph 4, this is actually where DoC formally commits to a multistakeholder, private sector led -- so including governments, including NGOs, all groups -- private sector led, bottom-up policy development model for the Domain Name System. For the benefit of global Internet users.

So again, a firm commitment to that model.

And then ICANN has to publish -- perform and publish analysis of the positive and negative effects of its decisions. This is a new requirement we have to be more explicit in sharing how our decisions are reached.

Paragraph 5, international domain names, basically states that both parties agree this has got to get done.

So that's all paragraph 5 does.

Paragraph 6, the Department of Commerce affirms the U.S. commitment to ongoing participation in the GAC. The Governmental Advisory Committee is extremely important to ICANN. We, of course, wanted the U.S. government to commit to continuing their involvement. They have committed here, effectively in perpetuity. This is a long-term document. I will come back to it at the end. So the U.S. government is saying, "We will be involved in the GAC." So it's not just a temporary working group. It's a long-term advisory committee for ICANN.

7 -- And it also sets the model for other countries to participate.

7, ICANN commits to adhere to transparent accounting and finance actions and fact-based policy development. What is fact-based policy development? We need to discuss that as a community. We need to decide what does that mean.

And when we say the public interest, what does the global public interest mean? Is it just economic? Is it just the value to Egypt of having a new

Arabic country code extension? Is it purely economic? I think not. There's great social issues, cultural issues, the pride of people in their language. So we have to think about what all these terms mean. There is no simple definition.

So that is number 7.

Let's see here. Fact-based.

Cross-community deliberations. So we have got a focus on that side. And we commit to providing thorough and reasoned explanations of our decisions taken.

On to paragraph 8. ICANN and the U.S. government are committing to a single interoperable Internet. That means the integrity of the Domain Name System and the integrity of the address space. That's a commitment.

And get this, now this is a really powerful sentence here, ICANN is a private organization and nothing in this affirmation should be construed as control by any one entity.

That's truly the U.S. government recognizing that ICANN is independent right there. And it's guided by you and other stakeholders that are involved in the processes. Very powerful, bottom of 8.

Then we get to 9. Everyone has talked about 9. Those are four reviews, and I will come to a close. Four reviews are going to be done roughly every three and four years. The first is on transparency and accountability. The members of that are chosen by our chairman, Mr. Peter Dengate Thrush. Peter, are you in the room? If so, please raise your hand. Okay.

And Ambassador Janis Karklins I know was in the room before. Ambassador Karklins is right here. They will choose the members of the first review team. That needs to be done I think by next December. It's quite soon. And then there's a lot of details on how those review teams will be constituted.

The second reviews are on stability, security, and resilience of the DNS system. Those will be run every three years and reported to the world and posted for public comment.

The next, promoting competition, consumer trust, and choice. This is about adding more options in the DNS, Domain Name System.

9.3, the next one, the final review, the fourth is about WHOIS. And some very important language in the WHOIS is ICANN is committing to these reviews, and reviewing its existing policy related to WHOIS, comma, subject to applicable laws. Those are the applicable laws in every country and region of the world. The E.U. has very strong privacy protections. It's right in here. Subject to applicable laws.

So recognition of the international nature of WHOIS and of the Internet and the policies.

The next thing is very important in this fourth review. This is very new, is the formal commitment of global law enforcement and privacy groups in the WHOIS review. Both of those entities were never mentioned in previous documents relating to the formation of ICANN. So it's formally recognizing

we need law enforcement involved, and we need to have the privacy groups involved.

Okay. On to ten quickly. That we commit to publishing the reviews openly to the world. That's what paragraph 10 says.

And 11 has a really important comment, too, that's often missed. And this will be the last one. Which is that this agreement is intended to be longstanding. There is no end date to the Affirmation of Commitments agreement. But either party can leave it at any time with 120 days notice.

So this again is a great model of multistakeholder collaboration. This is a voluntary commitment by both parties, and it represents the spirit of the Internet in the same way that we work with the ccTLD operators on a voluntary basis.

So that's the summary of the AoC. The other question was IANA. I have a very quick position, it's very simple. ICANN is a purpose-built organization to help run the DNS and names and addresses. IANA is a contract that was created by the U.S. government that continues until either September 30th of 2011 or October 1st and what the U.S. government does at that time is up to them and I have no comment. You should ask the U.S. government.

>>JEANETTE HOFMANN: Thank you, Rod. I have one simple question before I open the floor. If the Joint Project Agreement had just been phased out, would it make any difference to the Internet?

>>ROD BECKSTROM: Well, no. The Internet would keep going on. I think the beauty of the Affirmation of Commitments is the part of it Sha shaped the JPA is basically saying, okay, you want to be more global? Be more global but you need to show you are a responsible citizen and you need to commit to how you are going to act in the global public interest.

So I don't think it was essential, things could have moved on, but it was viewed as being beneficial by both parties.

>>JEANETTE HOFMANN: Okay. Thank you very much.

The first question is from (saying name). Has she got a microphone already?

>>CHRIS DISSPAIN: Put your hand up, sir.

>> On the issue of managing the critical Internet resources, this is a major issue of IGF, as it is stated in the Tunis Agenda, paragraph 72, subparagraph a. This is now a consensus on the part of your parties. During the WSIS, parties reached an understanding on the definition of critical Internet resources which includes the management of Domain Name System, IP addresses, and root server system, of which the root zone file system is the most critical resource of the Internet. Should there be a security glitch of the root domain name server, it could lead to the collapse and paralyze of the Internet worldwide.

