

2005
Fourth Quarter

In This Issue

Internet Community
Calendar2

Meeting Reports 2

2005 Election Report...4

ARIN Board and AC
Actions5

ASO Call for
Nominations for ICANN
Board Seat.....5

About the World Summit
on the Information
Society (WSIS)7

About Review

Review is produced for the ARIN membership and Internet community. Articles and contributions dealing with Internet number resources are welcome from all sources.

If you have an idea about an article or just a suggestion, please contact webmaster@arin.net.

ARIN XVI and NANOG 35 bring large numbers to L.A.



Taking place from October 23 to October 28, 2005, back-to-back NANOG and ARIN meetings proved to be a success once again. ARIN XVI, held from October 26-28, had attendees in near record numbers, featured a first-ever all-day workshop on the basics of setting up IPv6 on a network client, a very popular social event at the L.A. Lucky Strike bowling alley, and two and a half days of very important and informative technical and policy discussions.

The online meeting archive at http://www.arin.net/meetings/minutes/ARIN_XVI/ has copies of the presentations given during the tutorials and meetings, archives of the webcast, and the minutes of the Public Policy and Members Meetings. Information about NANOG 35 can be found at <http://www.nanog.org/mtg-0510/index.html>.

Nearly 200 people registered for ARIN XVI, with approximately 87 being first-time attendees. In addition, attendees represented a range of geographic locations including 26 U.S. states and the District of Columbia, 4 Canadian provinces, and 16 other countries.

The ARIN-related activities began on Sunday, October 23 with a workshop titled "Getting Started with IPv6" hosted jointly with NANOG and led by Jordi Palet Martinez, CTO/CEO of CounsellIntel. This was followed on Tuesday with three events: a tutorial on "Getting to Know

See ARIN XVI, Page 4

Internet going on 33

By Vint Cerf

As the year 2006 begins, the Internet as an idea is approaching middle age. As an operating system, however, it is only about 23 year old, having been deployed in the academic and military world on January 1, 1983. As we look at the Internet of 2006, it is clear that many changes have been made in its basic infrastructure although the primary design is still much as it was when Bob Kahn and I wrote the first paper about it in 1973 (published in 1974).

It is a great deal larger than it was on first roll out. About a million times larger in fact. There were on the order of 400 hosts that had to be transitioned from the NCP protocol to TCP. Now there are at least 400 million machines on the net, and perhaps many more if you count episodically connected devices such as laptops, personal digital assistants and Internet-enabled mobile telephones. The number of users has increased from about 50,000 at most in 1983 to nearly one billion, or a factor of 20,000. That this is not a factor of a million is partly a consequence of the role computers play on the Internet of today versus that Internet

See Internet, Page 6

Upcoming Internet Community Meetings

SANOG 7

January 16 - 24
Mumbai, India

Joint Techs Workshop

February 5 - 8
Albuquerque, New Mexico, US

NANOG 36

February 12 - 15
Dallas, Texas, US

APNIC 21 / APRICOT 2006

February 22 - March 3
Perth, Australia

IETF 65

March 19 - 24
Dallas, Texas, US

ICANN

March 27 - 31
Wellington, New Zealand

Updates to this calendar can be found at:

<http://www.arin.net/meetings/calendar.html>

Internet Community Meeting Reports

NANOG 35

October 23-25
Los Angeles, CA

The fall 2005 NANOG meeting was held October 23-25 in Los Angeles and was the fourth joint meeting that NANOG has held with ARIN.

ARIN and NANOG cosponsored a hands-on tutorial given by Jordi Palet entitled "Getting Started With IPv6" which was held from 9:00 a.m. to 4:30 p.m. on Sunday. NANOG tutorials began on Sunday afternoon and included such topics as BGP Multi-homing and Scaling Considerations in MPLS Networks.

Sunday night was reserved for a NANOG Steering Committee Community meeting followed by a welcome reception sponsored by Equinix. General Sessions began on Monday and continued into Tuesday and covered many topics of interest to include talks on Autonomous System Numbers, Shim6, Blacklisting, Internet Security, and BGP Filtering. Monday afternoon BoFs included BGP Data Analysis and IPv6 Multi-homing, and on Tuesday Ray Plzak gave a tutorial on Getting to Know ARIN.

