

Chris Disspain: Can you hear me?

[Male Participant]: Yes.

Chris Disspain: Good morning. We have a busy day today. We're going to start with a session on what is called in here Rules and Responsibilities, but I'll explain a little bit about that in a second. That's going to run for an hour, then we're going to have the marketing session that we didn't manage to get to yesterday, and then at 10:45 we have the ccNSO review report results, and Tom and Jean-Jacque will come and talk about that. And then we go into some updates and stuff.

This morning's session, Patrick Sherry, who I think most of you, if not all of you know, is going to run the session. Patrick's also going to run our session this afternoon as well, but - The council, the ccNSO council has been over the last couple of years, has had a series of workshops at ICANN meetings, closed council workshops to talk about the way the council works, to talk about the way the council works, planning, etc. And part of that is talking about what we've done this time. Following on this time from the meeting in Nairobi, trying to get some parity around what are the rules and responsibilities of a councilor so that people who come to the ccNSO as members can understand what it means to be a counselor and why they might want to do it, or not want to do it. Also that line logically leads into if you want to be a contributing member, you want to be someone who is actually involved, what can you do as a member to help. So that's what this is about, and I'll hand you over to Patrick. Do you want to use that microphone? This one works. Thank you.

Patrick Sherry: Now, Chris, before you sit down can I just ask you— Oh, in that case that's an errand of mercy, you're allowed to do that. Now, Chris, why do we have a Council? Why don't we all just turn up and talk?

Chris Disspain: Yes, that's a very good question, Patrick. Why not just let me run everything and it'll be fine. We have a council because, actually that's a more complicated question than it might sound, historically. If you look at the GNSO it's the Council in the GNSO that make the decisions, effectively. If you look at the ccNSO it's slightly different. What we do, and it was deliberately set up this way, is the council – and I'm talking formally here, as opposed to what we might do in the corridors – but the council effectively ratifies what the members want. That's why the GNSO Council meeting goes for a day, and ours goes for an hour. Because we

actually have the members meeting over two days, then the council picks the strands up and says we'll formalize that because we need to.

As a simple example, yesterday we agreed, the members agreed to set up a Working Group on ccTLD contributions to ICANN. Under the by-laws, that Working Group has to be set up formally by the council, so this afternoon the council will pass a formal resolution to do that. Okay? The other point, the other things that happen – this is not why we have a council, but because we have a council – there are people who are councilors, so they are seen by both the ccTLD community and the other communities in ICANN as leaders. So they are often spoken to by people because they are on the council. Is that enough, or do you want some more?

Patrick Sherry: Just a little bit more on the history might be interesting. So the council is part of the by-laws, and they were put in the by-laws because?

Chris Disspain: When ICANN version 2 was, yes, version 2.1A was being set up, we were still negotiating the possibility of considering the very early stage concept of maybe having something that might be looking like the ccNSO one day. And so the by-laws were written with the GAC space for the ccNSO and the ccNSO by-laws were written, effectively negotiated by us, by Bernie and Bart and me and some others, to– in a way that was acceptable to the ccTLD community at the time. And it was not acceptable to the ccTLD community that a small number of ccTLDs would sit in an ivory tower and make decisions, so the by-laws are written in a way that makes it clear, because one of the first things we did was then do a policy development process on the first by-law to change it so that we would satisfy some other issues.

And so it's written in a way that squarely sits the power with the membership, and there are all sorts of methodologies and ways of overturning things, and so on. The council technically speaking, can't act on a decision for seven days after they passed the resolution. Now, in practice, of course, we all know that the members have said yes to a Working Group on contributions, so we'll make that decision today, and we'll make a call for members of that Working Group, but technically, within a certain period of time, the members could come back and say no don't do that. So if that's what you want, that's why it was written that way.

-
- Patrick Sherry: So one of the things you said early on was we could just let you do everything. Why wouldn't we just let you do everything?
- Chris Disspain: I wasn't serious.
- Patrick Sherry: I know you weren't serious.
- Chris Disspain: I'm starting to feel like this is an interview.
- Patrick Sherry: It'll be a multi-faceted interview in a minute. We just need you to get us started.
- Chris Disspain: Yeah. What was the question?
- Patrick Sherry: So why don't we just let you do everything? There's not a lot to do, is there?
- Chris Disspain: Hardly anything at all. Influence and power, power in the nicest sense. Influence and power comes from cohesion as a group, as a team, and leadership is about building, I think, is about building consensus. You can't do that unless you have team of people who contribute, and everyone needs to be involved. The other point, of course, is that we're all volunteers. We all have day jobs. Most ccTLD people are not in the position that I'm in, which is that I run an organization in Australia that is comfortable for me to spend the amount of time I spend doing this stuff. That's a fairly unique circumstance, I would suggest.
- So I can't do it forever, and it's not good for the organization. The organization needs to grow, needs to swim without armbands. As part of maturing, it has to find new ways of working, and if it cannot make its members participate by taking some of the strain or doing some of the work, then it's failing as an organization.
- Patrick Sherry: So the council members are actually critical to the ongoing success of the organization?
- Chris Disspain: Council and members, absolutely, yes.
- Patrick Sherry: Okay, let's hear a bit more from the other side. Byron, you're actually a council member. Why did you become a council member and why is it so much fun?

Byron Holland: Can you hear me now? That's a bit of a leading-can you hear me? That's a bit of a leading question, but as a relatively new one, to me I think there's been a few elements that make it worthwhile. First off, the collaborative nature of the actual activity. I just personally as a ccTLD operator receive much benefit from the ability to share issues, questions, be it technology, policy, whatever, to be able to learn from my colleagues. So there's significant benefit both to me personally as well as to the organization that I run. I think without a doubt there's very much a community sentiment so that as part of a community you want to contribute and give back to it.

So like we receive benefit from being part of it, we also feel pretty passionate about being part of it, and as a result contributing in the ways that we get asked to, or in the ways that we think we can bring some value. So I'd say it's very much a win-win scenario on both sides.

Patrick Sherry: And do you find that being more deeply involved by being a council member actually increases the amount that you get out of your involvement?

Byron Holland: Without a doubt, without a doubt. You know, clearly we all have different interests in terms of how we want to see things develop or how policies should go or the directions we should take. As a councilor there's the opportunity to influence that direction, and I think that's clearly a benefit as well.

Patrick Sherry: Thanks Byron. Where's Pablo gone? Pick that microphone up there, and tell us why you find it valuable to be a council member.

Pablo Rodriguez: I think in the beginning it was a very big challenge. In the days of the launching of the ccNSO. This city, this community was a difficult community so it was a challenge for us. I thought that it would be good for my country, our region to participate a little bit more. At that time there was not a lot of participation from the region. So we thought that the region needed a voice. Since then it has become easier. The council, I think, has functioned quite well. And we have the benefit of learning more about the issues, and the policy development. The challenge now is just making sure we get more countries in. Talking to the countries has been really, really rewarding for me. From a relatively good position to be able to talk to my fellow ccTLD's. So I have found it important to participate.

-
- Patrick Sherry: That's good. I think that piece there about it being important to see that your country's views, your region's views are represented is a really important one as well as that piece there about being involved in something that's actually important. Now Lesley, it's not so much that you're an old member to Byron being a new member, but that you're a more experienced member of the council. Why do you do it and why have you stayed?
- Lesley Cowley: I was waiting for Byron to say that it was my fault that he was volunteered to join. We're involved because no one that has a commitment to taking a leading role in the development of the internet, and for us it enables us to say and we're putting our actions in place to deliver on that. From my personal experience it also really helps to get yourself involved in great detail in some of the issues. Which when I wasn't a councilor, I would be here in the meeting tapping away on my computer, trying to do my day job, and maybe just not having that level of depth of understanding, and that has been really helpful.
- Patrick Sherry: Okay. So there's a couple of things, one is that, a little bit like what Paolo said, it gives you a better understanding of what's going on, and I think Byron said something a similar thing. What interests me particularly from what you said is the first part, which is, no one as an organization has a commitment to developing the internet. Now, is that just because it's a good thing to do, or does that have flow on benefits for the country in which you work?
- Lesley Cowley: Maybe you need to ask my politicians. I think it has benefits for the country, one would hope it would have, but it's only a little contribution. Wouldn't wish to exaggerate it.
- Patrick Sherry: Thanks, Lesley. Now, let's just have a look at this slightly from a different side. Nashua you're a council member but a noncom appointee. Would you like to talk to us about your experience being a council member, and why you've found it useful and interesting?
- Nashua Abdel-Baki: I can share of my thoughts. Actually I can share some my history also because I was heavily involved earlier with the INET business from the early beginning, from 1989 to 1996-97. Then I quit that life for something like 10 years. I came back to Egypt again, 2006, and found people, friends, asking me to participate with ICANN. I didn't know anything about ICANN, what was ICANN? And I thought, okay, maybe I can join this

ccNSO because it's nearer to what I was thinking I can also contribute. At that time, Egypt was far from any business related to the top level domain. So it was just frozen for the period of ten years.

Coming back to the world of ICANN and trying to learn the language here, which is really totally different than the language of the old days of the INET and all of these things, there are more legal issues, more financial issues. It's less technical issues. This is very important for me and also for the community there. I have really learned here a lot. The word of now is thinking of the internet services and the net business as a whole. How to turn this world that is purely technical into business today. Also legal issues, and cultural issues, and all of these things. It was very important for me and for also the community.

I think now I have brought some good ideas to my country, of course. I'm not really quite sure that I have contributed to ccNSO community as much as I have contributed to my own local community, the Egyptian community. Now we have many companies that we know how to be registered, what's the method of registry, and all of these things. I think it's coming to a hopefully good stage within the next one or two years. Thanks.

Patrick Sherry: That's good. It's interesting to hear you say that it's been at least as much benefit to you. Becky, you're the other NONCOM appointee, you had a long history with ICANN before you ended up on the ccNSO committee, with various forms of involvement. Why did you come back, why did you accept that council position and why do you think that is important?

Becky Burr: Obviously ICANN is an important institution for me, and something that I care about. I care about the success of it, and the ccNSO group is for me sort of the closest thing to the old internet, to the-and I don't mean that in the way that it just sounded-but to the sort of original conception; people working together, collaborative, consensus-driven, a variety of perspectives and business models and all of that. So the work that is getting done in the ccNSO is very important. Also I wanted to contribute to ICANN in some way and this is the organization that is the most pleasant group of people to work with as colleagues. So that's why I started doing it. I thought maybe I had some skills that would be useful.

Patrick Sherry: If you don't mind answering the question, what were those skills that might be useful?

- Becky Burr: They're principally writing and legal and history of ICANN skills.
- Patrick Sherry: So it's not a pure technical competence, it's actually a much broader piece than that?
- Becky Burr: I don't think it's remotely a technical competence. I wouldn't remotely call myself technically competent. But it really is, in the GNSO all of the businesses and contractive parties have lawyers working with them. I know some of the cc's do, but not all of them. Despite what everybody says about lawyers, sometimes they're useful, mostly as editors, frankly.
- Patrick Sherry: That's great. I think that is an important point, that council needs a range of skills, not just technical skills, and people can contribute in lots of different ways. So that's great, thank you. Patricio, what makes you stay involved as a ccNSO council member?
- Patricio Poblete: I guess it's mostly in the beginning a hystErickal accident that I've been involved in this since before there was an ICANN, in the days of IFWP. At that time the ccTLDs of our region were much smaller, less developed than they are today. Many of the ccTLD managers there also had more trouble making themselves understood, and understanding English than they do today. So I was one of the few people, like Oscar, that were able to do that, so it kind of came naturally for us to be in positions of leadership in the region. That carried on to when there was the ccTLD constituency and the DNSO the atcom of the time and then the ccNSO was formed. I've been put into this position for such a long time that I'm kind of used to it.
- Patrick Sherry: How long have you been doing it?
- Patricio Poblete: I don't know. Been with the ccNSO from the start.
- Patrick Sherry: And before that, in various other forms?
- Patricio Poblete: Sure, basically from 1997-98 or so.
- Patrick Sherry: See how much fun it is? Some people even stay around for 13 years.
- Patricio Poblete: Of course it is a position where you get access to be involved with how things are being developed and interacting with colleagues from other

regions. So it really gives you lots of opportunities. Although in the design of our ccNSO councilors, as Chris was saying, do not have a lot of degrees of freedom. We basically get to meet for an hour after everything is done to ratify things. Even if we could do things that go against the wishes of the community, it would be hard for us to get away with it.

There are checks built into the by-laws, so in that sense it isn't really much different from being a member. In fact it is different, because when you are not a councilor you feel freer to take a backseat to things, let the councilors do the work. There are a lot of important examples where members have been involved in Working Groups, even leading Working Groups in a very good way. But most often than not it's councilors who get to do the job. People in our regions rely on us to be where the action is, and it is our duty to talk to them, get to know what they are feeling so you can provide good representation for them.