A certain change to the root zone file system could lead to the disappearance of the Internet of a given country from the global Internet map.

The report of the Working Group on Internet Governance set up during the

Geneva phase of WSIS points out that the central issue regarding the management of root zone file system and root server system lies in the unilateral control by the government of one country, which was also a major reason lead to go the establishment of IGF. The U.N. should continue its deliberations on this issue and seek solutions to this issue.

We have also noted that the recent signing of the Affirmation of Commitments by ICANN, which is a step forward towards establishing a new review mechanism in attracting wide participation of multistakeholders in the management of critical Internet resources.

However, as was pointed out by some Ministers in their statements yesterday, on the issue of IANA function contracts, that the management and distribution of Internet domain names, IP addresses, and technical protocol parameters as well as the operation of root domain server are all performed through the IANA function contracts delegated to IANA -- ICANN by the government of one country which apparently enjoys the rights in terms of managing critical Internet resources through IANA function contracts that other countries do not enjoy.

We hope we can....

-- the information does not change this status. We should resolve this issue.

>>JEANETTE HOFMANN: (off microphone) but before that we have Willie Currie on the list.

>>WILLIE CURRIE: Willie Currie, Association for Progressive Communications.

I think we should certainly see the Affirmation of Commitments as a major important step forward in Internet governance. And I think it opens up the possibility of a range of actions to be taken in its wake.

I think one of them is the transfer of the responsibility for the IANA contract to ICANN itself. And, you know, I think there's no reason to wait till 2011 for this to take place.

I think it goes to the issue of the integrity of ICANN as a rule-based decision-making body that it assume this responsibility as soon as possible.

There are a number of reasons for saying this. The one is the debate we just had about the signing of the root. It seems that the authority for this lies with the U.S. government. As it's made very clear in the 2005 policy statement, that it would not hand over control of the root zone file.

I would submit that policy needs to be reviewed and is a missing element in the Affirmation of Commitments.

The other reason is that if one peruses the transcript of the ICM registry versus ICANN matter before the independent review panel, there seems to be a prima facie evidence that the U.S. government, through the Department of Commerce, was willing to try and use leverage -- use its control over the root as leverage in the dot XXX decision. Namely, that if ICANN went ahead and approved dot XXX, U.S. government would refuse to enter that domain

onto the root.

Now, this raises important freedom of expression issues.

And the other gap, I think, in the Affirmation of Commitments is that it does not take advantage of making one of those commitments a commitment of ICANN towards freedom of expression, association, and the right to privacy. This is a gap.

There was a very interesting session yesterday that said that this could be something that should be proposed as a bylaw change for ICANN. And I would certainly think that would be a useful thing to explore, particularly in the light of the new gTLD process.

>>JEANETTE HOFMANN: Thank you, Willie.

Please keep it short. I have lots of people who want to speak up. Y.J. is next.

>>Y.J. PARK: Hi. Finally. Thank you for giving me a chance to make a comment on AoC.

>>JEANETTE HOFMANN: Please introduce yourself.

>>Y.J. PARK: Yes. I am Y.J. Park from Delft University of Technology. I am also one of the MAG members.

First I would like welcome U.S. government's willingness to move forward in terms of the internationalization of ICANN. However, despite some progress made in the AoC compared to the previous JPA, the current AoC still confirms the special status of U.S. government.

Therefore, U.S. government still remains as a sole global authority that approves all delegation and redelegation of the rest of 251 ccTLDs and 21 gTLDs as of today.

According to IDN fast-track process identified by ICANN, U.S. government is about to exercise its power once again to approve IDN ccTLDs as final authority.

Such a practice of delegating sole power to a nation state without global consensus is very unusual in a national community. As one of the academics who studied ccTLDs, my study found that under the supervision of one nation makes it very difficult to have more stable relationship between ICANN and ccTLDs.

Therefore, taking advantage of this opportunity, I would like to urge that the next IANA contract between IANA and U.S. government should not repeat what AoC did. Instead, the next IANA contract should identify an international body that will take over the current role of the U.S. government.

Since the IANA contract is to expire in 2011, as Rod said, I would like to remind IGF community here that we, international community, have only more than a year or so to identify the international body.

Therefore, I would like to propose the IGF should start to encourage such discussion, who can replace the current supervisor who coordinates the global critical Internet infrastructure.

As we all recognize in this room, ccTLDs and gTLDs, IDN ccTLDs, are critical Internet infrastructures for a nation state. The global

coordination of a critical infrastructure of a nation state should not depend on another nation state's approval.

Lastly, I hope IGF can continue facilitate internationalization of ICANN. Thank you.

>>JEANETTE HOFMANN: Thank you, Y.J.
Milton is next.

>>MILTON MUELLER: Thank you. My name is Milton Mueller. Can you hear me?

>>JEANETTE HOFMANN: No.

>>CHRIS DISSPAIN: Now it's on.

>>MILTON MUELLER: Can you hear me?

>>JEANETTE HOFMANN: Yes. Please keep it short.

>>MILTON MUELLER: I will.

As a member of civil society, we welcome the U.S. government's step away from ICANN. We recognize that the IANA contract is a bigger step. I'm not sure I see the need to rush that and recognize that when many people call for internationalizing the IANA contract, they want to participate in the power of the U.S. government rather than eliminating that power. And I'm not sure that's always a good thing.

Good that the global public interest is memorialized. It's very good that language about fact-based policy development and thorough and reasoned explanation is in there.