<http://www.nanog.org/mtg-0510/>

IETF 64

November 6-11
Vancouver, BC, Canada

The 64th meeting of the Internet Engineering Task Force (IETF) was held in Vancouver, Canada from November 6 - 11, 2005. During the IPv6 working group meeting, Kurtis

Lindqvist described a new Internet Architecture Board (IAB) IPv6 Ad Hoc Group whose purpose is to advise the IAB on IPv6 addressing issues. The group was formed when the IANA sought advice from the IAB on various addressing matters. The group is comprised of individual participants including members from the IAB and the RIRs. Any output of an IAB ad hoc group has no special standing and is not considered binding. Rather, any work they do will feed back into the normal IETF and/or RIR policy processes for further action. As a sign that IPv6 has matured beyond the start-up stage, the IPv6 working group came to a close at the end of its session. Future IPv6 considerations will be made within all of the working groups of the IETF instead of focusing in a single working group. The mailing list will continue as a forum for general IPv6 discussion.

As one working group shut down, a new area started up. A proposal suggested the formation of a new organizing area called the 'Real-time Applications and Infrastructure Area' (RAI). The focus of RAI will be on protocols and architectures for delay-sensitive interpersonal communications. The new area is primarily being split off from the existing Transport area and will inherit many of its existing working groups, e.g., the Internet Emergency Preparedness (IEPREP) and Session Initiation Protocol (SIP) working groups. A presentation about the proposed split was made to the Joint Applications and Transport Area meeting. ¹

In the DNS arena, a proposal was made that full service resolvers should automatically serve a number of specific zones. The goal is to offload local traffic to these zones that should not have to be answered by the root servers. RFC4193 specifies that this protection should be in place for the zones that serve locally assigned local IPv6 addresses, i.e., d.f.ip6.arpa. The new proposal extends that practice to cover a number of other zones, e.g., RFC1918 address

space. Data has shown that, despite instructions to restrict them, significant leakage of queries for these name spaces is occurring. ²

The Cross Registry Information Service Protocol working group is close to completing all of the work in its charter. It will likely be closed following the next IETF.

¹ <http://www3.ietf.org/proceedings/05nov/slides/apptsv-1.pdf>

² <http://www.ietf.org/internet-drafts/draft-andrews-full-service-resolvers-01.txt>

<http://www.ietf.org/PASTMEETINGS/IETF-64b.html>

ICANN

November 30 - December 4

Vancouver, BC, Canada

Over 700 delegates from 109 countries gathered in Vancouver, Canada to participate in ICANN's 24th International Meeting.

Items of interest that were under discussion or announced include government participation in ICANN, progress on Internationalized Domain Name (IDN) implementation, public comment on .com and settlement agreements, and several ICANN Board resolutions.

The approved resolutions included the following:

- Approval of a resolution to enter into negotiations relating to the proposed commercial and technical terms of the .ASIA sponsored top level domain (sTLD)
- Adoption of the terms of reference to be used in the review of the Generic Names Supporting Organization (GNSO), consistent with ICANN's bylaws
- Acknowledgment and posting for comment the recommendations by the Country Code Names Supporting Organization (ccNSO) for changes to the ICANN bylaws applicable to the ccNSO to improve and clarify areas in relation to membership
- Removal of restrictions relating to expense categories involving DNSSEC deployment, ALAC projects, translation, facilitation of regional meetings, and establishment of regional presences
- Adoption of changes to the bylaws to improve the certification process for At-Large structures

<http://www.icann.org/meetings/vancouver/>

AfriNIC-3

December 12-14

Cairo, Egypt

More than 130 attendees registered to participate in the AfriNIC-3 meeting held in mid-December in Cairo, Egypt. On December 12, an IPv6 workshop was held, similar to the one that was held at the NANOG 35 and ARIN XVI back-to-back meetings. The next two days included an African IPv6 meeting and the AfriNIC Public Policy Meeting.

Policy proposals discussed at this meeting included proposals for end-user allocations, temporary address allocations, changes to the ASN policy to require AfriNIC membership and prohibit reassignment of ASNs, and the global policy for IPv6 allocation from IANA to the RIRs. There was consensus at the meeting for all four proposals.

The idea of a 4-Byte ASN policy was introduced, but a proposal was not submitted in time to be formally discussed under the AfriNIC policy development process.

Other highlights included presentations on changing the HD-ratio in IPv6, an ITU presentation on competitive address space allocation, and a panel on WSIS and the role for AfriNIC in Africa.