Now they seem, in my region, in Latin America and the Caribbean, I think everybody is, all the ccTLDs have grown, have more staff. I think everybody now is doing very well in English so the time is near enough (inaudible 0:23:09) so to let people come into these positions of leadership, and do this kind of a job. Since the beginning until now it's fallen on people like me to do it.

Patrick Sherry: That's great, Patricio. Erick, you're from a not dissimilar part of the world. What keeps you involved?

Erick Iriarte: I'm involved because it's an order from my boss.

Patrick Sherry: Did it come with a pay raise?

Erick Iriarte: Yes, it's true, because like in the manner of Peter, or Jon, or Mary from Africa, we are permanent liaisons not voting members. We need to be able to approach the reorganization of global restructure. You ask me before why young people want to be part of the council, or be a councilor. I don't know if it's about young people, or old people or gender, or brilliance. It is closer to the necessity of the community to give the opportunity to our leaders to make a path to follow. Sometimes it's also a personal necessity to help others in the process. For that reason I keep the position and quit my position as general manager. So it's fine.

Patrick Sherry: Thanks, Erick. Dotty, you've been involved for a long time as well. What keeps you hanging about? We just need to get your microphone up there.

Dotty Sparks de Blanc: Well, I have a lot of deep reasons, that are old. I think that one of the best reasons for being a part of ICANN and the ccNSO is that in the rest of the world, no one else has a clue about what's going on or what you do. You cannot explain to somebody what you do on a daily basis. This is a forum in which you can have a lot of exchange and learn a lot and basically be involved at a level where people have common concerns and interests and different knowledge to contribute. The other thing is that I find it extremely exhilarating to be at beginnings because when we, in our company, and my husband, whose steps I followed, not in the technical sense, because he was the technical genius, and I am not at all-had free public internet for everybody in the Virgin Islands in 1994 before there was really any web. So it was his desire to really empower the developing world. So I feel a commitment to that.

Patrick Sherry: And being involved with the council is a way to put that into action?

Dotty Sparks de Blanc: Yes.

Patrick Sherry: Good, good. Hiro, you have been involved for a little while as well. Why is that important to you?

Hiro Hotta: From the beginning, as bad as you are, Chris. Maybe as the tenth speaker, there are five that are councilors. To be a councilor enables me to meet and talk with people, and fortunately forces me to keep eyes on and contribute to the topics that are of various ccTLDs are facing. Not only the topics that re-arise and interest me at the moment. Of course, I can bring the topics back to my company and think about more widely for the company, That is why my company supports me attending ICANN and being a councilor.

Patrick Sherry: So it has a lot of benefit for you as well as you being able to contribute?

Hiro Hotta: Yeah.

Patrick Sherry: That's good, that's good. We haven't quite gotten to all of the councilors, but I'll just see, Young-eum have you got a comment there?

Young-eum Lee: I just wanted to mention, of course, it's the after hour drinks with Chris that keeps me here. But when the ccNSO was first being formed, I counted a huge organization, and it's a global organization. Cc's actually do their jobs well in their respective countries, but I think that it is very important that those individual views of the cc's be known to ICANN. I think the ccNSO is trying to do that and the council is helping a bit. Actually, that is what keeps me here. I agree with Becky and say that the original spirit of ICANN, or of the internet, itself is very much alive here.

Patrick Sherry: Thanks, Young-eum. So what we've heard from people that are councilors is that in almost every case, there's a sense of getting as much, and perhaps more, than what you have to give. We're obviously having this conversation because very soon it will be time to take nominations from people who want to be councilors. On Sunday the council had a workshop, and one of the things that we looked at in that workshop was what is actually involved in being a councilor? So the councilors participated in Working Groups, and there's how many of those going on right now? Twelve or thirteen?

Bart Boswinkel: There are about, I think, nine active Working Groups.

Patrick Sherry: Nine active Working Groups. So the councilors work within those Working Groups, sometimes as members and sometimes as chairs?

Bart Boswinkel: Yes, most of them. With the exception of one or two.

Patrick Sherry: Thanks, Bart. Use your skills. And we've heard various people talking about the sort of skills that we need. Becky made the point that it's not just the technical skills, it's perhaps the legal skills or the drafting skills, it's the sense of corporate memory which is a point that Young-eum made before. Some people do stay involved because of their technical skill and that's great too. So there's lots of ways that you can contribute depending on what your skills are. They talk about the ccNSO and help build membership.

As you would all be very aware, the membership of the ccNSO continues to grow and that's a wonderful thing, and in no small part that's due to the work that's done by the councilors, talking to people in their regions about why it's useful to be a member. Councilors think about the issues that affect ccTLDs, and I think that's another way of putting down the points that others were making before, that one of the things about being a

council member, because you're listening to people from around the world talk about these sorts of issues, because I think it was Dotty said, this is a place where you can come and people do understand what you do and you can talk about the things that matter as a ccTLD manager.

That, as a councilor, that forces you to think about those. And that then improves your ability to do your own job. You represent your region and you feed back information to your region, and that was the point that Alice made very early on. But one of the great things about being a councilor is that sense of being able to represent your region in that way. It's important that councilors believe in the cmodel, and the importance of the relationship with ICANN. But in a sense, people wouldn't be here themselves, people wouldn't be members of the ccNSO people wouldn't be interested in ICANN meetings if they didn't think that was a useful thing to have.

Be an active participant in meetings, and the bottom line, what's actually involved in being a councilor? We did a bit of a survey and had a discussion with the councilors on Sunday, and what people said was that the time commitment was the 18 days a year for the meetings, so meetings like this, and that would require the support of your organization, which is probably the case for everyone in the room anyway, and six to eight hours a month for calls and preparation.

Now, I'm just going to go back to some of the Council members, and I'm going to start with you, Byron. That six to eight hours a month for calls and preparation, in practical terms what does that involve? What sort of calls are they, what sort of preparation do you do?

Byron Holland: Depends on the subject matter, definitely. Typically it's just understanding what the Working Groups are, what any particular issue is. Usually we have a sense of what's going to be on the agenda. Certainly it's not an overbearing workload at all. Like I say, it depends on what the issues are, but an hour or two of reading and prep typically before a call, unless it's something like the Working Group that I'm involved with, and then obviously it's a little longer in terms of presenting or being ready for that, but it's very manageable and it's not a huge imposition.

Patrick Sherry: Byron, you're also running the Strategic and Operational Planning Group. What does that involve? Is it much extra? Why do you think it's a useful thing to do?

Byron Holland: Well, starting with your last question first, personally I certainly think it's useful because as a councilor and a community, we should have significant input into the direction of ICANN, and this is one opportunity for us to really focus and comment on ICANN's strategic direction and then as you ripple down the chain, it's operational and budgetary directions. So it's really our opportunity as a community to be – to give voice to what we think should be the direction.

In terms of what it requires, it's not as many calls typically as the councilors, but it's probably leading up to an ICANN meeting it's a couple of calls, typically they're an hour each for the calls, and then for the budget and operational cycle we do some work and hopefully as people know and have seen, we put out a report that tries to summarize the issues, strategic or operational, for the community. And that's some writing and some work, and depending on one's level of commitment to it, it will be a number of hours per person in the Working Group to create the documents, but again, I think it's very manageable for a TLD operator such as myself, or those in the group.

Patrick Sherry: And you're comfortable that the six to eight hours is a fairly accurate reflection of what's involved?

Byron Holland: Yes, I would say that's very reasonable.

Patrick Sherry: Thanks, Byron. Now, Vica, we didn't hear from you earlier. As a council member, what's involved for you with preparation and calls, and do you think that's an accurate representation of what's involved?

Vica: Sorry, my voice. Yes, that is an accurate representation. Is there a need to say more? You need some hours to prepare, to sit outside to write the documents. Yeah, to many for participation at the consulate hours they can call in and sit quiet for an hour, it is an accurate representation.

Patrick Sherry: Yes, good. Thank you. Any other council members have a reflection on the amount of work that's involved and how manageable that is? Yes, Hiro?

Hiro Hotta: Maybe for me it takes more than six or eight, because it depends on how fluent in the topic and in English. For example, for the wild carding

document, it was about fifteen pages, it took me three or four hours to read through the documents, so it depends on the fluency.

Patrick Sherry: So sometimes it's more involved because of the technical detail or the language difficulties or the complexity of the issue, or those sorts of things? Yes, thanks Hiro. Chris?

Chris Disspain: I just wanted to say that's about right from the point of view, six to eight hours for cause and preparation. Yes, as people have said it depends on how many Working Groups you're involved with, but that's the case for being a member as well as being a councilor, but it could be a lot more than that if you chose it to be. I'm not saying you should, but it could be if you chose it to be, because you take on more responsibility. The point of view of if I was going to be a councilor, what's the minimum I could commit, that's probably about right.

Patrick Sherry: Okay. Any other observations from councilors on what's involved? Are there any questions from people out there about what else is involved in being a councilor, or questions of any of the councilors? Young-eum?

Young-eum Lee: It's not just participating in the Working Groups and all that, but you actually have to be physically present in ICANN meetings and be able to come to these meetings, and have the financial backing, if you will, to be able to come.

Patrick Sherry: And that's the support from your organization that we've included on this lineup there. And that's a good point to make. Becky?

Becky Burr: I think that what's up there represents participation in the council, but it doesn't really reflect the need for councilors to take responsibility for driving some project to completion. We say, okay, here's a project that we're going to do, who's going to be on the Working Group? Who's going to drive it? and I think, maybe the six to eight hours covers it, but I think that there's responsibility for drafting and doing those kind of things – taking the laboring or on a project so it's not Chris doing all of the heavy lifting.

Patrick Sherry: Becky, from what you said before, and from what others have said, the other side of that is the sense of accomplishment for having been involved in something that gets to that point. Would that be right?

Becky Burr: Absolutely. I mean, it's rewarding. It's work, and it takes time, but it's very important.

Patrick Sherry: Thank you. Alejandro, I'm just about to ask that man a question. Sorry. So Chris, if someone was interested in becoming a councilor, what's the process, how does all this work?

Chris Disspain: Okay, well a couple of things. Each region elects three councilors and they come up for – it's a three year term, so each year one person comes up for re-election. This is ignoring the nom-com, which is obviously a different process, so each year we ask each region for nominations for a seat on the council, so that's – we have 107 members in the ccNSO now, and there are 15 elected councilors. We're not talking about current councilors wanting to stand down, etc., what we're talking about is that it would be great to have more people interested in becoming a councilor.

The process is that you nominate, you must be nominated by a ccTLD, or member, ccNSO member, from your region, and seconded by somebody from your region. This makes the North American region quite hard to deal with, because that's effectively means that 50% of the region has to nominate you and second you, but leaving that aside, until Steven joins them, excuse the numbers, and then if there's more than one nomination then there is an election, more than one nomination in your region, then an election of people voting in that region. Okay? That – so that's one seat a year. But I wanted to stress that there's a path to that.

You might not be prepared to be a counselor for all sorts of reasons, all perfectly understandable. You might not make it, you may put your hand up for it and not get elected. But there are roles that members can have that are just as important and just as critical to this organization working. We've kind of touched on it, because we've said you know, the councilors tend to chair the Working Groups, etc., but actually that doesn't have to be the case, and it would be fantastic if people, as members would be willing to commit a certain amount of time, to involve themselves in one or two issues that they care about.

The best example I can give you is that Keith Davidson chairs the Delegation/Re-delegation Working Group. This is a pretty, I'm sorry – my phone is buzzing and it's porting me. How extraordinary. It's a pretty key and significant Working Group, and I think it's marvelous that that

Working Group is being chaired by someone who's not on the council. So I just wanted to give you that as an example.

Patrick Sherry: So the point there Chris, is that there are a number of ways to be involved, being a councilor is one of them, but people who want to be involved without being a councilor could do that through the Working Groups or even by chairing the Working Groups.

Chris Disspain: Correct.

Patrick Sherry: And the timeline for everything you've just described there?

Chris Disspain: Gabby is the timeline guru for council elections and things. I have no idea.

Gabriella Schitteck: So the elections will start, nominations will start in I think October. We're trying to have it sorted by within this year, so we now three months in advance who will be on the council.

Patrick Sherry: So when you say it will start in October, is that the nomination process that will start in October, and the voting will happen a bit after that?

Gabriella Schitteck: Actually it already started in September, normally starts the end of September, first of October, and there's a nomination process and if one region has more than one candidate then it goes to election, and since the elections sometimes, there can be re-elections, so we have to have a lot of time, and this is why we start so early.

Patrick Sherry: So when should people expect to first hear about this? Sometime in September?

Gabriella Schitteck: Yes, I will send out something in September.

Patrick Sherry: And it will go to all the members?

Gabriella Schitteck: All the members, yes. There's no fixed timeline, I always send a suggestion to the council, which approves it, which I'm basing on our guidelines and it's always roughly the end of September or early October.

Patrick Sherry: Right. Good. Thank you. Has anyone got any questions about being a council member or other ways of being involved more actively in the work of the ccNSO? Patricio?