We appreciate Rod's enthusiastic exegesis of the affirmation and particularly his explanation of what we hope will be a more balanced approach to WHOIS.

The final and most important point I want to make is about accountability. We recognize that this is just a step towards clearing a path towards a real form of global accountability to a global public, and we view the U.S. step a way as a precondition to that. We do not think self-reviews by the ICANN community are a substitute for accountability. And we have actually, as IGP, the Internet Government Project, are releasing a new paper about this accountability issue and how we might go forward with it. And that will be on our Web site at igp.org either today or tomorrow.

Thank you.

>>JEANETTE HOFMANN: Thank you, Milton. Now we have two contributions from governments. Maria Høll and then after that, Stefano Trumpy.

>>MARIA HøLL: Yes, thank you so much. It's Maria Høll from the Swedish government offices and also for the E.U. -- Swedish E.U. presidency.

The E.U. welcomes this new and more open working environment for ICANN with this Affirmation of Commitments. We believe that the present model, the private sector led, multistakeholder, bottom-up model for the technical coordination and day-to-day management of the DNS.

We also welcome that this AoC highlights the role of governments and also the GAC, the Governmental Advisory Committee. And also give more perspective of the public-policy issues. But of course there are challenges, and the challenges are the implementation of this AoC. And

it's not only the review process that is very important, but the review process is not only participation. It's about a methodology and how this process is going to go on.

But it's not all the review process. It's all the other activities that is going to ensure transparency and accountability for ICANN. But this process also gives us more ability to engage ourselves. So that is actually something we need to think of, all of us, to engage ourselves and try to help out with this new and more open model.

Thank you so much.

>>JEANETTE HOFMANN: Thank you so much. Now Stefano, please.

>>STEFANO TRUMPY: Stefano Trumpy.

>>JEANETTE HOFMANN: It's on. Try again.

>>STEFANO TRUMPY: Okay.

Stefano Trumpy, representing Italy in the GAC.

And I want to make a few very little considerations after declaring that, of course, we concur with the statement of the European Union presidency.

This is -- It is certainly the AoC, a very relevant step forward for the internationalization of the management of DNS. And this is something that is going in the direction of the Tunis Agenda document produced in 2005.

And the basic of this is that ICANN was sort of an institutional experiment, let's say. And then the -- This bilateral declaration of U.S. government and ICANN is recognizing this model as the best model, I could say the unique model, that may assure this service for the global community.

And it is important also to note that yesterday, in the declaration of Mr. TourÈ, there was a recognition of this model. And this is a very, very important statement, of course.

Now, ICANN has to demonstrate the external accountability to the community of the Internet. And this is -- will -- The task to organize this review will be a complex task.

But answering to some questions that are coming to me, what will change in the business that ICANN does, my answer is probably not so much in the sense that the decision-making mechanism has to go ahead. And the only point is to make all the efforts in order to then put in relation the board decisions with the global community.

Thank you.

>>JEANETTE HOFMANN: Thank you.

Alejandro is next.

>>ALEJANDRO PISANTY: Thank you. Alejandro Pisanty, previously introduced, ISOC Mexico and UNAM.

I have been a participant in the ICANN processes since their very start. I have been a member and vice-chairman of the board and I have watched ICANN now also in some of the review capacities.

I applaud the Affirmation of Commitments as a very smart and forward-looking way of continuing the ICANN revolution and assuring that later, down the road, stuff like the IANA contracts can also be dealt in a more

internationalized way.

I would like to express an exception to the approach as expressed, for example, by Ms. Park for looking for another international body to do the supervisory functions over the IANA contract, to substitute or complement the U.S. government functions.

I think that particularly coming from academia and civil society, what we have to look is not any more have governments as proxies. It's, for me, an absurd contradiction sometimes that civil society organizations are looking for governments instead of building the organizations ourselves, as we have been doing with ICANN and with many other of the Internet governance president bodies.

We should look more to create structures that accrue trust on themselves, and that by circular architecture, become more reliable for every other party instead, again, of calling for proxies for what we can do ourselves.

>>JEANETTE HOFMANN: Thank you. But in the long run hopefully governments as well as private sector --

>>ALEJANDRO PISANTY: I don't mean this with any exclusion to governments. Their roles in WSIS are very clear. But not as proxies being called for the creation of new bodies from civil society.

>>JEANETTE HOFMANN: I still hope that they both sort of follow similar principles of creating legitimacy and that there won't be such a divide between private sector principles of running a global infrastructure and governmental principles.

Now, Abdullah (saying name). Can you --

>>CHRIS DISSPAIN: Gentlemen there.

>> Thank you. This is Abdullah (saying name) from Saudi Arabia.

I believe that everybody here would like to see ICANN more internationalized. Therefore, the affirmation is a step forward in our view, and we welcome this initiative.

However, as our ICT Minister mentioned several times, we would like to see ICANN to be WECANN. And here I would like to comment on a number of issues related to the affirmation.

One is the point related to the independencies of ICANN. In fact, as long as ICANN is working under the U.S. Californian law, then it is as independent as Motorola or Lucent. And we can say that if we apply this, Ericsson and Nokia and others are also independent. But this is, in my view, not the case.

The second thing which is a point that was raised many, many times during the WSIS process, and this is related to the management of the root zone. And I would like to make clear here that the point I want to mention should not be understood wrongly.

Our relation with the U.S. government is excellent. It was excellent. It is excellent. It will continue to be excellent. So it should not be understood any other way.