<http://www.afrinic.net/meeting/>

ARIN XVII

MONTRÉAL, QUÉBEC

APRIL 9-12, 2006

Information and Registration
Information Coming to the ARIN
Web Site In Early February!

ARIN XVI, from Page 1

ARIN” presented by ARIN President and CEO Ray Plzak; a tutorial by Randy Bush on secure routing; and the ARIN Open Policy Hour. Wednesday, October 26 and Thursday, October 27 were the two days of the Public Policy Meeting, and the ARIN activities ended on Friday, October 28 with the ARIN Members Meeting.

In addition to the policy proposal discussions at the Public Policy Meeting, roundtables on “The Future of IPv4” and “Directory Services Requirements” were held, with the panel for the Directory Services roundtable including two members of the ARIN Advisory Council and two representatives from U.S. government agencies. One of the highlights of the meeting was the presentation by Richard Hill, a representative from the International Telecommunication Union (ITU), on the ITU and IPv6. His presentation also addressed some of the other issues the ITU is involved in, and sparked an informative and lively discussion.

ARIN XVI Policy Proposals

At the Public Policy Meeting, the following policy proposals were discussed. They are grouped by the nature of the action recommended by the Advisory Council.

Policies to move forward:

- 2005-4: AfriNIC Recognition Policy
- 2005-5: IPv6 HD ratio
- 2005-7: Rationalize Multi-Homing Definition and Requirement (also applied 4.2.2.2 verbiage to 4.3.2.2 for consistency)

Policies to Amend:

- 2005-1: Provider-independent IPv6 Assignments for End Sites
- 2005-8: Proposal to amend ARIN IPv6 assignment and utilisation requirement

Policies Abandoned:

- 2005-2: Directory Services Overhaul
- 2005-6: IPv4 Micro-allocations for Anycast Services

For the most current information on any of these proposals, please see the Policy Proposal Archive page at: http://www.arin.net/policy/proposals/proposal_archive.html.

2005 ARIN Election Report

In October, ARIN members voted to fill two seats on the Board of Trustees and five seats on the Advisory Council that become vacant at the end of 2005. Complete results for these elections are available at:

<http://www.arin.net/announcements/archives/20051111.html>

Board of Trustees

Lee Howard and Bill Woodcock have been elected to the ARIN Board of Trustees. Each will serve a three-year term commencing January 1, 2006. The ARIN Board of Trustees congratulates Lee and Bill and looks forward to working with them.

The Board wishes to thank Vijay Gill and Doug Humphrey for their participation as candidates in the election, and encourages their continued participation in the ARIN community.

Advisory Council

ARIN would also like to congratulate the following individuals on their election to the ARIN Advisory Council: Dan Alexander, Bill Darte, Alec Peterson, Matt Pounsett, and Suzanne Woolf. Each will serve a three-year term beginning January 1, 2006.

The ARIN Board of Trustees wishes to thank James Deleskie, Owen DeLong, Andrew Dul, Teresa Gurney, Allie Settlemyre, and John Sweeting for their participation as candidates in the election and looks forward to their continued involvement in ARIN’s activities.

NRO Number Council

ARIN is pleased to announce Martin Hannigan has been appointed to the NRO NC from the ARIN region. He will serve a three-year term beginning January 1, 2006. Martin will fill the seat vacated by Lee Howard at the end of 2005. Information on the NRO NC can be found at:

<http://www.nro.net/about/number-council.html>

Information about the procedures and processes for the elections referenced above is available from the ARIN Elections page at:

<http://www.arin.net/elections/>

ARIN Board of Trustees Actions

The ARIN Board of Trustees met on October 26 and November 8, 2005.

The following are highlights of Board actions and discussions at these meetings:

- Appointed Martin Hannigan to the Number Resource Organization Number Council (NRO NC)
- Extended the waiver of initial fees for the transfer of AS numbers and IP addresses through December 31, 2006
- Discussed the Residential Customer privacy policy and associated guidelines
- Discussed a change to the ARIN bylaws to ensure that legal requirements can be met after a Treasurer vacates their position on the Board
- Reviewed and adopted the 2006 ARIN budget
- Confirmed the results of the 2005 Board of Trustees and Advisory Council elections
- Approved the NRO Statement of Ethics and Principles

Minutes for all Board of Trustees meetings are available on the ARIN website at:

<http://www.arin.net/meetings/minutes/bot/>

Advisory Council Actions

The ARIN Advisory Council met on October 27, November 17, and December 15, 2005.