Patricio Poblete: Just one observation, because Jon just said that it is true that you do need financial backing of your organization to come to these meetings, you are expected to be here physically; that is true, but that should be – that might scare away some people, so I should also point out there is some financial support available. We’ve each of us, councilors, has one of our trips paid by ICANN per year, so you only have to get financial support from your organization for the remaining two meetings.

Patrick Sherry: That’s a very important point to make. Thank you, Patricio. Any other questions or observations on being a council member? Or other ways of being involved? Vica–

Vica: I have one thing also which might be worth emphasizing, is participation in the Working Groups, even when you are not a council member, I think it provides a good base as far as understanding how the ccNSO works, and by the time you become a counselor, you have a list or view of what’s going to be involved, what’s the purpose. I’ll be co-chairs of rushing to the council sometimes and not understanding the dynamics involved and the demands involved,

Patrick Sherry: Yeah, that’s good. Thanks Vica. Thank you. So I think what we’ve heard today is there’s this thing called the council and without exception when we went round and talked to the councilors they said that it was a useful thing to be doing and they often got more out of it themselves, than the work that they put it. That it was a good thing for them, but in terms of their understanding of issues, their ability to represent their region, their ability to contribute to something, that’s very global and a key part of the internet.

We also heard that the process for those nominations will start in late September or early October, and it’s a great way for you to be more involved in what’s happening here, and of course the other side of this is that the ccNSO relies on the council members to get things done, to keep itself alive, to keep itself vibrant, to get its work done, and to achieve what it needs to achieve. So we need people out there to take that step, to make that commitment, to be willing to be involved. So if there’s no more questions, I’ll hand to Chris for a last word, and thank you particularly to the council members for your contribution this morning. I’m sorry, Jon. A comment?

Jon Lawrence: Thanks, Patrick. I had a very quick one. As you're aware, we're not really ccNSO member because we are sort of registry operator sitting under Chris' organization – is there any scope for somebody like myself to serve on Working Groups in that situation?

Patrick Sherry: Yes. We'll take volunteers from almost anywhere.

Jon Lawrence: I thought you'd say that.

Patrick Sherry: We're not proud. Except Australia. We're not proud.

Chris Disspain: Thank you, Patrick. This is about growing up. We've done all the sort of forming and storming and all that stuff, and we're coming really to a point now where we're dealing with the real grown up issues. We've got Delegation/Re-delegation stuff going on, we're talking about money, we've had some amazing successes in the last few years, we've had a success in, at least for now, getting the country names off the table, thanks mostly to Annabeth and Hilde for their persistence in doing that, and that's what I mean by not having to be a counselor. But getting self-involved in something that you care about and you are passionate about, because it's the care and the passion that actually drives it, and makes the time that you put in seem less of a burden than it might otherwise do.

So that's really good, and I really encourage everybody to consider helping out a bit more, putting their hand up a bit more. Start as small as you want to start. It might just be you know what, I'm going to stand up and say something in the room. But that's – lift the game and we've got a lot of things to do in the next few years. Thank you Patrick, and Patrick is going to be back this afternoon because we are having a strategic what should ICANN have in it's what we now know as a strategic wish list. What should ICANN have in its strategic wish list for the next three or four years, so that will be fun.

We're going to do the marketing session that we didn't do yesterday now, Hiro you're going to chair that I believe. And who is the other one. Vica, how are you going to cope with doing a session if you can hardly speak? It's nothing to do with the soccer, right? You haven't been blowing your vuvuzela way too hard. So I'm going to hand you over to Hiro whose going to run the session, then we're going to have coffee break and then please, quarter to eleven we must be back because [Irva] and Tom and

Jean-Jacque and Alejandro are going to talk to us about the review report, so please, please be here. Thank you. Hiro, over to you.

Hiro Hotta: Okay, thank you Chris. Now we are moving to the marketing session. This is to share experience and information from presentations so we have thirty minutes. The reason couple of ccNSO meetings we had marketing sessions and they were popular enough to decide to have another session in Brussels. Today we have Vica from South Africa and Yeo from Malaysia. So Vica –

Vica: (inaudible, mic and voice problems 0:52:33-0:54:30)

Yoshi Tamura: Hello, my name is Yo, and I'm from the policy department of .my domain registry. My colleague [Sherial Omar], he's from the business development and corporate communications dept, he's unable to be present here, the ccNSO members meeting due to marketing activities that currently taking place in Malaysia. Nevertheless we'd like to thank the ccNSO for giving us the opportunity to share with you some marketing updates from Malaysia, from .mydomainregistry.

So this presentation will be on the role of channel management and new media. Our strategy for .my domain registry for this year is basically based on two main concepts. So the first concept is basically that we'd like to utilize the word my, in its secondary meaning, so we want to define my as belonging to, made by or done by me, or is mine to create a sense of belonging for our customers. The second concept basically for marketing that we're going to execute this year is what we call the fear factor approach, and that's by instilling fear on those who've yet to register their .my domain name, so this would be a situation where, for example, trademark or service mark owners, they've not registered their .my or .com.my domain name yet, we would basically be raising awareness about the issue and phenomena of cyber squatting to them, that should they find themselves – basically they can find themselves in a situation where they can be blackmailed by the cyber squatters.

So our main focus is to engage in what we call the btl activities, which is below the line activities, because we find ourselves on one hand having a limited marketing budget and on the other we're facing increasing media costs in Malaysia, so some of the activities that we hope to roll out this year is by having price promotions, loyalty incentives for our resellers, and we'd like to organization competitions and hand out attractive prices,

so our main target market for Malaysia is the small medium enterprises and businesses. so another main focus that we would like to explore this year is to fully utilize channel management and new media.

On the role of general management, .my domain registry doesn't operate on a business model that includes registrars. We are the sole registry and registrars for the Malaysian ccTLD .my Malaysia. We were appointed to that position by the Malaysian communications in multimedia commission. So our domain name registrations for .my, they're done by our resellers who are doing the front end marketing for us. So we've identified the need to have a channel management department which we created this year in June, and we hope to expand the role of our resellers. Currently we have 62, and we hope to provide them more support and get them actively involved in .my's activities for this year.

We look to our resellers are helping us to gather the relevant for us and providing us with the market feedback. What are the issues, barriers, and trends and competitors in the Malaysian market. Another role of channel management that we're exploring is we would like to engage with what we call co-marketing partners, first of which would be the central company registry of Malaysia, which goes by the acronym SSM, the companies commission of Malaysia. We hope to have a win/win situation with that because what we found out basically from them was that they've launched something called a elaunchman services, for companies and businesses in Malaysia. They find the uptake is very low, so we hope to collaborate with them, where is new businesses and companies fully utilize the elaunchman services, they could at the same time register their .my or .com.my domain names.

Another partner that we hope to collaborate and engage with is the Malaysian intellectual property organization, in short known as the MIPO, they have an online system for filing trademarks and service marks, so we hope to leverage on their online platform and work closely with them as well to encourage trademark and service mark owners in Malaysia to register their .my at the same time when they apply for a trademark. With the sponsorship from our Malaysian communications and multimedia commission, MCMC, we hope to organize a series of road shows this year. We hope to begin the road show in Saba, which is at the northern tip of Borneo, and by doing so we hope to co-market and co-organize these road shows with our industry players, which would include the companies commission and the Malaysian intellectual property organization. We

have participated in mostly business to business, b2b events. We participated in the Malaysian cultural expo since 2008, by setting up our exhibition booth there.

We are also going to open up a booth in the small and medium enterprise innovation showcase that's going to take place in Kuala Lumpur this year, and a first for us is to also set up an exhibition booth in the Malaysian International [Halel] Industry Showcase, which is also taking place this year. One of the business to consumer events that we are participating in is the – what we call the national ICT PC fair, so that's the first business to consumer event that we will be participating. The PC fest are basically organized on a quarterly basis and this is I think a form of marketing that was coined by an American writer, guerilla marketing, so this is something that we are looking to apply for our events, so instead of having really big budgets our primary investments here are our time, our energy, and imagination in all the departments of .my domain registry. So we'd like to combine guerilla marketing with other marketing tools for maximum impact and we'd like to use this marketing tool in some of our events, which includes the road shows that will be taking place this year.

So social media – we find that the capabilities of marketing with social media, those aren't entirely tapped, but there's huge potentials for future development. We hope, through social media, to offer the benefits which come from having reduced costs and enhanced performance, so we're looking into interactive marketing opportunities beyond websites. We're looking at blogs, podcasts, mobile computing, and we find that social media will allow our customers and consumers, internet users in Malaysia a greater public voice and role, and this will basically generate opportunities for marketers groups to share, sell, or stock their goods online.

So for example, we launched the .my registry woman entrepreneur online market place, this is the online marketplace that we launched earlier this year. We developed this community portal specifically and exclusively only for women entrepreneurs in Malaysia, so this will enable them to trade their goods, and some of them are selling chocolates, batik cloths, and the cookies and homemade products basically online, and we find that it has generated a lot of support from organizations in Malaysia. Just to share basically that we've registered the platform under our .my domain name, we call it juanita.my which is in (inaudible 1:03:30) so in English it translates to one woman. We're experimenting with Facebook. We have

actually established an internal Facebook for the company at the moment so we're still exploring Facebook to extend it beyond our company. We plan to use it as a communication tool, to make us more accessible and visible, and we hope that this will provide the interaction that our customers are looking for.

We hope to create a personality through Facebook so that our customers can identify themselves with this, and establish a relationship with the .my brand. So we hope that this will encourage repeat subscribers and promote customer loyalty. So we hope to integrate Facebook with our other vehicles of marketing. Another form of social media too that we're looking at is Twitter. So what we plan to use Twitter for is to monitor and inform us of any public relation issues or problems in real time. Our plan, main plan for using Facebook is to drive traffic to .my corporate materials, live status updates, and help us create surveys for our customers.

Lastly, on blogs, we received an invitation to sponsor or become one of the sponsors for the Asian bloggers and social media conference that will be held next month in Kuala Lumpur, we do evaluate bloggers events. Not all, too basically see if those events are in line with our companies objectives, and we found basically from our experience that when we launched our 50% price promotion last month, there was a particular blogger in (inaudible 1:05:18) the southern tip of Borneo, who blogged about this price promotion and we found that it generated a lot of interest for .my; it helped us raise awareness, and this particular blogger, he goes by the name (inaudible 1:05:32), he's been nominated for an award under the first ever Borneo bloggers award taking place this year.

So he's been nominated for the best technology blog category, so we wish him all the best and hope that he will generate more greater awareness of .my and the work that we do, if he wins the award. So Thank you very much for your attention., If you have any questions you can email my colleague from the corporate communications business development department, his email is shario @domainregistry.my; my email is yo@domainregisty.my and do watch us. We've got our .my registry company up in ccNSOs youtube channel, so thank you very much.

Hiro Hotta:

Thank you for sharing your experiences and thank you for keeping your time. So any questions, comments?

-
- [Male Participant]: Yes, I'm sorry. Can you bring your presentation back up? Can you go back to the page with the guerrilla marketing? I'm just curious as to how these images tie in with .my.
- Yoshi Tamura: Okay, basically the artist is basically leveraging what tools he has, I think he's just using crayons and a public road. So basically what we're trying to associate is that we don't really need a big budget to promote and conduct marketing activities, we leverage on what we have, so basically it's our time, our energy, and our imagination.
- [Male Participant]: So is .my anywhere in the images?
- Yoshi Tamura: No. It's just basically to share that idea.
- Carsten Schiefner: Hello, it's Carsten Schiefner from Munich. Yo, you mentioned you don't have a registrars system but you would rely on resellers. Is my assumption correct also that those resellers are contractually bound with my registry or is that a resellers, could basically anybody reselling domain names to third parties without having a contract in place with you. Because if there would be contract in place, I would like to ask what is the difference from your point of view with a registrars system compared with your system?
- Yoshi Tamura: Thank you for the question, Carsten. We do have a contract with all 62 of our resellers and it's just that basically they do not take on additional functions, so when it comes to the transfer or deletion of the domain names, that's done by .my registry, so their role is basically only to register and renew the domain names, the database is still with us, so we maintain the database, but we also will take on the additional functions like transfeR&Deletions.
- Carsten Schiefner: So for example, if a domain name holder would like to cancel his or her domain name, they need to come directly to you instead of going to the reseller?
- Yoshi Tamura: Exactly.
- Carsten Schiefner: Okay. Thanks.
- Hiro Hotta: Any other – yes, Henry?

Henry Chan: Thanks for the presentation. I would like to hear more about your use of social media. specifically how do you assess the success the use of the media? Just (inaudible 1:09:39) having a certain number of fans in your page or certain followers on Twitter (inaudible 1:09:46). So how do you assess those activities?

Yoshi Tamura: Thanks for the question, Henry. I think our first major challenge is to find a dedicated staff to actually help us keep tabs of the messages and statistics from Twitter and Facebook, but we do find basically that the social media market is growing in Malaysia, so it's a matter of tapping into that current market and this is mean the youths, Malaysian teenagers and youths that are utilizing social media tools. So for the statistics, it's what do you call that? I'll probably get my colleague to get in touch with you on that, the major challenge now is to find dedicated staff to look after the Twitter and the Facebook social media.