However, it is a principle issue. And this is from the WSIS. The management of critical resources is a point of international public-policy

issues that should not be done by a single government.

And this point is not mentioned at all in the affirmation as if the root zone management has nothing to do with the whole issue.

So this is one of the things that needs to be, in fact, addressed, and also resolved.

In my view, this will help -- I don't mean that there should not be any control whatsoever because there needs to be clear rules and regulations and processes on how to deal with the root zone.

I just remind the people that during one day -- or during one time, one of the country code -- I mean ccTLD of one of the Arab countries was taken out of the system. And this isolated the country from the Internet for some time.

I don't think this -- anybody wants this to happen to him.

So I think clear processes need to be done and agreed upon by all.

>>JEANETTE HOFMANN: Thank you Abdullah.

I think the IANA contract might be on the agenda again next year.

So our last speaker is Herbert Heitmann.

>>CHRIS DISSPAIN: Herbert Heitmann? No?

>>JEANETTE HOFMANN: Herbert Heitmann. Where is he?

>>CHRIS DISSPAIN: Here he is, and then we are going to move on to the next topic because we are running out of time. Could you keep it very brief.

>>HERBERT HEITMANN: Thank you very much. I am representing the ICC. I am the chairman of the Commission on E-Business, I.T. and Telecommunications.

I want to say we very much welcome the developments that happened in the context of ICANN. I must say I was extremely impressed when we met with Rod the first time how internationally he has set up his team. So I don't see any kind of concerns with the future direction in this regard. And I think it gives business a reliable future for the domain system, and we are very much supportive of this. We see progress, and I think we are happy with this. You can always ask for more, but I think that is a good start.

Thank you very much.

>>CHRIS DISSPAIN: Thank you very much indeed. We're going to move on to the final topic, which kind of dovetails into this, so we can still sort of talk about -- we'll still continue to talk about ICANN and the AoC, because the final topic for this morning is enhanced cooperation and the internationalization of management of the CIR.

We're going to have a brief introduction from Ms. Qian who will just run us through some thoughts on enhanced cooperation from the U.N. point of view, and then we're going to throw it open for discussion of what is enhanced cooperation, what does it mean, is enhanced cooperation simply governments improving its role and responsibility within ICANN, or is it other things as well.

Is it, for example, the ITU improving its interface with civil society?

What is "enhanced cooperation" and what does it mean? But, first of all,

an introduction from Ms. Qian. Thank you.

>>HAIYAN QIAN: Thank you, Chris. I just want to clarify that I'm not really going to introduce any views from the U.N., but I'm going to share with you what has happened since last meeting held in Hyderabad.

The IGF 3.

I remember that -- you may recall that we actually had also a session on this particular topic, and ever since then, not long after the meeting, the United Nations General Assembly adopted another resolution which requested the Secretary-General to submit a report which might contain recommendations on the process towards enhanced cooperation, and on public policy issues pertinent to the Internet can be pursued. How this process can be pursued, basically.

But based on the consultation of the relevant organizations, including international organizations.

So in response to that, Under-Secretary-General Mr. Sha Zakang of UNDESA invited these ten relevant organizations to give their views and provide recommendations.

And this report has been compiled by us, and which was submitted to the ECOSOC because it was requested to submit to the ECOSOC in 2009, which was actually taking place in July, but this report was actually deferred for review to the next year's ECOSOC, 2009 in July in New York.

If I may just -- since I am not given too much time, I just want to share with I my take on the major points raised -- I mean, recommended by these ten -- not ten. Actually, six -- seven of the ten relevant organizations provided recommendations.

So the points are the following.

I think one is that many called for a continuation of the stakeholders dialogue, which should be transparent, open, inclusive, and consultative before any decision is made. Of course they also -- some of them encouraged to use IGF as a platform to continue to do so, and another main point is that to enhance the capacity-building in the Internet-related issues, particularly for developing countries.

And the third point I remember is related to promoting or enhancing the -- more participation from the governments, and also the partnership between the governments and other stakeholders dialogue.

And there's also a caution of not to create any intergovernmental body before evaluating the existing ones, and some believe that the existing intergovernmental bodies are in the capacity of playing certain roles in dealing with these public policies pertinent to the Internet.

If I may stop here and if there's any questions, I'd be glad to answer.

>>CHRIS DISSPAIN: Thank you.

>>HAIYAN QIAN: Thank you.

>>CHRIS DISSPAIN: Thank you very much. We're going to go through the same process. If you want to speak, please raise your hand. And someone will come and take your name. But while they're starting to take the names, we have actually got two speakers who have got their hands up light

now. So we'll start with this gentleman right here and we'll go to Peter behind and so anyone else wants to speak, please raise your hand, please write down the names, bring them up. Sir.

>>PETER BRUCK: Thank you very much. Thank you very much. Thank you very much. My name is Peter Bruck. I'm the chairman of the World Summit Award and the chief researcher of the Research Studios Austria. I have a very brief intervention. I think the question of the independence of ICANN has come up many times, and the issue of having also a good and a sustained approach to solving that issue needs more creativity than what has been applied to it now. So from my point of view, my question would be to those who -- who are trying to consider that the solutions which are on the table are not appropriate so far, that one enters into a structured mediation process on that issue in order to resolve it in a, let's say, foreseeable future.