The following is a summary of the actions and discussions at these meetings:

Policy Proposals

- Proposal 2005-1, "Provider-Independent IPv6 Assignments for End Sites" - recommended the AC continue to work with the author to revise
- Proposal 2005-2, "Directory Services Overhaul" - Withdrawn by author
- Proposal 2005-4, "AfriNIC Recognition Policy" - recommended adoption and move to Last Call, subsequently recommended adoption by Board after completion of Last Call
- Proposal 2005-5, "IPv6 HD-Ratio" - recommended

adoption and move to Last Call, subsequently recommended adoption by Board after completion of Last Call

- Proposal 2005-6, "IPv4 Micro-Allocations for Anycast Services" - recommended abandonment, but AC will continue to work with the author
- Proposal 2005-7, "Rationalize Multi-Homing Definition and Requirement" - recommended adoption and move to Last Call as amended, subsequently recommended adoption by Board after completion of Last Call
- Proposal 2005, "Proposal to Amend ARIN IPv6 Assignment and Utilization Requirement" - recommended the AC continue to work with the author to revise
- Accepted policy submission "4-Byte AS Number Policy Proposal" as Policy Proposal 2005-9

Other Items

- Discussed member suggestion process
- Reports were provided by AC members who attended APNIC 20 and RIPE 51

Minutes for all Advisory Council meetings are available on the ARIN website at:

<http://www.arin.net/meetings/minutes/ac/>

ASO Call for Nominations for ICANN Board Seat

In compliance with the ASO MoU and ICANN bylaws the Address Council hereby calls for nominations to the ICANN Board to fill the ASO seat currently held by Mouhamet Diop, whose term expires in June of 2006. This nomination period will close on April 4, 2006.

Nominations may be submitted by anyone by sending email to nominations@aso.icann.org. Details about what information must be submitted as part of the nomination is available at: <http://aso.icann.org/>.

Nominations will be reviewed in accordance with the ASO Board of Directors selection procedures, as documented on the ASO website.

Internet, from Page 1

of 1983. In that world, machines were large mainframes that served hundreds and sometimes thousands of users. The ratio of users to machines has changed from 1000:1 to 1: 1 or sometimes 1:3 or more (many people have more than one computer at their beck and call). The number of networks has increased from a few score to hundreds of thousands, if you count all the personal/residential networks as distinct from one another and from the networks of the Internet Service Providers, hotels, and businesses.

That the Internet has become a globally important infrastructure should be obvious by now. However, the work is far from complete. There are over 6.5 billion users in the world and only an estimated 1 billion are now online. Scaling in several dimensions can be expected: more users, more devices per user, more data transport demand per user and a wider variety of applications per user.

Providing for this kind of growth is no simple trick and the importance of IPv6 cannot be underestimated as the population of computers or programmable, Internet-enabled devices continues to mount. This brings up the general question of IPv6 address space allocation and assignment. The RIR community is developing regional and global policies for allocation of IPv6 address space. It seems important to be alert to any potential for re-creating some of the problems encountered in the allocation of IPv4 address space. In the earliest years of Internet's existence, very large allocations were made because they were part of the experiment leading to the standardization of the Internet protocols. Some will recall the original address format in which a network of some 16 million devices could be supported. At the time, no one needed 16 million devices on any one network but we simply allocated this address space to the small number of experimental participants in the Internet development program. After the Internet became a public phenomenon, these large assignments were obviously excessive. Some have been returned to the pool. Others remain. I hope that each RIR will take care to track and report address assignments so as to maintain a global sense of address space utilization and to signal if/when it is necessary to introduce changes to address allocation and assignment to assure that IPv6 will last until something new replaces it.