Hiro Hotta: Okay, I am inviting the last question to Eva. Okay, thank you Eva. Vica?

Vica: Thank you, Hiro. I will present briefly about – provide an overview of a market survey toward .za space that we did starting late November last year and we had it finalized end of February this year. We did a report from all those contents. Probably to explain why we needed to conduct a market survey for the .za space, we wanted to understand our customer needs better and watch for the trends when it comes to the registration of names. We wanted to understand views and perceptions per za as a domain and za also as their regulator and as ccTLD manager for za.

We also wanted to understand the impact that other ccTLD have on za and understand some of the companies for multi-national, there will be some that have presence in our country but use other top level domains, it could be another country domain or it could be a genErick domain. And we wanted to use the results to help us with better planning to improve our space.

There were a number of areas of improvement, obviously. The registration process is that when you are must improve the management of the registries toward za. We have multiple registries for use; we use a second level domain structure. You do not register your name .za, you register just your name.co.zeda. So co.za is run by an overrun all .zas internet solutions, ace.za for academics and institution is by internet. So we have multiple registries.

We want to know how we can improve the management of registries, we also want to choose the results to remove any barriers and bottlenecks that will come out of the survey. Identify any other options that people want to see for registration purposes, and also see what's double branding can do for .za in relation to other gTLDs, and then use that results also to manage our licensing and policy development processes better.

Now the terms of reference were clear was that we wanted organizations to help us establish a percentage of South Africans with domain names, whether they be .za or any other tld. We wanted to find out the details, the details in terms of choosing domain, how much price is of registration and influence people in choosing a domain they wish to register. We wanted to understand the customer attitude toward .za and other domains and part of understanding the importance of having a domain name.

This was important because the law that funds zadna requires us to conduct such surveys from time to time. We also wanted to test our DNS levels regarding the forthcoming genErick top level domains ICANN will be launching. What's the population of .za domains is like, or if there's any of our leverage in our second level domains, which new domains should or could be added into .za.

One of the key questions was do you want the second level domains to compete, do you have a bid toward .za to complete it past .za, or should we keep the current structure, and also big question again for us was the question of whether people want to register directly under .za or wait with the second level registrations. This was an important question because there was harm in the ICT media who started last year lobbying that we do away with the second level domains and allow people to register straight under .za. The methodology that the consultants used was basically a two pronged methodology of consultative research to the isp organization; which included interviews with the major isp and then they would conduct investigative research and use statistically valid survey techniques. They will do an online survey of (inaudible 1:15:20) toward .za domain name holders.

So .za holders will compete in registry with this days I think 560 and something thousand domain names, the online survey was one of two waves. It will be a first wave where they will target registrants with most domain names, basically that will be effective with ISPs with most domain

names registered with .za, and then there will be the second wave of registrants with sort of za names, less than 3000 names registered. Then there will also be a telephone survey of businesses of different sizes where at the end we conducted 607 interviews with different business entities in our country and we also do an online survey of the ought.za registrants. Ought.za is the second largest second level domain name for .za.

Now of the key outcomes that we found out, one of the key questions was what do you consider to be a primary domain, and that was the question was primarily based for custom businesses. You will see that out of 601 respondents 501 had considered .za to be their primary domain. This was important because some of these businesses have multi-national presence. They are present in South Africa, they are present in other countries. So 83% of them said they still consider za to be their primary domain of registration. The rate of them that (inaudible 1:16:47) badly probably 15% for various reasons and all .za and others scored much less than that. We also asked the respondents if they ever had to look for alternative name if their first choice domain name was already taken with .za, and we find out that 95% of businesses said no. They've always been able to get the name they are looking for in the .za space. That is self explanatory.

We're a space that has I think a little more than 600,000 domain names if you group all of the domain name registrations that we have. That's not too much close. Maybe we hit around 8 million registrations in .za I think you will see a different answer there. There wouldn't be 95% of people who say we always find our name. It will decrease because names will have been taken. But what it says is that currently this space is still large for businesses to register names without having to change the name they want to register. We asked if the first choice of a name was already taken what did they interested parties do?

Now, as you will understand 95% said no, we were able to get the name that we wanted to get, but if in case that name was taken, you will realize that 65% of the respondents in the first wave, that topped 3000, said they changed the name entirely, and they sent in the (inaudible 1:18:18) the second wave said 69% said yes they changed the name entirely, but the majority said they applied under another domain extension. It could be a .com, it could be a .uk or other.

We wanted to understand what are the key effects in defensive domain name choice. We interviewed , we looked at part the (inaudible 1:18:39)

toward the registrants and businesses, and we found out that South African identity online was the key priority, in part waves. You will see that the first wave 96.3% of the respondents said it's South African identity that we want when we register names. We asked if our customers were happy with their current domain name fees, and 95% said yes. 2% were neutral and 3% said no.

A little explanation is that we have different domain name fee structures in .za for now, but that will change once we start licensing the registries and the za registrars. You get some second level domains for registration that are free, you get some second level domains where the registration fees once off, that goes toward za and they seed .za , then you get other domains like city.za, law.za that charge a normal registration fee. So 95% of the people responded and said they were happy with the domain name fees.

We also wanted to check on question, was one of the things that have been bothering us for the last two years. It's conveyed by some of the registrants, that some of the ISPs listed themselves as holders of domain names when in fact they were supposed to list the actual registrant as holder of domain names. So we asked if our respondent would check the .za WHOIS conversely there is not one center right now, we have especially WHOIS right for second level. And if they've checked, who is listed as a registrant, for businesses the answer was more confusing because they were either listed as the holder of the name or some representative of the company was listed.

So now that gives you 85% of people saying the right people are listed as the holders of the name. And again, that doesn't mean it's controversial, some of the ISPs agree with the registrants to list ISPs as the holders of the names. What domain name registration fee would you consider to be fair for the dead.za space? Looking at the cause of domain name holder. 68% of the respondents said in the first round of interviews that anything less than 100 rand is cheap, which means for us under the 50 rands that people pay to register co.za name is well acceptable. 21% said anything more than 100 but less than 200 is acceptable.

We asked if you could start from scratch, which domain would you want to register in, and the businesses considered we ran them as the first choice domain, that if you could start from scratch what domain would you register in, and 79% of businesses said they would still choose co.za. And

only 19% said they would choose .com, so as much as co.za got huge it still does matter because ur would rather, for example, have another za option taking that 19% name instead of .com. Now we come back to co.za and .com and we wanted to know which is the most preferred domain using the following attribute. For obvious reasons you will see that 81% of respondents saw that .com was superior when it comes to global presence. They said the domain that gives them global presence, but other than that co.za scored much higher than .com, so .za , another person said is considered superior locally, provides more information for them, it gives them more ability and it's also more affordable.

We then asked one of the few questions was that we were testing the awareness of the South African market of ICANN's coming genErick domains, 85% of the respondents said they were not aware that ICANN was planning to introduce new domains, and only 15% said they were aware. We then asked the key question whether people wanted to see competition for second level domains, would people to see biz.za competition or .za. 78.3% said no, they'd prefer the current structure, with co.za the primary domain for entities that are commercial oriented entities, 21% said they would like to see biz.za just as well. So those were the key findings. There were other findings, but I thought these were the key findings that we could share here. Thank you.

Hiro Hotta: Thank you, Vica. Very interesting. And conversations on co.za being top ranked with 80%. So any questions, comments from the floor? Yes?

[Male Participant]: I was a bit surprised to see that 0% would prefer .za to .co.za because when we have .com.ts in the case of Spain, or .ts; .com.ts is much cheaper, nearly for free, but people obviously prefer a shorter domain name. So what do you think it is this, because this does not happen only in our case, but I say no, in most cases where both domains are available most people prefer to register directly under a tld but your findings were completely opposite in direction. Have you talked to people, you did direct phone calls? Why would then they choose .za directly? Thank you.

Vica: Thank you. I think the survey is clear. That is a question we asked ourselves for a while as the authority, you know, there were some people who come to us like I said, there was some loading in the media where some journalists went and said do away with co.za and caf.za, we want to register directly under .za, and that was one of the main reasons why we did this survey. It's not clear why an overwhelming majority of the

respondents wanted to keep their current structure; it's probably people are more compatible with what they are used to, with what they know. Maybe you could ask the same question in a year or two and change the total forecast of the old years and find a different answer.

Hiro Hotta: Thank you. Hilde.

Hilde Thunem: Thank you for a very interesting presentation. When you talk about the reason why people choose co.za, and others I would guess that some of it might be that by having separate sub domains you can have special policies for, I mean, the businesses don't have to share with necessarily with the government organizations, or the nonprofit organizations and you can make special rules for the special interest groups. We have seen, having in Spain both second level domains and directly under the tld that people prefer to register directly under the tld, but we also see that we get into complex where some special interest groups want special rules for just them and others want special rules for just them. If we had had a space like you did, we could give each interest group their special rules without interfering with the rest, but we can't, and we can't go back.

Vica: I agree with you Hilde, that it's a – like I said to the gentleman from .ts – it's a question that depends on who you ask, basically. If you were to ask me personally, registering my business, if I want to register co.za or straight into .za; I would want to go straight into .za; you know, but we are a membership based entity so it's important that we conducted this survey because at some point, for example, in 2007 we obviously wanted to move into this direct registration toward .za , but we held that. For us to justify our stand we decided to conduct this survey and yeah, it's keep co.za; keep caf.za; we like that segmentation because it defines clearly and gives special rules for those second levels.

Hiro Hotta: Okay, Thank you, and may I invite the last question from the floor. Okay, if none, okay we'll convene at 10:45 sharp, so please come back before 10:45.

[Coffee break - 1:37:21]

Chris Disspain: Okay, welcome back, everybody. Could you please start taking your seats? I may have slightly mislead you because not everyone from ITEMS team is currently here, but we'll be starting soon. Well, thank you everybody for coming back, if you could take your seats please. We're

going to move now to the ccNSO review independent report and the next steps. Alejandro is just organizing his computer, and his coffee. So the way this is going to work is Alex will take us through from the point of view of the ICANN committee, Jean-Jacque should be with us soon. Alex will take us through and then I think Tomas, or (inaudible 1:42:23) will do a presentation on the report, yeah? Okay. So Alex, whenever you are ready. The slides are here, so I guess they're on the machine. I don't know how – how do you change the slides? On this, using this computer here? Okay, cool.

Alejandro Pisanty: So good morning everybody. I apologize for Jean-Jacque's absence, he's much better than I will, but we'll pull through. This is the presentation of the work done by ITEMS International, which is an independent consulting company, which was hired by ICANN – can you hear me well? Am I close enough to the microphone? Which was hired by ICANN to do the – So sorry. This is a presentation mostly by – oh Jean-Jacque – on the work of ITEMS International which is a company, a consultancy that was in contract with ICANN to perform the actions of the review and to produce a summary of it. The terminology has been explained, there will be a little more of that during the presentation, and this is presented now to you for comment. The ccNSO review Working Group was formed by members of the acting Board like Jean-Jacque, it was chaired by Jean-Jacque, and by former members like myself. There's a combination of different people in the Working Group. There's – we had some intervention in shaping the methodology for the report, vetting it, and discussing its progress. The work you'll see, though, the presentation today is the work of ITEMS. I'll hand this over to Jean-Jacque.

Jean-Jacque Subrenat: Thanks, Alejandro. I'd like to excuse myself because I've been late. I had some problem with my eyeglasses, that's the best excuse I could find, for getting successively two venues wrong, and getting stuck in the lift and all that. But I don't know how far you got in the presentation. Okay. So I think that the important thing is you have the composition of the review working team there, can we change slides? What I'd like to point out to you is actually a few indications of where we come from, so it's been a process of not very long, it was about seven months since the initial, since the start when the Working Group was established.

The RFP for consultant was launched in the autumn of 2009, and I'd just like to spend a moment on how we choose the independent reviewer, because you may be interested to know that this time, more than any other

I think, we were very careful to put out the call for tenders vary widely. I insisted on the fact that it was not restricted to the English language, and certainly not to Western Europe or North America or something like that. Thanks to staff, the effort was carried way out and this was publicized in Latin America, in Africa, in Asia and the pacific, etc. It's after a very thorough process of vetting that finally ITEMS International was chosen in November of 2009. Their final report was delivered just a few days ago on the 15th of June, and posted online the same day, for public comments. This is open to comments until the 30th of July, so on behalf of everyone I'd like to encourage you to come into that process, because that's where your value added can come in.

Today there will be the presentation of the consultant's final report for your comments and discussion. Next slide, or is that all? The next steps – I think this is interesting for all of us to remember what the timeline is. So probably in August, based on the consultant's report and comments received in between, I'm sure that means the 30th of July, this Working Group will prepare a report with its own recommendations, which may or may not be the same or restricted only to the recommendations made by the independent reviewer. Don't worry, Avi, that's the usual thing with all the reviews carried out at ICANN, it's not particular to you or to the ccNSO review.