I say this particularly in regard to the fact that what happens in the discussions which are taking place here in Sharm El Sheikh is not just significant to the people in this room, but there's a worldwide community of interests who are actually observing what we are discussing, and I think it is important to take steps in that direction to come to a more creative and structured approach to looking at the various different kind of perspectives. Instead of basically reiterating positions which will already well-known and not very productive. Thank you very much.

>>CHRIS DISSPAIN: Thank you very much, indeed.

>>JEANETTE HOFMANN: It was Peter, right.

>>CHRIS DISSPAIN: Yes. The next speaker is Peter Dengate Thrush. Peter.

>>MR. PETER DENGATE THRUSH: Thank you, Chris. Peter Dengate Thrush, chairman of the ICANN board.

I just wanted, in the spirit of sharing information, to make a correction to something that was said earlier about a ccTLD being removed from the root.

There has never been an operating ccTLD removed from the root. Okay? There's a lot of myth and legend what sometimes happens in the local jurisdiction is up to the local jurisdiction and there can be problems with access, but there has never -- and I've checked this with the U.S. Department of Commerce, and with the IANA function. When I said "operating ccTLD," there was once a nonoperating ccTLD, the outlying islands of the United States, which had never been used and which has been taken out.

But just to repeat: There has never been an operating ccTLD removed from the root. Thanks, Chris.

>>CHRIS DISSPAIN: Thank you very much, Peter.

I have Mr. -- I'm sorry, Mrs. Diagne from Senegal, and the next speaker will be Abdullah here, so --

>>MAIMOUNA DIOP†DIAGNE: Thank you, Chris. I'm Mrs. --

>>CHRIS DISSPAIN: I can't hear you. You're going to need to really speak up loud.

>>MAIMOUNA DIOP†DIAGNE: Hello. Okay. Thank you. Can you hear me?

>>CHRIS DISSPAIN: Not really, no. Okay.

>>MAIMOUNA DIOP†DIAGNE: It's working?

>>JEANETTE HOFMANN: Yeah.

>>CHRIS DISSPAIN: Now you're okay.

>>MAIMOUNA DIOP†DIAGNE: My name is Maimouna Diop Diagne. I work for Senegal's government. I'm a member of the GAC. And I really welcome the AoC, and we are looking forward to the implementation and we are also need to know how to improve participation of more government on the GAC, especially considering coming from a developing country. And I have a question, to read back some, because we are talking about enhancing cooperation. I appreciate his statement about one world, one Internet, everyone connected.

And my question is: ICANN is private driven now, and we are looking forward to having more GAC role on this ICANN process, but I think it will take time, and how is -- how is his approach for the third part of the statement, connecting people. I think that to connect those who are not connecting is a government responsibility, and my question is: If ICANN will plan to participate to ITU connect toward initiative. Thank you.

>>CHRIS DISSPAIN: Thank you very much. Next comment from the -- from Abdullah here. And after that, I'm going to call on Parminder. If you could put your hand up, Parminder, so they can bring a microphone to you. Thank you. Abdullah.

>> Thank you very much.

>>JEANETTE HOFMANN: Perhaps somebody wants to address that question.

>>CHRIS DISSPAIN: Yeah. I think if anyone -- sorry. My apologies. You're quite right. If somebody would like to address the question about ICANN and the ITU, that would be great. Sorry.

>> Thank you very much. I have three quick points.

The first one is a correction to the scripts because I said that our ICT minister said several times that we would like to say ICANN to be WECANN but not "weakened," so that nobody would --

[Applause]

>> This is one thing.

>>CHRIS DISSPAIN: That has already been picked up by the scribes, so --

>> So, again, it has to be WECANN.

>>CHRIS DISSPAIN: W-E-C-A-N-N.

>> This is one thing.

The other thing, I thank the gentleman who tried to correct the information related to the deletion of the ccTLD. I would like to ask him if there are clear rules and regulations when that cc -- any ccTLD will be deleted, if that is very clearly agreed by countries.

This is one thing.

The third point related to the enhanced cooperation. Being a person who participated in all the process of the WSIS, I know as well as many people here in the hall the history behind the enhanced cooperation issue, and the -- and the WSIS process, there was agreement to have two processes. One is

the enhanced cooperation. This is to deal with the international Internet-related public policy issues. That is for the governments to sit together. Of course with the consultations with other multistakeholders, but this is the main idea, and the WSIS mandated the U.N. Secretary-General to start this process on the second phase of 2006.

The other process is the IGF which already started since the last four years.

So that process has not yet started, to our information. One step forward was taken by the ITU by creating a dedicated group for all governments to sit together and develop the international Internet public policy issues. We hope that this is a seed that will be really taken care of by the U.N., but we -- still that process is not here. There are other small processes that need to be done by the individual organizations, but this is also to support the main process to develop the international Internet-related public policy issues by the enhanced cooperation. Thank you very much.

>>CHRIS DISSPAIN: Thank you. I'm going to take Parminder next. Then I'm going to take Janis Karklins who is over there. Parminder?

>>PARMINDER JEET SINGH: Parminder Jeet Singh from an NGO in Bangalore, IT for Change. Part of about what I was going to speak was anticipated by the speaker who spoke just before me, but I have some points to make insure different from what he said. I agree that my reading of "enhanced cooperation" consists of a different process. When I read the Tunis documents, I see that enhanced cooperation consists of two parts. One part is dedicated to creating globally applicable policy principles, and there is an injunction to the relevant organizations to create the conditions for doing that.

And I have a feeling that the two parts of that process have been conflated into one. And getting reports from the relevant organizations is going on, but we are not able to go forward to create a process which addresses the primary purpose of enhanced cooperation, which was to create globally applicable public policy principles and the proof of that is that I don't see any development of globally applicable public policy principles, which remains a very important need.

