Organization Member Advisory Council Report

prepared for the ISOC BoT meeting, April 7 2014, Hong Kong

by

Scott Mansfield, Organization Members Advisory Council Co-Chair

Advisory Council of Organization Members welcomes the opportunity to present its report to the Trustees of the Internet Society and to the CEO and President of the Internet Society about its most recent activities. The ISOC AC meeting was held March 7, 2014 in London, United Kingdom.

1. ISOC CEO and President – Kathy Brown

    Kathy Brown the CEO and President of ISOC provided her view on the top priorities for ISOC in 2014.

    - Internet Governance

        ISOC is committed to "Maintaining and strengthening the multi-stakeholder process both globally and locally". The "Internet is for everyone", and no one forum or country controls the Internet. Strengthening the Internet Governance Forum (IGF) would provide the community with a platform for Internet Government discussions that could produce tangible results. The IGF is a true multistakeholder organization that carries the weight of a UN mandate but is only "lightly" linked to the UN. Having a venue for Internet Governance and Policy discussions with all stakeholders present will help ensure social issues are addressed and everyone knows where to go for support with the big policy issues of the day.

    - Pervasive Monitoring

        There are serious trust issues in the Internet community on topics of security and monitoring. ISOC is committed to "promoting robustness and resiliency of Internet security and privacy through technology standards and deployment".

    - Capacity Building

        IXP Toolkits, Capacity Building, and Education are just a few of the topics in this particular area. ISOC is committed to "advancing the deployment of core Internet infrastructure and evolution of technology to ensure the sustainability and reliability of

the Internet". The Internet is global. ISOC provides a platform for engaging the community to help ensure all corners of the world have access to fast reliable Internet.

Q/A

Huawei representative asked: "How can the ISOC actually impact capacity growth?

KB: We can explain how capacity growth is important, and provide information on how to build that capacity. Further, we can work with the efforts to reduce SPAM. Engagement of the community is important here, leveraging Chapters, Advisory Council Members, and the whole Internet Community.

Juniper representative asked: "How can the AC help ISOC? Can we brainstorm on how the AC can help ISOC?

Fred Baker pointed out that an ISOC committee created an outline of what it means to "consult" with membership. The consultation process is written from an ISOC and ISOC chapter's perspective. The process can be found here → http://www.isoc.org/isoc/chapters/guidelines/consultation_procedures.shtml. This process should be useful for ISOC AC organization members and it is recommended that the material be used as input to the engagement discussion.

The AC organization members would like to know what ISOC is thinking about, and if there is an opportunity to engage in a project of some kind with ISOC the Advisory Council organization members would like to advise and collaborate with ISOC.

This answer provided a transition to a set of slides presented by Scott Mansfield.

2. The Two Way street

Scott prefaced the rest of the meeting with slides that clearly pointed out that the AC meetings are for information exchange. The AC meetings allow ISOC Staff to communicate to the AC members and also the AC members to communicate back to the ISOC Staff, Leadership and Board. One particular issue that AC member companies would like to communicate to the ISOC board is that AC member companies do not want to be "surprised" by positions or announcements from ISOC. It is very hard for an AC member to provide feedback to their organization on a topic if they aren't briefed (or at least provided background material) on positions taken by ISOC.

Finally a slide discussing ways for AC members to get more involved. The bottom line is that AC members get more out of membership when they are actively participating. There are opportunities to help in various ISOC Staff projects, present topics at AC meetings, engage with local Chapters, and form ad hoc discussion groups to develop material for a hot issue.

3. Discussion on Internet Governance

Sally Wentworth the Senior Director, Strategic Public Policy for ISOC and Markus Kummer the Vice President, Public Policy presented a [Discussion on Internet Governance](#).

Markus and Sally provided an overview of the issues for the 2014-2015 timeframe. Any AC member that is interested in working with ISOC on ITU-related governance meetings should contact the AC chairs. The call for action is to mobilize in the countries where the AC members are active and work with governments, other stakeholders and the ISOC Chapters. A request from Markus and Sally is for information sharing on any Internet Government topics.

Topics that are important for 2014 leading to WTDC, the Brazil High Level Meeting, and PP-14 are: Role of government in the Internet, Surveillance, and a number of development-related questions.

One way ISOC is trying to engage regulators from around the world is through the ISOC Policy Program. The Policy Program at IETF 89 attracted fellows from 21 different countries and they had a full week of activities to introduce them to the work of ISOC and the IETF. Material presented to delegates included: an introduction to DNS, routing in the Internet, Overview of IP addressing, IXPs, IPv6, Pervasive Monitoring, and ccTLD redelegation. Many representatives from AC member companies and the IETF Technical community assisted throughout the week.

Q/A

Q: What is the impact of the revelations of pervasive monitoring?

Sally: Some countries are saying in public that is has shaken their confidence in the multi-stakeholder model. Also monitoring has resulted in some countries arguing that they need to protect their "piece of the Internet" to prevent monitoring by other entities.

To summarize the discussion… There are constituencies that are using the surveillance revelations to put the US in a defensive posture. Some think that that the US controls the Internet and they do not believe that the Internet is run by a true multi-stakeholder model. The AC members are looking for the best way to engage with ISOC on this topic and the Staff indicated that they are working with the AC Co-chairs to develop tools and mechanisms to use for collaboration.

A specific ask for the AC community:

The term ICT is used all over the ITU in Recommendations and Resolutions. But, it does not appear in the treaty text of the ITU.   It is our current view that, in general, including the term in the ITU Constitution would expand the scope of the ITU Constitution into new areas that we would not support. The question is - are there nuances to this? What are the arguments we can/should develop as a community to advocate for our point of view? Some of this is legal, some of this is technical. Any of that analysis would be helpful from the AC.   Importantly, the points need to be relevant and useful for developing countries.