And then in September, October 2010 we will make best use of all the comments received, and draft our own final report, the Working Group final report to be submitted to the ICANN Board for consideration and hopefully approval, or adoption. Once that is adopted by the Board, then the report becomes the basis for the development of an implementation plan by the ICANN staff, and you – the ccNSO community. We think this would occur in November or December, 2010. The step wise implementation of all that would occur during 2011.

[Period of fumbling with microphones or computer or something – followed by applause]

Ari Freedman: Thank you, thank you. Okay, thank you. So this review was very trusting for us and very particular because ICANN is very specialty organization and ccNSO as well, and in a way it's a very different review for my company with other organizations. This review is based on what we received, about 97 responses to survey and we had around 80 interviews only 65 names mentioned, because some people don't want to be mentioned. I go fast on some slides, there are three key objectives for the

ccNSO review. Mainly of these three objectives, and let me focus on the development policy, because ccNSO is a policy development body. So there was no showing consensus with the ccNSO community and the (inaudible 1:51:39) coordination action as an ICANN organization.

There is another one, the number four objective, the RFP mentioned only the three objectives and after we were through, okay but there is another one. The fourth one, and the fourth one is not open because it's the ccNSO in engaged in the other activities authorized by its members, and that open the door and some activities carried out by ccNSO could be interpreted in relation to this objective. So first the global picture is very positive, and when we asked members globally, or people what do you think about ccNSO if ccNSO has affected a lot, people are very positive.

After when we discuss this paper in this case it's now obvious we had a lot of comments with people saying globally its positive, but after asking questions about transparency, about accountability, and things like that, or information. So just to remind you, it's important that now the cc domain represent in 2009 represent 41% of the cc, of the domains, and that's increasing and maybe in the next few years will be equal to gTLD. To discuss about what the people say the ccNSO is different depending on which type of organization they represent. The ccTLDs managed by adjunct government agency or administration is different perception from the nonprofit or academic, and generally governmental agencies or administration are more critical to ccNSO and sometimes roughly critics. So it's best to take care of that and try to separate some of the answers depending on the kind of organizations represent.

So about the first objective, of the first objective policy development is a most discussed objective, and in a way it was very difficult for us, because some people considered the ccNSO has to focus its activity on policy development and other people say totally the contrary, and it was very apparent point for us and very important point regarding recommendation what we could propose, and the fact is that it is difficult because the scope is very narrow and there is two items. One is data-entry function and the other one is name server function. Is very formally, is very technical functions where ccNSO is able to develop policy, and so this focus is very narrow and that's an explanation why ccNSO has developed only one policy through the PDP mechanism. Only one. And people consider it's generally it's a complex factor that is complex related to this narrow scope.

At the same time everybody has, not everybody but a lot of people, a majority of people have noticed that ccNSO has played a really major role in the adoption of the IDN fast track, and that's an important point. So regarding the objective two, it's generally a consensus that not when it's related to the ccTLD policy same as before.

We see that a lot of people were very positive at this point and regarding the objective three, coordination with SO and AC, we had ambiguous answers on this one because a lot of people talk about ccNSO some people were very formal but they said, okay we don't know what ccNSO does, and ccNSO act as a (inaudible 1:58:02) or something like that, but another way, yesterday afternoon for example, we have a relationship with GAC, for example, is very good, and no trouble between the chairs with the ccNSO chair and the GAC chair, so that's a fact that a lot of people were happy with and sometimes critical on that point.

Other than the four objectives people were more open and generally people are positive on that part, saying okay, it's maybe it's not formal but that's the way it is and maybe that's good for ccNSO to have a maybe an area where they can discuss any purpose within the community. So that's what we have tried to represent with this chart, with the left part policy development, with diverging opinion and the right part is more consensus, more consciousness that maybe less formal mechanism. However, the Working Group mechanism which acts on different issues, but some people express, a lot of people express that ccNSO should express more position, more forward position on some issues, and in our report we have put the example of the discussion about the security, and it was interesting discussion because in Nairobi, the chair discussed with the council about the ccNSO position.

But after they had the letter between the chair and other SOs and some people were saying okay but we just discovered this letter after, we just discovered the reason after, and we will have to discuss about this issue, and nobody confess and nobody complains about the result, it's just about the process. People say okay, we want to be more part of the process and we think that would be a good way to develop something, maybe a new culture in the ccNSO to formalize position, to formalize letters, with formal process.

For example, yesterday Peter Dengate Thrush, asked the ccNSO why don't you have taken position on the final issue responding to the ICANN request and maybe if the ccNSO would have this culture, we would have been a dramatic process, a formal process, and to express a position. And that's the meaning of our first recommendation, and we have taken the example of what the Center have done, and the Center have formally detailed what is a common mechanism, what is a position paper mechanism, and we think the ccNSO could take profit from that experience maybe to adopt the same kind of mechanism.

About the factors which have maybe prevented the ccNSO from achieving its objectives, we are going to present just one. Some people were very formal in expressing strong points on this issue. It's about the dominance of English. Most of the people do not consider the dominance of English a problem, but at the end you have quite a few people who consider that an important issue. We think you have to take care of that. That is the reason why we propose you translate not all of the documents, but the main documents into the main UN language.

Another way to do that would be to take the example of Wikipedia, everybody know Wikipedia; and ask the linguistic communities to do it, to translate what they want to translate. Maybe with a kind of reference, people would be able to check the translation. But I think you could do that today for free, and it would not be an additional expense. We have assessed in other that communities, that if you want to translate something linguistic communities are ready to do that.

About the membership, the map is very impressive but you can look at Asia, here, and a part of Africa, that is not covered by ccNSO membership. Arguably, after the change in the by-laws in 2005, the ccNSO memberships have increased, but some regions are maybe under-represented, specifically Asia Pacific and Africa. In the same way, we can assess, if we tried to differentiate, depending on the statute of the governmental organizations and profit organizations, are not represented at a high level. That's an interesting point, and we think that ccNSO would try to abridge activities to enlarge membership in the way they did a few years ago. Maybe there should be an online community manager.

We are going to talk again about an online community manager because it is not only related to that point, and we will come back to it. If we try to understand why people, why ccTLD, don't want to join ccNSO the main

reason is the perception of global cc policy commitment. We think we have to relate that to the fact that governmental organizations are less present in ccNSO than in other organizations. We think that ccNSO maybe could coordinate something with GAC and AC. We will discuss being ready to participate in such an action to try to get new ccNSO members. Related to the coordination with the ICANN system, I have discussed there is a position of structure but in another way a good relationship with some other organization, especially with the GAC. In general there is a valuable leverage of coordination. But we have tried to work on this idea, the question of why there is no other constituency of the ccNSO and could we imagine to propose constituency representing, specifically, the registrars who were acting globally.

They say they are concerned with ccNSO issues and sometimes would like to participate and work in groups. Somebody asked this question just this morning, from Australia, but we think it's a tricky question. Because, everything ccNSO it's a fine balance, and we want to take care to propose a strong change like that.

That's the reason why for the first time we propose to create a Working Group, maybe in coordination with GNSO because in GNSO you have a registrar stake holder group and a business constituency. That's where these constituencies are represented in the ICANN system. We think there is something to do with that. Regarding the resource, the first point is the website, because we have received a lot of criticism about the website. There is a redesign of the website in the process right now. We have read the documents, which are draft documents now, specifically information regarding the next website. It doesn't really respond to our main concern which is to help the community to work together.

We have other projects like that with other organizations, and one of the main tools to do that is social networking. In the specification document the word collaborative or the word social is never used. If you have to do a website today in a community like ccTLDs, you have to consider that the base-line of the website. It's a social community website you have to do. At the same time to work in that perspective with this kind of website, we are saying that you have to appoint a specific community manager. A community manager will sometimes discuss the community with people, will sometimes publish information on the web, and the other time to deal with an impressionable task or to prepare the meeting. A community

manager is totally dedicated to the community. To manage a community they will need to be able to discuss with people using these tools.

Another point that was very important for us is the budget. If you have read the report, you have noticed that we have specifically asked ICANN after Nairobi a question to understand the precise limits of our mandate on the question. For the first time in a review - we have to make a review where we don't have a financial budget dedicated to the organization. We have to agree to make the review. We have received instruction not to investigate more, not to make a proposal on that point. All we can say is that for us there is a kind of antagonism to ask a review of an organization and not to have a financial budget dedicated to this organization. Because this budget is not related to ccNSO this budget is dedicated to global ccTLD activities. We will come back later to the financial issue at the end.

About accountability, we will say, like I said at the beginning, that there is a very positive global picture about the accountability and transparency, but on that specific point we had a lot of specific comments in contradiction with this positive global picture. So that's a few words that illustrate this point. It was a very difficult point for us because of this comment. We think that this transparency and accountability with ccNSO should consider introducing a limit to the number of terms. We have had a discussion about that. Other SO's, like GNSO or GAC, have limits, generally of two terms, and we think it's very important because today ccNSO is very mature, they have more than one hundred members, and if you want to renew the live Council-sometimes the Council is considered as a club because it's people they know. They could try to be elected to the council by the councilor. It would be difficult to succeed, and they prefer not to apply.

In the same way we think ccNSO should consider ratifying the rules of the Council and the Chair. In many situations maybe the Chair explains the view of the ccNSO and people say okay, why is it only the Chair and not the ccNSO? It's not in contradiction with the by-laws, it's just an assessment of what people are saying. We think that ccNSO should ratify that.

Regarding the facts related to transparency and to the finance as I was saying, we feel the ccNSO should appoint a permanent finance liaison. In a way that's what you do today with SOP. Regarding the discussion yesterday morning between the ccNSO and the Board Representatives, it

was exactly the point we are focusing on right now. A Working Group like the SOP is limited in its time, and we think a permanent finance liaison would be something for long-term.

Another point, and this point can be tied with what ICANN can see. Your comments yesterday morning were to define a policy, a world map for the next two or three years. We think it's very important for transparency to define what we are going to work on for the next two years. And at the end of these two years, to be accountable for what we have proposed to work on. That's the basic principle of accountability.

The last point, and I don't know if it's the most difficult or not, but we had to draw on deep discussion within our team about the compliance and mandate to understand why the ccNSO have been set up and whether the reasons the ccNSO are set up are still valid today. We were really in the history of the ccNSO and this discussion between ICANN and the GAC and a different organization and ccTLD members center on a vision. We think there is a kind of trend and this chart represents the trend. At the beginning, this is a systematic global view, we had to tell a direct link between cc and ICANN. ccNSO in the global landscape, helping the cc, are trying to develop a consensus between cc's and the GAC and government. The GAC and government in a way were far from these discussions.

Today, we think the GAC and the government are more present. For example the delegate-the government will decide, okay, we are going to rattle the gate as though they're cc. We think that changed the rules. The example we could compare is a utility. You have a government, a local government decide to locate a frequency, an operator, but the policy is not the question of the operator, it's business. The policy started as the business of the government, of the local authority. The question is do we have to go on with this comparison or not? At the end, we think about disrupting relation, a new relation, between the ccNSO and the GAC as a way to change the relation with the government.

At the end we have decided not to propose a change in the by-laws because that would really change the structure of what the ccNSO is. We think the people of the community need the ccNSO and we don't want to risk changing the fair-balance between the ICANN system where ccNSO is represented. At the end, we do think that the ccNSO have a continuing purpose in the ICANN structure because of many issues. At the end, to

fully work toward one world, one intellect, and everyone connected.
Thank you.

Patrick Sherry: What I'm going to suggest is that we have some time now for questions. Could we perhaps just go to the recommendation slides, one by one, so just go back to recommendation number one. And then we'll just see if there are any questions on recommendation number one and so on, and then we'll take general questions and so on. Sorry? Yeah, we'll take the general questions as well, just some sort of guide for the discussion.

So the question is whether we do the general questions first or the , which would you prefer? It's a question wish list, exactly. Does anyone have any questions about recommendation number one? Okay. So we're all going to, I have no doubt that many of us will be making comments on the document, etc., so don't take no questions as meaning no comments, it's just that there are no questions. Just for my – I have a note here that said actually we do this, but we don't have necessarily a formalized approach to doing this, and the question of course is with the speed with which these things happen, with a formalized approach would make it less likely that you'd end up doing it, or more likely because the formalized approach takes longer, but I accept the point.

Okay, number two. Anybody want to say anything about translation?
Hilde.

Hilde Thunem: Well, that's sort of the recommendation number two and number three together, and I just first of all want to congratulate you on actually not suggesting something that costs a lot more money from somewhere, because you have made the recommendation that this is something that the community can share and do in a cost effective way. But still I do wonder a little bit why you chose to focus so much on language, given that it is of course a problem for a minority of us, and it is also a barrier towards entering the ccNSO but it is the least important barrier toward membership in the ccNSO according to the graphs, and it is still a minority of the barriers within the ccNSO so why did you focus on that and not on the other barriers?