I do not agree that we can go back to any process -- ITU was suggested -- or any other organizational system which was before the WSIS, because WSIS identified the needs of Internet-related policy were different. The processes which are needed to make them are different, and I read in the Tunis Agenda that it speaks about a new process, though it's not very clear a new process should be started which would constitute enhanced cooperation, and I wonder what is the timetable or what are the kind of the views on UNDESA on starting this process at all.

Another thing which caught my attention regarding development of public policy principles vis-a-vis IGF is that -- a press note from Council of Europe. It says that they will use this event also to seek accession by other states of certain policy instruments which are being negotiated by certain countries. And I wondered whether this is the right method of

developing public policy principles or public policies, when they get negotiated by a select group of countries and then you seek accession by different states to that -- those treaties. And it speaks how important it is right now to globally get together in a democratic manner in the countries and as the stakeholders sit together and decide those principles, later than be made by some countries or be left out, not made at all.

Thank you.

>>CHRIS DISSPAIN: Thank you very much, Parminder. Janis, you're up next. Then I'm going to call on Ra'l and Alejandro. Janis?

>>JANIS KARKLINS: Thank you. Thank you.

>>CHRIS DISSPAIN: It should be on now.

>>JANIS KARKLINS: Yeah. Thank you very much indeed. My name is Janis Karklins. I'm a Latvian representative to the Government Advisory Committee. At the same time I'm chairing the Government Advisory Committee.

And I had an honor and privilege to chair the preparatory committee of the World Summit on Information Society, second phase, where these issues have been discussed, and particularly enhanced cooperation.

I agree that enhanced cooperation was agreed as a part of the package deal in Tunis, but equally, I have to remind ourselves that we could not reach full agreement and common understanding of what does it mean, "enhanced cooperation." Or we could not reach agreement on one interpretation of "enhanced cooperation."

That allows many interpretations and I think that this is -- this is the beauty of multilateral negotiations, that we can agree on the term which allows interpretation.

And I'm speaking in a very positive sense, because I think that we can interpret "enhanced cooperation" as enhanced cooperation among governments. We can interpret it as enhanced cooperation among other stakeholders and the governments, where this cooperation did not exist before. We can interpret it as enhanced cooperation of the governments with ear stakeholders where this cooperation did not exist before. We can interpret it as a centralized process, one centralized process of enhanced cooperation. We can interpret it as multiple processes in different places in order to improve public policy considerations related to Internet governance.

And I think that we are on the way because all -- in different instances, these advancements are taking place.

The distinguished representative from Saudi Arabia mentioned one: In ITU, creation of the ITU council WSIS working group. I think that this is a major step forward in ITU on -- in enhanced cooperation among governments on the public policy issues related to mandate of ITU, but ITU does not all mandates and there is, for instance, UNESCO, which -- in which mandate is multilingualism and multilingual content, so I'm not aware if there have been any specific proposal to create special working task -- or task group in -- intergovernmental task group in UNESCO, but this can be, maybe, as

one of the options.

I can tell you from my experience in ICANN since a number of years, we have undertaken a lot of steps to improve performance of the Government Advisory Committee of ICANN, and for me personally, this is a step towards enhanced cooperation. This is how we, in governments represented in Government Advisory Committee of ICANN, interpret "enhanced cooperation." To be more present, to be more productive, to be more influential on public policy issues in the public -- in the policy debate which takes place in ICANN.

And this is our contribution, and I believe that these examples we will find reflected in the U.N. Secretary-General report on this issue which will be discussed in ECOSOC next year. Thank you.

>>CHRIS DISSPAIN: Thank you, Janis.

I'm going to -- Ra'l and Alejandro, but I've got some speakers who haven't spoken yet, so can I please ask you to be very, very brief, Ra'l. Very brief, Alejandro. We are going to run out of time here and I'd like to get to some people who haven't spoken yet. Ra'l?

>>RAUL ECHEBERRIA: Thank you. Thank you. I think that we have discussed the meaning of the "enhanced cooperation" expression last year and the year before, and in fact, last year we had a panel about this in which I had the honor to participate.

I would like to remark that the explanation from Ambassador Karklins about the meaning of "enhanced cooperation" has been very clear, but let me add that the -- as Karklins said, we didn't have agreement in the meaning of the expression in Tunis. As we got the final agreement in the night before the summit started, some level of ambiguity was needed for getting those agreements.

In the same (inaudible) the agreement, in the same paragraph, Paragraph 71, it says that the Secretary-General of the U.N. should start the process of enhancing cooperation and in the same paragraph, it says that the relevant organizations, existing organizations, should start the same process. And so it means that all of us have to work together in order to enhance the cooperation, and this is what we have been doing in those years. And so nobody can say that we have not enhanced the cooperation. And so I think it's we have made important progresses.

It is enough not -- it's not enough. We can improve that, in fact, some of us have claimed for more -- more multistakeholder mechanisms, a more open mechanism in intergovernmental organizations like ITU, for example, in which we would like to have more participation and to have more influence in discussions and decisions.

So it is not clear. I think from my subjective point of view, I think that some organizations have made more progress in enhancing the cooperation with other -- with other stakeholders than others. At the regional level, really we can say that in Latin America, the cooperation between different actors, including governments, civil society, technical organizations, has been improved very much. Thank you.