The Internet was very much in the news during 2005, thanks to the multi-year World Summit on the Information Society (WSIS). Without attempting to recount the many events leading up to and including the first Summit in Geneva in December 2003 and the subsequent summit in Tunis this

past 2005, it is fair to say that the Internet and the many organizations and institutions that operate it, standardize it, maintain its unique systems of identifiers, addresses and parameters, and provide services through it, were the subject of considerable debate among the participants in the two WSIS events and the various preparatory conferences leading up to each summit. The Internet quickly became a major focus of attention. Participants in the WSIS, especially some governments, soon asked "who is in charge of the Internet?". The only global body with specific responsibilities for certain aspects of the Internet is the Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers (ICANN). ICANN consequently became the subject of a great debate on Internet Governance. The discussions were inconclusive at the first summit and a Working Group on Internet Governance (WGIG) was formed and produced a report that broadly defined Internet Governance covering many more issues than lie within ICANN's mandate. This report was presented to the final summit in Tunis which produced its final report leaving ICANN and other institutions associated with the many aspects of the Internet's function in place. An international Internet Governance Forum is to be convened to serve as a platform for wide-ranging discussions among government, the private sector and civil society about the many aspects of Internet that affect or are affected by public policy.

It has become clear that governments of the world have an increased interest in the Internet and all aspects of its evolution and operation. It seems to me of vital importance that all the organizations and institutions that have connection with ICANN work together to improve and solidify the policies and practices that guide the ICANN operation. Absent evidence that the Internet community, especially the private sector, is fully capable of self-governance, there is a very real risk that various forms of national and/or international regulatory structures will be pursued. The open and collaborative nature of the Internet, with its emphasis on technological soundness and freedom to experiment, would likely be lost or much altered, to the detriment of all who enjoy the Internet as it is today and as it could be in the future.

Vinton G. Cerf is vice president and chief Internet evangelist for Google. Widely known as one of the "Fathers of the Internet," Cerf is the co-designer of the TCP/IP protocols and the architecture of the Internet. During his tenure with the U.S. Department of Defense's Advanced Research Projects Agency (DARPA), Cerf played a key role leading the development of Internet and Internet-related data packet and security technologies. Cerf has received many awards in recognition of his work. Notable are those that he has received along with partner, Robert E. Kahn. They include the National Medal of Technology, the ACM Alan M. Turing award, and the Presidential Medal of Freedom in November 2005.

About the World Summit on the Information Society (WSIS)

By Megan Kruse, ARIN Public Affairs Officer

While the information age has changed how people communicate, behave, and work, it has also created a gap between the rich and the poor – the Digital Divide. The International Telecommunication Union (ITU), an organization within the United Nations that coordinates the global telecommunications network, proposed a forum to discuss the digital revolution and the digital divide that resulted. In 2001, the UN General Assembly endorsed the ITU's proposal to hold a World Summit on the Information Society (WSIS).

WSIS consisted of two phases. The first phase took place in Geneva, hosted by the Government of Switzerland, from December 10-12, 2003. The objective was “to develop and foster a clear statement of political will and take concrete steps to establish the foundations for an Information Society for all, reflecting all the different interests at stake.” The major outcome of the first phase was the adoption of the WSIS Declaration of Principles and Plan of Action. During discussions at the Preparatory Committees (PrepComs) before the first phase of the Summit and in Geneva during the first phase, Internet governance emerged as one of the leading discussion issues.

The Regional Internet Registries (AfriNIC, APNIC, ARIN, LACNIC, and RIPE NCC) became involved, primarily speaking collectively as the Number Resource Organization (NRO). The NRO participated in meetings during both phases, monitoring discussion on Internet governance and the role of the Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers (ICANN).

The second phase of WSIS took place in Tunis, hosted by the Government of Tunisia, from November 16-18, 2005. The objective of the second phase was “to put Geneva's Plan of Action into motion and to find solutions and reach agreements in the fields of Internet governance, financing mechanisms, and follow-up and implementation of the Geneva and Tunis documents.” The biggest outcome of the second phase was the publication of the Tunis Commitment and Tunis Agenda for the Information Society. In the end, ICANN will continue its day-to-day management activities and the UN Secretary-General will convene an Internet Governance Forum (IGF) to discuss other issues.

Phase One

During the first phase of WSIS, participants agreed to pursue the dialogue on Internet governance to prepare for a decision at the second phase. One outcome of the first phase was therefore to request that the United Nations Secretary-General establish a Working Group on Internet Governance (WGIG). The Secretary-General asked the WGIG to present its results in a report for consideration and action at the second phase of WSIS.

The final WGIG report was presented in Geneva on July 18, 2005. Among the findings in the report were:

- to maintain the Internet's stability and robustness, it would be not be advisable to introduce significant changes to the existing Internet governance system;
- that no particular government should exercise an oversight role over any Internet Governance component;
- and that an open, multi-stakeholder global discussion forum would improve inter-organizational coordination and facilitate discussion of issues not considered by any specific organization.