Patrick Sherry: Can I just add to that before you, and you respond if you choose to respond. Which is that I actually had written down here that you say a significant minority, what is a significant minority? And you also say that the point, the suggestion, which is fine, that we can translate our own

documents, I think the only comment I would make about that is yes, but that needs time, it needs willingness, and it needs accuracy, and it needs trust. We sometimes can spend months discussing one word. I can remember the discussions about an accountability framework, and what should we call it? And having a discussion about the fact Hiro said it means nothing to me in Japanese. What does accountability framework mean? and how would you translate that? It's quite, I would say it's quite challenging. Before you say anything, Sabine also had her hand up.

Sabine Dolderer: I have also question. When you say a significant minority has say language is an issue, have you also collected the languages they want, before you come to the recommendation to do it in that languages?

Patrick Sherry: Yes, if a significant minority is 27 people who all speak Urdu, that's one thing. Okay, Tom.

Tom Mackenzie: Well, first of all the significant minority is around 20, between 20 and 25%, that's a quite a large number of people. We thought that was a significant enough number of people to at least raise the question of whether-

Sabine Dolderer: Which language group do they represent?

Tom Mackenzie: Well, actually some of the language groups are not that far removed. French, for example-

Patrick Sherry: So it's just the French then- [laughter]

Tom Mackenzie: Yeah, I mean we – well being based in Paris we were in a position to translate –

Avi Freedman: In Nairobi that was a frequent word.

Patrick Sherry: I understand completely.

Tom Mackenzie: We were in a position to translate the survey questionnaire into French very easily, but it turned out that was a way of getting through to quite a large number of people across sort of- Africa, (inaudible 2:27:33). And if you look at that map, you will see that there's a huge swath of Africa that's not covered in the ccNSO membership, that is basically French speaking Africa. So you know, that's one thing, but then there's having

documents in Arabic. There were quite a few, not Russia itself, but there were ex-Soviet states who all speak perfect Russian who expressed, some of whom expressed the need or to have the use of translation into Russian.

Patrick Sherry: Sure – it’s important that we don’t get into a sort of self-justification thing here. You justifying, us criticizing. I just want to cover stuff, Sabine did you have something else you wanted to say?

Sabine Dolderer: I just want to say it doesn’t answer my question.

Patrick Sherry: Yeah, okay. Lesley do you want to do a general question? No, okay fine. So let’s go to four. Now, anyone want to – I’ve got a couple of comments to make about this, so I’ll start, because I have the microphone. You talked about, you put up a map and it’s got blank spaces as if that, you know, there are actually lots of reasons why there might be blank spaces. There are – because people don’t interact as well, they find it very challenging to enter, and I think it would be fair to say that we are, as a community, very well aware of that, but I’m concerned that we ask the question; yes, of course, having a larger membership is a good thing, but how much effort do you put in to achieve that on a 80/20 rule basis is really the question for us.

You get to a point eventually where it costs you a huge amount of time and effort to achieve one extra membership or two extra memberships, and I know the regional organizations understand this as well, because they have the same issues. So I’m just, I don’t need a response, I’m just saying there are challenges around that, that make it difficult. Did anyone else want to comment on this issue? Dotty, Sabine. Dotty?

Dotty Sparks de Blanc: Well, I think at the very least what we could do is get contact information on the people who are not members, the contact name and the name of the operation and stuff, and just add them to the mailing list of some kind of group name like potential affiliates or something.

Patrick Sherry: Understood. Sabine?

Sabine Dolderer: I also understand that you think that enlarging the membership has something to do with selling, let’s say selling the advantages of the ccNSO properly, I know a lot of people in the room being not a member because of legal issues, because they are government bodies and they cannot become a member because they think it’s - have you elaborated more

deeply that they are intentionally not a member and they know what they are doing, of it is not only about if we explain to them their role?

Tom Mackenzie: Very quickly about that. We had a whole sort of series of questions in our survey which we're just trying to understand why people didn't apply; people who are of the existence of the ccNSO but just didn't apply. There were quite a few sort of reasons for that. Some people said that they had sought invitation, but then sort of given up, or they hadn't been contacted again; there were sort of these kinds of issues.

Patrick Sherry: I'm sorry, I need to stop you there. Are you telling me that someone said that they had applied and not been contacted?

Tom Mackenzie: There were people like this-

Patrick Sherry: No, no. This is – so there were people – let's be really clear here, this is critically important. There are people who have applied to be a – there are 60 TLDs –who have applied to be members of the ccNSO and have not heard from us? That is absolutely –

Tom Mackenzie: I mean, I could produce the feedback –

Patrick Sherry: That would be very useful. Because that would, frankly, be quite extraordinary. I have [Everherd] and Young-eum, Vica, Keith , and we will run out of time. So [Everherd], quickly.

[Everherd]: I'm [Everherd] from .na, we are not a member and we have also in the survey indicated that we don't want to become a member as long as we are required to follow – to automatically on admission abide by ICANN policy. How many others-

Patrick Sherry: About being required to abide to ICANN policy.

[Everherd]: Membership in the ccNSO (inaudible 2:32:37) that you automatically agree to abide by ICANN policy.

[crosstalk]

[Everherd]: For us that's a reason not to join because they assign policy we don't agree with. How many others are there who say we don't want to join because of this automatic part of abide by ICANN policy? But every ccTLD

member should be a member of the ccNSO that's official. That's what I wrote.

Patrick Sherry: Yes, it is.

[Everherd]: But how many think we don't want to because we –

Avi Freedman: You have a reserve here on one point –

Patrick Sherry: Okay. Fine. For some that's significant. Alright. Young-eum, briefly.

Young-eum Lee: Just a comment. It would be really helpful if you had a diagram of the breakdown of the cc's who responded into various categories.

Patrick Sherry: Vica-

Vica: I think you have this kind of information of this point in your report –

Patrick Sherry: It's the big red button. Okay, hang on.

Avi Freedman: In your case probably comment more like 2:34, ccNSO membership-

Tom Mackenzie: Well, on that question of being aligned with the US government, whether that was perceived in any way as a kind of blockage to membership, we asked that question and only a very small number of people, a sort of negligible number of people reported that to be a block, a stumbling block to membership.

Patrick Sherry: Keith –

Keith Davidson: Really just a question to Chris. Is it not part of the ICANN staff regional liaisons duties to sort of discuss the options of ccNSO membership?

Patrick Sherry: Yes, it is. The answer is Keith, it's something that they do all the time. It's also a matter for the regional organization - they often do the same thing. I mean, LATLD is probably by far the best example of that. LATLDs incredibly supportive of ICANN and membership. I'm conscious that we're running out of time, so can I ask Lesley to (inaudible) her question, and I'll just take general questions rather than recommendations, this is going to take too long. Lesley.

-
- Lesley Cowley: Thank you, because mine was (inaudible 2:35:57). I have a money obsession and if you look at the aims of the review on page 15, the only possible question that covered money was about – question twelve which is talking about resources that the ccNSO needs to accomplish its tasks, and then on page 61 you mention that your response to the RFP provided the offer to do some work analyzing the funding model, which appears not to have been agreed, because on page 62 there was a dialogue about clarification on the – that element of the scope of the review I believe, so therefore given all that, why on pages 62 to 68 do we seem to go at length into finances and contributions to ICANN, because I believe that is out of scope for this review. It's not, either, particularly constructive in terms of finding a way forward. If one were cynical, which of course I'm not, one might think that that's on a wish list somewhere – but if this was part of the review then why don't pages 62 to 68 include comments from cc and other representatives on that particular issue?
- Patrick Sherry: You're not obliged to answer that question, if you'd prefer to take the fifth.
- Avi Freedman: We have tried just to present a compromise because a lot of people have asked us to do that. Some people expressed their willing to get more information than we presented on the report, so that's the reason we tried the final compromise.
- Patrick Sherry: I have a –
- Lesley Cowley: So was this in scope for the review?
- Avi Freedman: Uh, yes. The scope of the review, the term financial was used and we proposed in our proposal it was where it basically paragraph on this point.
- Lesley Cowley: But on page 62, there's a clear message from ICANN that you're understanding that you're supposed to analyze all aspects, is wrong?
- Avi Freedman: Yes, that's the reason why we don't – why we haven't investigate more. It's just compromise.
- Patrick Sherry: So hold on. Let's make sure we're really clear here. Examining the financial aspects of the relationship between the ccTLD community – let's be clear here. There's no financial relationship between the ccNSO and ICANN. One of the reasons why it's massively out of scope is because if,

indeed, there is a financial relationship, it is between an individual ccTLD and ICANN. Because individual ccTLDs are sovereign, they ain't gonna be reviewed by anybody except possibly their own government, is their own government chooses to do so. So because there is no financial relationship between the ccNSO and ICANN, there is nothing to review. Now, that's not the same thing as saying there isn't a budget that ICANN spends on stuff that might sit in the ccNSO but there is no relationship, financial relationship between ccNSO and ICANN. Have I put that clearly? Is that –

Lesley Cowley: My clarity is about this review. I'm not in denial it's not an issue, but if it was within the review then it would have been helpful to get cc, input as part of that compromise.

Patrick Sherry: Exactly, and I think Lesley's point is just that there were no questions in your survey about financial – anything financial that I can recall – and yet there is stuff in the document that relates to it, so that's why some might think there is a bit of a disconnect. Okay.

Avi Freedman: Yeah, the question is how can you investigate transparency without minimal assessment of this point.

Patrick Sherry: Well you can if there isn't a point to be assessed. But we can talk, we've spent too much time – we're already running out of time. I have Hilde and I have Nigel and I have Sabine, and then I think we will probably have to call it quits.

Hilde Thunem: Thank you. I think one of the things that is very interesting about this review is it gives us view of how we look from the outside, like a natural science program trying to find out some strange rituals of – and we start to see that what for us is apparent is perhaps not so apparent for people outside this room. One of the things that I think confuses you a bit is the narrow scope and then people say yes, but we will only make policy.

I think you're catching up on the fact that the narrow scope is because that is only for binding policies and that's [Everherd]'s point, that some (inaudible 2:41:37) member, being a member in the ccNSO you accept being bound to certain policies, those are the ones we use as ccPDP to make, and also the ones that are extremely narrow, because if that scope were any wider, half of us would walk out of this room. because the scope is what it is, there are still people out there who don't want to walk into

the room and be a member; they will participate in the meeting, but they will not be a member because of the ability to make binding policy, so that's an explanation.

Two small questions, or one question one comment. It would be very helpful to get the entire set of graphs for all the questions. Because yes, I read the report, but still some of the questions are not illustrated there, so I'd like to now see the entire background for the conclusions that are drawn. My comment is that I'm a little bit concerned. I know that it's very difficult when you have the open questions, where people make comments, to actually imprint who is saying what and what do they really mean, but I am a bit concerned about some of the things I've seen, for example, when you touch upon the perception that the ccNSO works in isolation; the comment you have quoted together with that conclusion actually says the exact opposite.

The comment says there's too little across all three bodies and cites the example of the new gTLDs process which dissipated into the GNSO silo, without getting together with all the others, so I do hope that you have other things than that comment to build upon when you draw the conclusion that people think that the ccNSO works in isolation.

[Male Participant]: Can you publish the details out of the survey.

Patrick Sherry: Yes, excellent. Nigel. Quickly please.

Nigel Roberts: I'll be as quick as I know how. Two points. First of all the slide which talked about the history of the ccNSO seemed somehow to my mind, out of the comments you made about the role of governments, re-write history. I was elected member of the ccTLD constituency of the DNSO forerunner of the GNSO my recollection is it was a perfectly functioning government advisory committee back in 1999 and 2000, and although it was a lot smaller, as were the ccTLDs, it was perfectly well functioning. Governments aren't taking any different view of the cc's by and large than they did then. That wasn't the most important point. The question I've got for you is what on earth makes you think that registrars of .com domains should have any say in the running of ccTLD matters?

Avi Freedman: Yes, but I'm not sure to – I'm trying to think – what I could say more than what we've said about the register how we think we do things that registrars should have a voice –

-
- Nigel Roberts: Which registrars?
- Avi Freedman: Why?
- Patrick Sherry: Slow down. Which registrars? Do you mean registrars in .com, or do you mean registrars in our own ccTLDs?
- Avi Freedman: We tried to define a concept of global registrars, globally on the cc, but this constituency doesn't exist in the ICANN system, the reason why we just opened the debate with registrars and we propose to create a Working Group to somehow we could – performance of the – something specific with the registrars. We are limited by the fact that on the registrars just represented by the stakeholder group.
- Patrick Sherry: Hold on –
- Nigel Roberts: Can I just repeat the question, because I don't believe you answered any part of it.
- Patrick Sherry: Can I just –
- Nigel Roberts: The question is why –
- Patrick Sherry: I understand, but can I perhaps – I don't think we're clear on what we are talking about, so before we get to the why I think we need to get to the what. So please, I just need to know this. When the ccNSO develops a policy that could impact the constituencies of registrars and registrants, I understand those words, do you mean my registrants, .au registrars, and .au registrants? And everybody else's dot whatever registrars and registrants? Or do you mean the .com .net .org registrars who sit in the GNSO constituency and their registrants. Which are you talking about? Or both, and then when we know that – yes, I know, but it doesn't say that. It implies that you're talking about the GNSO registrars. Are you talking about the GNSO registrars?
- Avi Freedman: The issue you raise is that – so when national ccTLDs when they have the (inaudible 2:47:37) impact their local registrars and registrants so we will raise the case of global registrants of the registration on a global basis or registrars who operate on a global basis, they could be concerned by policies that could be developed by the ccNSO. Policy which could impact

those global registrants or global (inaudible) on an international basis – a mechanism could be, should be set up to have their inputs or their –

Patrick Sherry: Could you give me an example of something of a global policy that we would make that would affect global registrars?