>>CHRIS DISSPAIN: Thank you, Ra'l. Alejandro, and then excuse me -- Alejandro and then we're going to hear from Mr. Cornelius from Cameroon. Is there somebody here are from -- ah. Microphone down there, please. Yeah, not yet. Excuse me. Can I have a microphone here, please. Alex, over to you.

>>ALEJANDRO PISANTY: Alejandro Pisanty from ISOC Mexico and the National University of Mexico.

I'll be very concrete here.

It is time to move forward. It is time to stop discussing what "enhanced cooperation" means and to start, for all parties, to cooperate as best they can.

IGF has beaten the ICANN issues, the ICANN-related issues, to the very last drop. I don't see that IGF discussions can squeeze more out of it.

ICANN participants have enough space in ICANN now to move the issues there instead of using IGF to leverage outside space for ICANN.

It is time to dispel the legend that the whole WSIS process was to create a separate, independent space to discuss and redo ICANN.

It is time to use the ICANN experience of cooperation among multiple stakeholders, and there are many other forms of cooperation among multiple stakeholders that have appeared and been created during the IGF process.

To apply this experience of cooperation, enhanced cooperation, enhance this cooperation and use it for dealing with really more substantive issues that concern users in developing countries, that concern the way to get access to deploy IPv6, to increase the security of the networks.

It's time for all this stakeholder -- multistakeholder experience to be applied elsewhere and to move IGF forward, to make IGF a promising venue for the following years, where it will not only be about ICANN and the DNS.

>>CHRIS DISSPAIN: Thank you, Alex.

[Applause]

>>CHRIS DISSPAIN: We can -- We will be able to talk about that some more, I have no doubt, in the taking stock session.

There is a gentleman from Cameroon at the back of the room. If you can put your hand up, please, sir. Put your hand up -- oh, you have a microphone already.

Thank you very much.

>> Thank you very much for giving me the microphone.

My question is concerning how can we, within the framework of enhanced cooperation, enable all the stakeholders, including those in the developing countries, to participate in the process of transforming ICANN.

What I am saying here is that, is IGF laying down any mechanism for the transformation of ICANN to the new ICANN? Shall we come here after one year in the next IGF to the same declaration? Has IGF put in place a task force to define the functioning of the new ICANN? This is what the previous speaker said. What is the mechanism put in place for action to take place?

Thank you.

>>CHRIS DISSPAIN: Thank you very much.

Bertrand is next.

And then one more comment from Y.J.

Okay.

The gentleman from the ITU.

Bertrand.

>>BERTRAND DE LA CHAPELLE: Thank you.

Good morning. My name is Bertrand De La Chapelle. I am the French special envoy for the Information Society and French representative in the GAC.

I would like to continue on the line that Janis Karklins has mentioned, to highlight that we probably do not agree yet on what enhanced cooperation is, but there are a few things that have already progressed.

The first thing is that enhanced cooperation is a goal. The paragraph 69 says enhanced cooperation in the future. It's because we don't know exactly how the interaction between the different categories of stakeholders will finally stabilize that we use this word in the WSIS.

Balls the second element that seems to emerge as a consensus is that what we're talking about here is the famous "in their respective roles" expression in the definition of Internet governance.

And defining the respective roles of the governments, the private sector, the civil society, and the international organizations is a tricky issue because these roles are likely to vary according to the type of issue, the venue where they are discussed or the organization where they are discussed, and sometimes the stage of the discussion.

Very early stage can be very, very open. Drafting documents can be closer, and adopting them or putting them in force is different.

That's the first element.

It's about the respective roles.

The second element, quickly, is enhanced cooperation is not only about ICANN. It's about public-policy setting. And this is much broader than the Domain Name System alone. It is a topic that we have to explore.

Finally, the distinction that we have made in the WSIS documents between the goal of enhanced cooperation and the process towards enhanced cooperation is very operational here. And what we are focusing now upon and what this discussion is actually about already, and what the U.N. Secretary-General has done with its report, is to encourage the different actors who are dealing with public-policy issues on the Internet to discuss together the respective roles and the way they articulate. And that means very concretely that each single organization that has a role, be it an intergovernmental organization or a non-intergovernmental organization, multistakeholder like ICANN, or even the IETF, or the IRRs, these organizations have to ask themselves, in our specific type of competence, what is the right balance between the different actors? And probably the IGF next year or further during this week is a nice place for people to ask together this question: How do we discuss the respective balance of the

stakeholders according to each issue and each venue?

Thank you.

>>CHRIS DISSPAIN: Thank you, Bertrand.

>> Well, thank you very much. I spoke before, but on enhanced cooperation, I think this is a very, very important topic.

Ambassador Karklins I think was very clear what happened in the WSIS, but his view is that we should go to -- the governments should probably have more say in the ICANN process. And this is what I understood from his statement.

I just want to say the ITU has always been open to the private sector, for example, and this fact is not mentioned.

We are the only intergovernmental organization of the U.N., which the private sector work hand in hand with governments for the last 20 years or so.

So it's not new.

I know there are other stakeholders that still have to come in in this international mechanisms, like the IGF.

I think I agree with everybody who said that every stakeholder has a role. And we cannot sit here and assume that the different nations, the different governments, they don't know what they want, with their civil society, with their businesses, and with their government policies. So they go to the ITU sometimes and they go to the UNESCO in another capacity. But they all come to the IGF as all stakeholders.