The WGIG report presented four oversight models for certain specific Internet functions. The four models call for: (1) replacement of the ICANN Government Advisory Committee with an intergovernmental “Global Internet Council;” (2) no new oversight body, but an enhanced version of the ICANN Government Advisory Committee; (3) a new body to oversee ICANN; and (4) three new bodies, one each for policy governance, technical oversight, and global coordination.

The Number Resource Organization (NRO) supported the proposal presented as Model 2. “We believe that the participation of interested parties in all organizations relating to Internet Governance, together with the multi-stakeholder forum proposal included in the report, ensures the efficient control of the system. This control exercised by all stakeholders, including governments, is much more beneficial than an oversight exercised exclusively by governments.”

The NRO recommended caution as WSIS considered any oversight mechanism. It argued that the creation of governmental oversight structures may have negative impacts such as slowing Internet innovation, subordinating technical decisions to political criteria, and increasing bureaucracy.

The NRO highlighted the implicit acknowledgement that the current Internet governance systems function correctly and included only one recommendation that allocation policies must guarantee equal access to numbering resources, specifically relating to IPv6. This concern is widely shared and considered by RIRs and their communities in their daily work.

Phase Two

Prior to the second phase of WSIS, government delegations stated their positions in two preparatory committee meetings. Positions covered the entire range of options from absolute intergovernmental control to multi-stakeholder forums involving the current Internet governance mechanisms, world governments, civil society entities, and the public sector.

As of September 2005, the delegations had still failed to reach a compromise on the future of Internet governance. However, immediately preceding the second phase of the Summit in Tunis, government delegations reached a compromise – ICANN was to continue its day-to-day management activities, while the UN Secretary-General would convene an Internet Governance Forum (IGF) to discuss issues outside of the technical management of the Internet.

The IGF is intended to be a multi-stakeholder, democratic, transparent body that will identify and discuss existing and emerging issues and make recommendations where appropriate. The IGF has no oversight function; it does not replace existing organizations and has no involvement in the day-to-day or technical operations of the Internet. The IGF will hold its first meeting in 2006.

During phase two of WSIS, the NRO joined the “Internet Pavilion” at the ICT4all exhibition hall in Tunis, a parallel event to WSIS. The Internet Pavilion was an initiative of a number of the key organizations that are responsible for both day-to-day management and policy development in the Internet sphere.

NRO executives and representatives met WSIS participants and journalists and exchanged knowledge, experience, and views on Internet activities. The NRO worked with WSIS participants to promote a greater understanding of existing Internet governance mechanisms and how these relate to the WGIG recommendations and wider WSIS principles.

The Internet Pavilion facilitated an understanding of why a collaborative and cooperative governance model is essential both to the success of the Internet and to the development of the Information Society.

NRO Comments on WSIS

The NRO was satisfied with the result of the WSIS. It praised efforts to ensure that national governments not become involved in the technical and operational functions of the Internet. The NRO went on to comment that building on the success of the WSIS, the RIRs look forward to increased participation of all stakeholders, including governments, in regional and global policy processes. As stated in the NRO’s press release:

“The WSIS has recognized the long standing bottom-up processes and services provided by the RIRs to the Internet community. It affirms that neither competitive nor parallel registry systems are needed, recognizing that RIR processes fully support open participation by the community at large, allowing for fair, equitable, and representative resource allocation policies. It further recognizes that these processes will also continue to balance the priorities for Internet resource management at the global, regional, national, and local levels, in order to ensure stability and integrity of the Internet’s global addressing and routing structures.”

Next Steps

ARIN, primarily via its role in the NRO, and the entire Internet community will monitor Internet governance activities and will participate where appropriate as the process continues.

For More Information . . .

On the NRO’s activities at WSIS, see <http://www.nro.net/wsisp/>.

On WGIG, including the Final Report, see <http://www.wgig.org/>.

On WSIS, including the official documentation, see <http://www.itu.int/wsisp/>.

ARIN Review

Editor-in-Chief: *Jason Byrne*

Contributors: *Einar Bohlin
Megan Kruse
Cathy Murphy
Leslie Noble*

Guest Article: *Vint Cerf*