Avi Freedman: Uh- So for example if the ccNSO would develop the policy about WHOIS data accuracy availability it would impact those global registrants and global registrars. So it's not sure if WHOIS data is within the scope of the by-laws of (inaudible) but if some steps were made towards policy on this field it would have an impact for the activities of these –

Patrick Sherry: I understand. I understand.

Nigel Roberts: So my question again, is why. And the reason I ask it that way is simply this. You mentioned during the presentation a word which is very close to my own heart because I started kicking it around years ago, the word is subsidiary. And that means that cc matters, cc policy, cc WHOIS data, we have regular meetings with the data protection commissioner, it is developed locally and there is no reason that a .com registrars should be or ICANN should require us to have any dealings with them over that. This is one of the reasons that we are not a member of the ccNSO.

Patrick Sherry: We can't – Becky wanted to say something and then Sabine, and then I'll end the session.

Becky Burr: I just think that there's a fundamental problem with this, the way this is structured. When the GAC, in 1999 or whatever it was, started writing ccTLD delegation/redelgation principles one of the big discussions was should ccTLDs have to follow policies – the question – is the community the global internet community, or is it the local internet community that cc's are responsible for being responsive to? A fundamental question and it was a question that came up in the particular case where certain ccTLDs were being used for – or alleged being used for trademark infringement or something like that, that clearly had global impacts.

There was a very, very heated debate and the governments involved took a very strong position that that was not appropriate and that the issue about what policies get impacted was a matter of sovereignty and local sovereignty. So I can imagine ten places where you will hear they should consider the global community because sometimes the policies of ccTLDs

have global impacts; but I can tell you that is an issue of enormous history with profound debate upon which the governments have taken absolutely clear position, so it is like what Nigel is saying –

Patrick Sherry: Hold on. You're agreeing with Nigel?

Becky Burr: Sort of. Sort of. Only sort of. I'm just saying it's an interesting concept but we've been there and done that.

Patrick Sherry: Okay. Let's go to Sabine and then we have to call it quits, I'm afraid.

Sabine Dolderer: My esteemed friends Nigel and Becky already covered everything I wanted to cover on the recommendation. That was it.

Patrick Sherry: Gentlemen-

Avi Freedman: Just a point really to extension like .tv – it was typically a-

Patrick Sherry: And perfectly understandably.

Avi Freedman: And Nigel is gone, but about his point is the reason we haven't proposed to set up – we just put out the question and it was important –

Patrick Sherry: When reviews like this get done, there's always going to be push back. I don't think that changes the fact that you've obviously worked extremely hard, you've come up with some very interesting analysis and survey results etc., and for that I think we should all be grateful, and thank you. Alex wants to say something very briefly, and then we need to move on. So Alex –

Alex Corenthin: On behalf of – some words on behalf of the Working Group. As you know the report is now open for discussion, it's public and open for further discussion and debate online or in further sessions like this one. It will be handled by the structural improvements part of ICANN now, I personally think that this exchange has been extremely useful and interesting, it shows that the report has really pointed us to key issues, people may agree or not with some of the expressions they find in the report, or the recommendations; they may be questions about where some of the responses came from, but they came from somewhere.

The Working Group was very insistent with ICANN's to vet personally to have all the information well backed up by surveying responses from people there, so you can be sure that where it says people outside think the ccNSO think that the ccNSO works in isolation, there are people who said that. I mean they must have said it because - they weren't of course. The key point that I will be focusing on in reporting on this, if I'm required to, will be that there has been enormous progress in the ccNSO. the ccNSO has become a very cogent, coherent community that shows Chris' sense of maturity which has to be very developed in terms of succession plans and limits. and these kinds of discussions that truly will take place, and there continues to be, of course, an edge of undefined territory.

But basic principle about the outcomes of the ccNSO which was when we started separating the ccNSO from the GNSO and standing it on its own feet, and establishing principles and much looser obligations as compared for example to the GNSO or even the RARE communities which were existing and autonomous, the basic premise which seems to have been met with great acceptance is you shape it, you eat it. If you want to take part in the process, if you want to shape the outcome, you have basically to agree to abide by the result of the discussion of which you are a part. While there may be details and degrees of acceptance for that, that seems to be a well established. I think this community has to be congratulated for its contributions.

While it has been perceived by some to work in isolation, and that's something to work on, there also has been collaborative work with some important issues and that just has to be carried on now when the ICANN structure and the Board take this up.

Patrick Sherry: Thank you Alex. I just want to make it absolutely clear if someone said we work in isolation, that's fine. Well, that's not fine, but yes, we accept that. The question wasn't that. The question was did someone say that or is that an interpretation of what they said? Because the quote given that implies that doesn't seem to imply it. So that's all, it's not that we're concerned that somebody would have said it, it's just we're not sure that it was actually said.

Avi Freedman: There will be space to discuss the details of the information, and there's also an important point of separation here. ITEMS has done very clear work in review, on one hand collecting the facts, pressing them, and on the other hand putting forward the recommendations that will shape the

discussion without meaning that it has (inaudible 2:58:05) but I will say I find them all worthwhile.

Chris Disspain: We have to stop now, so thank you very much indeed. Vica is going to chair the next session, and Andreas is going to chair the DNS session. I have to go to a meeting. Those registries coming in at quarter to one and lunch is at one, right? Where's lunch, on the panoramic thingy again? We're not sure. Okay. If I can encourage the other sessions please to try and get in within the time, that will be really great, because we do need to start at 2 o'clock with the strategy session, because now we're not finishing at 3:30; we have the Accountability and Transparency Review Team coming at 3:30 to talk to us about the attr review and then we have a council meeting, so it's a fairly rushed and packed agenda. So Vica, over to you. Thank you very much.

Vica: Thank you Chris. We move on to the next session now, the original TLD organizations update. We've asked AFTLD (inaudible 2:59:15) to join us, Erick from LATLD, Ivanson Peter William from Centa, so if they're not here we'll continue with the three organizations. We do not have much time on our hands so we will limit this to ten minutes. We'll ask each presenter to not even do a presentation, but just to give us an update on what the regional TLD organizations have been doing, or what they're planning to be doing in the near future.

Once Erick and Jon are setting up I will give it over to Joe Munyori from .ke and the new Board member of the TLD, Joe will take his three minutes to tell us what is happening with AFTLD, really run through it, it will be fine. Just three minutes and then we are through.

Joseph Munyori: Thank you, chair. My name is Joe Munyori from Kenya, (inaudible 3:00:13) .ke – First of all let me thank you for coming to Nairobi, I hope you enjoyed your time there, it was a good pleasure hosting in Nairobi. I'll make it very quick. Since the 36th ICANN meeting we've had two members, that is Chad and Somalia, so far we now have 37 members and like you can see in the slide, 57% of ccTLDs in Africa are not members of AFTLD yet. So we only have 43%. This came out very clearly in the previous presentation, the reason why probably most members are not joining AFTLD.

Recent activities, in March of this year we had a fourth AFTLD event in Nairobi where we also had our AGM, then AFTLD also participated in the

37th ICANN meeting in Nairobi. Presently, in May we had the African Internet Summit in Kengali, where we had AFnoc, and Afrnic back to back, and AFTLD participated in that event. Now that planned activities we have for this year; right now we're participating in Brussels at the ICANN meeting, we are planning for the Aroc Advanced Registration Course which will run back to back in English and French, in Bamako, Mali. Then in December we are planning for to attend the IGF in Columbia, then in April next year we will attend – we will have AFTLD AGM in conference in Akroghana.

The projects that we are already undertaking, you can see on the slide, we are doing a new web site, our new select (inaudible 3:02:07) is almost out, and we are focusing more on membership drive and of course partnership. We have new partners on the AFTLD link Afrnic, and others are also on the pipeline. DNSec capacity building, now the road has been signed is a major focus most ccTLDs in Africa are looking at, so AFTLD will be there to provide them with capacity building on this area. AFTLD is also involved in the regional charity (Operator Survey 3:02:40) so far 12 members have already participated, and nine of them are acceptable as (inaudible 3:02:47). We agreed on a strategic plan, a five year strategic plan and we are already at a very advanced stage. Thank you much for giving me this opportunity to share.

Vica:

Thanks, Joe. We now move on to Jian.

Jian Zhang:

Hi everybody. I'm Jian from the APTLD, I was told that I only got three minutes, so I don't have slides. I'm going to keep it really short. Really there's not much happened in APTLD except the select female GM on board which surprised everybody, so I actually start my new position probably about two months ago. Right now we have 38 ordinary members and 18 associated members. We had our AGM in Kuala Lumpur March this year. The meeting is mainly focused on IP logistics, security, and the IDN launch. Also we had our new Board selected at that meeting, also we have upcoming Sri Lanka meeting right after this ICANN Brussel, on the 27th and 28th, for those who would love to travel long distance are welcome to come. In case you really couldn't make it, come to our very next one in Jordan at the end of October.

Also we have several surveys, our strategy matters survey was in September, last year and we also had our membership survey at the end of last year and we will also have our internal survey happened actually just

last month, May. Actually something happened (inaudible 3:05:19) our IDN made some magnificent progress on fast track. As you all know, we are one of the major case for fast track, so also we have the largest domain in our region for IDN. Two of four delegates completed so far in AP region, those are United Arab Emirates, and the Saudi Arabia, so congratulations to them. Plus Russian is partial our AP region. Also in our region, China, Hong Kong, Jordan, Palestine, Katar, Sri Lanka, Taiwan, Thailand has passed string evaluation, where we can start delegation at this point. Also Singapore and the Suri Arabic Republic just passed string evaluation yesterday so congratulations to them. Also we're doing closely follow-up on the development of ccPDP process, IDN ccPDP process, we have disaster support fund set up this year to support member organizations upon natural disasters.

We are going to provide technical support for rebuilding registry infrastructure in cases of damage. We also co-organized AP regional IGF last week in Hong Kong, it was a very successful one which has more than 200 attendees in that meeting. That's pretty much it, what's happening in our region. Thank you.

Vica: Thank you, Jian. Now straight to Mr. Iriarte from LATLD.

Erick Iriarte: Thank you, last time somebody called me Mr. Iriarte was in the school. Okay. I have a presentation but I am only going to read some facts. The first is we have a new consulate for the next two years selected in Corasol assembly. For the people attending our next assembly will be in Cancun, and the next will be (inaudible 3:07:58). New consul is (inaudible 3:08:03) from Panama and secretary from Brazil. Also we changed our- And the new members are from Columbia, from Dominican Republic, and from Paraguay.

The more interesting things is our next workshop that we will have in coordination with ISOC, ICANN and NSCR, we will have advanced registry operation course in Guatamela, 19 to 23 in July. Then we will have technical workshop, our IV Technical workshop in Uruguay, and will be the 6 to 10 September, is focusing on EPP, anycas, and DNSSEC, and finally we will have commercial workshop in Cartagena two days before the ICANN meeting. You are invited to follow our workshops. We have new members, now 34 members. Our new members are Nether Antilles, and Aruba, and Ungila. For the reason now our language in our

community are French, English, Dutch, Portuguese, and now we talk Spanish too.

Sixteen of our members are significantly in frameworks today, Ecuador and Netherland Antilles, and we have two more that change the letters. That means 66% of the region has some kind of agreement with ICANN. We are now with more kinds of these agreements. Also the 85% of our members are members of ccNSO that means the largest region with more members with the ccNSO. For me, nothing more. Thanks.

Vica: Congratulations to your new Board members, by the way, I saw the list; and congratulations to Jian on her appointment. I don't know if we have any questions to any of the three regional TLD organizations, if there's any questions I'll take one or two. Going once, twice, thrice. No questions. Therefore, thank you. If there are any questions after this, go to your regional chair or other representative. Thank you very much.