So I think what we have to do for the future, that we all agree this great mechanism of the IGF should continue to be a forum for all of us to do our respective roles, whether it's in the ITU, in the UNESCO, in civil society organization, NGOs and so on, but we all come here and report and tell each other what we have done to take this forward.

Thank you.

>>CHRIS DISSPAIN: Thank you very much.

We are rapidly running out of time. The interpreters need to have their break and so do we.

I think it's entirely appropriate that we should hear from Minister Kamel before we close and hear from our chair.

Minister.

>>H.E. MR. TAREK KAMEL: Thank you. Mr. Desai, ladies and gentlemen, I am very glad to see this very rich discussion happening here in Sharm El Sheikh in Egypt about Internet resources and the management of Internet resources.

I don't want to repeat what I have been saying yesterday in the opening session, but first of all, I wanted again to thank the ICANN for opening up the window of the fast track for IDN multilingual domain name. And whether Egypt or Russia or whoever is the first to register, that is not the issue. The main issue, we need to promote that within our own countries as well. There is a level of effort that needs to be exerted in order to make sure that the awareness on a national level is happening. There are still a lot

of effort that needs to be exerted and investment to be done in order to make sure that this is really reaching the grass-roots in our own countries.

Concerning the public-policy issue that has been debated, I think that Egypt thinks that the Affirmation of Commitments with the U.S. government is definitely an excellent step forward, provides ICANN with more accountability and independence. But we want to see more.

And I have listened today for many voices, and as we mentioned yesterday, also, in the opening remarks that we want to see more worldwide Internet community involved in managing Internet resources, and specifically the revisiting of the IANA contract.

It might be appropriate that we start here from Sharm El Sheikh, asking the U.S. government to open publicly a dialogue, maybe in 2010, about revisiting the IANA contract and the future of the IANA contract and how they think about this should be handled.

There is an international community that is here well represented from government, civil society, and various organizations. And I think we -- it's legitimate that we talk to our Ambassador Philip Verveer who is representing the U.S. government here with us and the State Department, that the U.S. government should really consider opening this debate about revisiting the IANA contract. We shouldn't wait until September or October 2011. But I think that this discussion, constructive discussion, should start soon.

I also agree with what Ambassador Janis and others, Alejandro Pisanty from Mexico, and Raul, have mentioned. Enhanced cooperation is not only the future of ICANN. Enhanced cooperation includes a lot of many other issues that we will discuss the rest of the week. And that would interest also the developing world. There are issues relating to multilingual content. There are issues related to cybersecurity. There are issues related still to outreach, the issue of outreach and reaching larger segments of society, of connectivity is not solved. We shouldn't overlook that. There are still some countries where penetration is low and where we need to exert more effort on the localized challenges that meet the countries. This goes for Africa, for Latin American, probably as well for Asia. So we shouldn't overlook that issue when we talk about the future of enhanced cooperation.

The world is not yet equal when it comes to connectivity, and every now and then we should really remind the international community of that.

But still, I am very happy with the discussions and deliberation that were taking place here in Sharm El Sheikh and look forward to a fruitful discussion the rest of the week.

Thank you very much.

>>CHRIS DISSPAIN: Thank you, Minister.

[Applause]

>>JEANETTE HOFMANN: Before Nitin wraps up, I would like to really thank you as a very constructive audience. I watched you. You were really listening to each other. That I found very impressive. Lots of you stayed

in the room and didn't leave.

So I think we have achieved quite a lot when we consider how we discuss these very issues during WSIS. We have become much more constructive, peaceful, and pragmatic. And I think this is an achievement of the IGF.

So thank you very much.

>>CHRIS DISSPAIN: I agree. I agree.

>>NITIN DESAI: Thank you very much to the two facilitators who were helping us with the debate. I want to thank the Minister particularly for his remarks which were so very helpful.

I don't wish to take much time, but I would say my take-away from this on the first issue of IPv4-IPv6 is that we have a two-year window for the transition. That means we have our work cut out ahead of us when we review these situations next year in Lithuania.

That one of the very interesting suggestions which came up was the idea of some national program of incentives for the adoption of IPv6, and I think we could certainly think of that.

We had a very interesting discussion on the new TLDs, the things which are happening on IDNs. I congratulate Egypt, Saudi Arabia, Russia, in being so early in positioning their new IDNs.

We had a very interesting dialogue when Patrick raised the whole question of root scalability. As a layperson, the way I understood it, Patrick, was you can take as many drinks as you want but don't take them too fast. And if possible, take a meal, which is the DNSSEC, before you start drinking. But that's the way I understood it anyhow.

But it was a very useful discussion that we had and I certainly learned a lot.

On the AoC, the general assessment, I think most people welcomed it as a forward step, but of course many people recognize that it is only a beginning. That many challenges have to be addressed.

The way in which accountability would work would still -- is really a blank slate right now. It has to be spelled out.

And I particularly welcome the suggestion made by the Minister that the IANA contract perhaps provides an opportunity for carrying this process of opening up one stage further. And I hope the message that goes from this IGF to the U.S. government could -- may well include this.

On enhanced cooperation, I don't have much to say. The ambiguities which are there in the text came out once again in the discussions. I only want to conclude by saying there's a mirror-image phrase to "enhanced cooperation." Instead of saying "enhanced cooperation," we could always say "reduce conflict." And one thing I will say is this; that our IGF process may not have secured enhanced cooperation, but it certainly has helped to reduce conflict.

So on this happy note, let me conclude the session. Thank you very much, thank you to the facilitators and all of you.

Let's go and have lunch.

Thank you.

[Applause]