Background:

At Plenipot 2010, there was considerable discussion about including the term ICT in the treaty. It was concluded that without an agreed definition, this wasn't possible and the ITU-D was asked to work on this. You can find the specific call for action on pg 5 of this Resolution: http://www.itu.int/osg/csd/intgov/resoultions_2010/PP-10/RESOLUTION_140.pdf

Below is the working definition that resulted from the ITU-D's Study Group work on ICT definition.

Working definition of the term "ICT" as "Technologies and equipment that handle (e.g., access, create, collect, store, transmit, receive, disseminate) information and communication."

The working definition is not intended to include content, services, software, or applications; interfere with the security or integrity of networks or personal data; appear in legally binding documents like the ITU Constitution or Convention, or expand the scope of ITU activities.

Please contact Sally Wentworth wentworth@isoc.org, Markus Kummer kummer@isoc.org, or the AC Chairs for more information.

4. IXP Toolkit Brief and Concept Paper Update and Discussion

Jane Coffin provided an update on the grant from Google to extend its IXP activities in emerging markets. The purpose is to build on previous work and to additionally create an IXP Toolkit which provides a study and Methodology to Identify Best Practices, Create an IXP Portal (website), and to conduct training and hold workshops.

The IXP Toolkit is available here: http://www.internetsociety.org/ixptoolkitguide

The IXP Toolkit Portal is available here: www.ixptoolkit.org

Any AC organization member that would like to participate or support the Portal or training efforts should contact Jane (coffin@isoc.org) or the AC chairs. Both the Toolkit Report and Portal are open for comment and feedback up through April 15, 2014. Please send feedback to: feedback@ixptoolkit.org

For additional information, ISOC released a report on LAC IXPs in November 2013.

The report is available at this link in English: http://www.internetsociety.org/sites/default/files/rpt-LACIXPvrt-201311-eng_0.pdf

The report is available at this link in Spanish: http://www.internetsociety.org/sites/default/files/LACIXP%20Role_Final_Spanishvert%20%28Nov%202013%29_0.pdf

The LAC study covers Argentina, Bolivia, Colombia, and Ecuador. Some of the data from the LAC study has been incorporated into and analyzed in the IXP Toolkit. Funds from the IXP Toolkit project paid for this report.

5. Routing Resilience Survey

Andrei Robachevsky provided an update on the ISOC Routing Resilience Survey. The presentation described the methodology behind the survey at https://www.internetsociety.org/rrs. Care is taken to consider all the confidentiality concerns and it was pointed out that any information or analyses that are shared outside of the network that produced the data is fully anonymized.

Any AC organization member or any network operator that wishes to participate is encouraged to do so. Send a request with (AS number and a contact email) to rrs-admin@isoc.org.

6. Lightning Talks

6.1. Alvaro Retana provided a talk on BGP Origin Validation and Islands of Trust. There are two important issues that need to be addressed when discussing BGP Security. The issue of BGP Origin Validation is one issue and the other issue to validate the path taken. This lightning talk describes a deployment in Ecuador that addresses the BGP Origin Validation issue. The presentation provided information on the state of RPKI deployment by region. A description of the RPKI tools can be found at http://www.labs.lacnic.net/rpkitools/looking_glass. The deployment at the NAP.EC (Ecuador) was described and lessons learned and best practices were captured. There was interest expressed to include this information in the ISOC IXP Toolkit.

The call to action here is to develop and promote RPKI Hosted Systems. This is an incremental step that helps increase BGP Security.

6.2. Eric Osterweil provided a talk on BGP Security that focused on the issue of validating the path taken. The presentation described how just validating the origin is not sufficient to completely secure the routing system. The routes need to be verified as well since without verifying the policies bilaterally an attack along the data path becomes difficult to address. A man-in-the-middle attack is a potential risk.

The call to action here is to enter the discussion to determine if attacks of this type on the data path are important and consider further work in this area.

6.3. Mark McFadden provided a talk on Carrier Grade Network Address Translators and the Implications on IPv6.

The talk provided background on what Carrier Grade NATs are and where they are being used. The work provided the results of a number of interview with European and North American

operators. The results show that CGNs are being deployed, but mostly as a transitional measure to aid in the transition from IPv4 to IPv6. One helpful aspect of CGNs is it helps to delay the deployment of IPv6 until the end-user devices and DSLAMs/Access equipment support IPv6. The conclusion reached is that CGNs have clearly delayed IPv6 take-up.

7. Leadership & Learning Initiatives: Opportunities to Collaborate

Toral Cowieson provided information about a new opportunity to support ISOC in the area of Leadership and Learning Initiatives. The presentation introduced Inform which is a platform that provides localized, on-the-go content with local language support and a number of formats (including mobile and low-bandwidth options). The curriculum is developed by experts and covers a wide range of Internet-related topic. The aspect of community building is important including access to subject matter experts, discussion forums, online collaboration tools, and professional development.

The ask is for the AC organization members to work with the ISOC Internet Leadership Team on partnership opportunities to help scale the reach of the programs. Also for organization members that have e-learning platforms, a discussion with ISOC on sharing content could be fruitful for both the org member and the Internet community. Also, a call for feedback on the material and courses provided is always welcome.

Please contact Cowieson@isoc.org or the AC co-chairs for more information.

8. AoB

There was no other business.

9. Adjourn

The meeting adjourned at 1640.

This ends our report.

Scott Mansfield

Izumi Okutani

Russ White

ISOC AC Co-Chairs