Henry Chan: Thank you, can I invite Panagotos from ENISA, Diego from Costa Rica, and Hirohota from the GP to the stage? and while they are going to be seated I just wanted to say we are going to change subject a little bit. We had our less technical sessions and now we will have some more technical session. It's about DNSSEC. We as members of the program Working Group very carefully watch your responses to the surveys that are done after the end of each meeting and DNSSEC session was run with the highest grades ever, so I hope you will enjoy the fact that we again included this session in your program. And because we are a little bit behind the schedule and we don't have enough time, I would like to ask the first presenter to start his presentation so it's Panagiotis from ENISA, hard to pronounce your name. And please –

Panagiotis Saragiotis: Hello everybody. So my name is Panagiotis, I work for the European Network and Security Agency and I'm here to present you with the results of our study on the course of DNSSEC deployment. This study was conducted for ENISA by the Lloyd enterprise services, they did the interviews and with assistance from ENISA's expert group on DNS and the center. So why did we need that study? Deploying a new technology like DNSSEC is often considered difficult that it requires investment in hardware, software, human resources, and also some operational expenses are to be considered, like bandwidth.

These investments were not well defined so we did this study in order to be able to calculate these expenses for a registry or a zone operator; a registrar, or even a (inaudible 3:14:07) operator, about their reluctance to deploy due to the cost of these technologies. So why ENISA is involved in this issue. ENISA is a European agency that helps the European Commission, the member states and the businesses to address, respond, and especially to prevent network information security problems. In that context, we are running a multi-annual thematic program on improving the resilience of the European e-communication networks, that started back in 2008, and we land hopefully this year.

So in this program ENISA did the survey with the operators regarding technologies that had the potential to improve the resilience of the networks, and one of those technologies was DNSSEC. So DNSSEC is considered to improve the stability and security of the networks, and it is a result of the study that the operators are willing to deploy, but they have some obstacles. For example, they feel that policies and guidelines are missing and are needed in order for them to be able to deploy the technology. As all of you know, DNS is a critical service for the IP based networks, since that was well understood by the community and the stakeholders in that study.

The objectives and the scope of the study, the objectives of the study were to study the costs, the operational and investment costs, of DNSSEC deployment. To assess the required transition of resources that already exist in the companies, and the different roles of operations. We addressed registries, registrars, joint operators and resolver operators. And we did, we asked them to complete the questionnaire, and we had some follow up interviews with them.

As a side effect of this study, we also had the opportunity to analyze the adaption of DNSSEC and to analyze the business benefit that those companies are seeing. We also wanted to find hurdles that they face, but we didn't have detailed answers on that part of the survey. So who did we survey? We surveyed 20 different companies, most of them were operating zones, the criteria were that they had at least seriously considered implementing DNSSEC, they did implement it, or about to do DNSSEC implementation. They were asked voluntarily to participate in this study, and the results, the data for this study were collected between June and September 2009. It's a bit over six months old now.

The overall result of the studies, is there is a big distinction between big savers and big spenders. Big savers invest an average of 27,000 EU in deploying the DNSSEC, while big spenders have invested more than 500,000 EU. One special category of the registrars, in that category these businesses do not have to deploy zones. Their investment cost is very low one, about 5000 EU. So what is the difference between big spenders and big savers? First of all, if we want to see the stats of course, big spenders invested heavily into operating their infrastructure, while big savers used existing infrastructure, used the overcapacity in the DNS servers, and CPU memory to deploy DNSSEC. Big spenders, on the other side, felt that they had to invest a lot into upgrading their infrastructure so that costed 17 to 50% of their total investment cost.

Besides the infrastructure cost, one important element is that strategic positioning toward DNSSEC. Big spenders have a tendency to be in the front line of development and deployment of the DNSSEC arena. They emphasize a lot in the governance issues of DNSSEC and the key management procedures, the key storage, the automation of the procedures, and also they had to put in place operational processes, procedures how to generate the zones, who has access to the keys, everything.

On the other hand, the big savers were companies that used software that is open source in most of the cases, and they only did a bit of customization on that software which was most of their cost, without being considered a lot about governance issues, and key management issues. One other important element of the cost was the software cost. Almost none of the correspondents in the survey used enough of self product to deploy DNSSEC. Most of them used an existing software and they customized it, or they did a lot of inhouse development, especially those who deployed DNSSEC before 2008, had to spend a lot of time and a lot of resources and effort into developing inhouse solutions for deploying DNSSEC.

But on the other side, those who deployed DNSSEC later, they used the existing open source software and they just customized it, but this customization was, in most of the cases, their main expenditure in deploying DNSSEC. As I said in the previous slide, that was 90% of their cost. A lot of people are using open source software, which means that this software is also returned back to the community and everybody can use it. 83% of the correspondents are using open source software.

Regarding the future cost on DNSSEC software, it is obvious that those who are the pioneers are investing a lot in the development while the others can leverage a lot and use the software. Another important issue that we studied through this exercise is the key management which directly relates to governance issues and operational procedures. Key management is mainly a concern for registry centers and zone operators. Most of them are looking into methods for making key management processes, but it is surprising to see that the adoption of hardware security modules, HSMS is very limited in the DNSSEC community. Registries show an increased awareness of the importance of using HSMS and they have concrete plans on using them in the future. On the other side, organizations without a registry role tend to be less concerned about HSMS and then tend to not plan to use them. The obstacles that correspondents saw in using HSMS, the push part of the HSMS with the open source software, and some of them responded about the cost of having those devices.

The size of the organization is not an influencing factor regarding the use of HSM, and the cost of HSM was recorded to be something from 500 EU, up to 25,000 EU, which are advance devices with accelerating capabilities. Through the interviews with the various stakeholders we inquired about other cost such as training and legal support. Most of the stakeholders indicated that they had a cost related to training, however there was no indication given to the cost because that cost was integrated into the budget, the general budget they used for training in their companies.

With regards to legal support, only two of the interviewed organizations, which were both registries, indicated that they requested external legal assistance from the DNSSEC implementation. They actually required legal expertise on the legal value of assigned DNS record and possible implications. Again, none of those figures have been revealed to us. I'm moving on, on the operational expenses. Almost all of the participating organizations did not provide sufficient insights on the operational costs of DNSSEC operation, which points to an operational reality where the operational overhead of DNSSEC is mostly integrated into existing operational cost.

The only potential cost that was reported was the cost of increased bandwidth. Again the numbers were not – the numbers of the increase that were reported were not enough to get an average, because we have

somebody reporting they see a 15% increase on the bandwidth, while others see 100% increase. There were a few other sets there. What is also seen from the communities is that cost evolution is, that the cost will decrease over time, and they don't see additional cost after they have deployed DNSSEC which means the cost for supporting a new send root, or other features like (inaudible 3:27:11) .

As I told you, as a side effect of this study, we had some results regarding the (inaudible 3:27:26) of DNSSEC, and while still the DNSSEC enabled the zones, the percentage of them is very small. We can see that the infrastructure is ready, or almost ready to support DNSSEC. We see that from the queries received from the responders to the study that 33% of the queries are having the dob set, which means that they can potentially support DNSSEC. And we also see a trend to see more of such requests in domains that were assigned a long time ago, more than five years.

Another interesting thing is the specialization of DNSSEC, so we observed that pure play zone operators that host less than 600 zones had managed to have at least 20% of these zones signed with DNSSEC. This might be an indication that these zone operators are recognized as specialists in DNSSEC, and that they have succeeded (inaudible 3:28:52) and convinced the domain owners to enable DNSSEC. This is an interesting business story. Also we measured the business benefit and motivation of different controls into deploying DNSSEC. For example, registries like your organizations want to become a reliable transfer core, while zone operators and registers want to create a differentiator in their service, and in the future they want to make a profit out of it.

While the recovery cost of operators, the ISPs wan to assure the end users of the DNS reliability and trustworthiness. That was my presentation, I just want to mention that we also issued a good practice guide for deploying DNSSEC, I think we don't have time to go into those slides, I just want to give you the references and the pointers for all those documents. I want to once again thank Center&DNS expert group that ENISA has assembled for their help into this study for finding contacts and convincing and forming the questionnaire for the study. Thank you.

Henry Chan:

Thank you very much indeed. Are there any questions about the study?
Martin-

Martin Boyle: Martin Boyle from Nominet.uk – I was quite interested by your cost breakdown between the very expensive and the very cheap and I actually wondered whether you had tried to remove from that the development costs that some of the early adopters had put in as I suppose their contribution to the community. And if you did that, did you end up with something that was very much more a similar cost per investment, and then my second question is really building on your comment about your work with Sensor, can you tell us something, a little bit about what sparked you to do this study? Was it originally a demand from Center, a request from Center, in other words, was it from the community or was it just something you thought was a good idea at the time?

Panagiotis Saragiotis: Okay, first of all I would like to reply about the cost breakdown. actually the– From the participating organizations that had the most cost in investing into DNSSEC, it was .sc, I don't know if somebody is here from them, so they actually were a very cautious in providing answers to our questions, and they decided to only include the cost they had lately into developing their software, their tools, for DNSSEC. They didn't include their total investment from 5 to 6 years ago, they had to put in to deploy DNSSEC. That means that the data are almost inaccurate in that respect.

We don't have a very extreme case into our data. You want to add something? Okay. Regarding the Center's involvement into the study, the Center actually found the idea very interesting, and they were involved from the beginning, Peter Van Ross helped us a lot into forming the questionnaire and involving stakeholders into that study. The study has been performed after a suggestion from the DNS experts group of ENISA, which are stakeholders from the community, it was not ENISA's idea to do the study.

Henry Chan: Okay, thank you. I don't think we can take other questions because we are running out of time, so we need to speed on a little bit, so thank you very much for the presentation, and the next one is Louis Espinosa from .cr registry.

Luis Espinosa: Hi. Luis Espinosa from Costa Rica, the .cr registry. This is a different point of view of the cost of implementation of DNSSEC, and this is based on our planning, not based on our experience. We look forward to the real cost of deploying DNSSEC. I have an intimation and a little information about why we need to find the real cost. About the process, about what for us what is the evident cost, and also the evident cost, some conclusions. In

the sight of the (inaudible 3:35:18) the implementation of DNSSEC is very simple, because it's one validation more and it's automatically. From the point of view of the process of the registry, when the system is already set up to create registries, to modify registries, it appears the process of signature, digital signature - this is not new on DNSSEC, this is a technology that we were already using in many applications.

So this new thing provides a new – a huge amount of new procedures. It's a different kind of technology that we need to manage. What is our concerns, in this case, for a small ccTLD? If I have DNSSEC, this involves DNS plus the digital signature. DNS by definition is a public service on behalf of internet, and when you mix digital signature for a public service, you must provide a trust certify. The trust certify involves following of security standards, and following the security standards, in the experience of the certified case authority involves high cost in process. This is our perspective of this.

Some of the processing involved in DNSSEC is keeping the chain of trust intact. This is very important for us. The key generation and storage, this technology, signature generation and storage, key removal is mainly process, and the policies, is mainly process. Then what are the evident costs for us? This is related directly to the size or amount of transactions. The bandwidth increased three or four times, it doesn't matter, the CPU of service may be increased up to 50% according to some studies I reviewed. The memory of service might increase up to four times the memory consumed, for the key generation hardware, we can go from the simplest smartcard to the most sophisticated HSM, and some software changes. About the bandwidth, I think it's low impact.

I know many of you may disagree with this, but the cost of bandwidth decrease constantly, the concern of searching for bandwidth in DNS is very low compared with other internet products. The CPU and memory of the server I think is low impact because typically the DNS servers are oversized. With DNSSEC accessing the servers, we will start to use the CPU, because before DNSSEC they don't use the CPU, in the results.

The key generation is predictable; we can go from a simple smartcard with cost less than \$100, or use a HSM from \$800 to \$25,000. In both cases, the goal is the same. It's protect the generation of keys. The software change I think is predictable because it's just one field. This is thinking about the software to manage the client, or the registration process. What

is not so evident cost for us, the IT staff time for research, set up and operations. This sometime is difficult to measure. Hardware and so for maintenance, well maybe this point can move it to an evident cost, but we need to think about because the change involves maintenance too. Changing and increasing operation of procedures, sometime maybe underestimate these costs, but the key generation and restore, the signing process, the key ceremony, etc., is huge amounts of new procedures, in this new implementation.

The definition of new policies, we need the help of lawyers here and involves high cost. Elective time is suspected, is higher. This new operations, generation of keys, signature of keys, (inaudible 3:40:48) upload the DNS, implementation of process, needs many hours of expensive research. The hardware and software life cycle maintenance, there's a number there 20% of analog of initial cost, but that may be not so high. The operation of procedures we think is very high, because I compared these with certificate authority where the more than 50% of the cost are procedures. I hear sometime is 80% of the cost are procedures.

This standardization involves the documentation of process, procedures, sorry. You must follow the procedures according to the recommendations, this is the cycle of the authorization. Security trust required to commend and maintain a process. The key ceremony is a new process, is only to provide trust because it is necessary, completely necessary, but is good to provide trust. I mention is what for the root service, but the last meeting in Brussel I realize net br is doing the key ceremony too.

And the key ceremony is not mentioned on the RFT 45 41, but it exist as a concept from certification authorities. The creation of new policies have a high cost because of imply lawyers, involves lawyers, and there is a high responsibility for the registry because the signature involves and the registry above the role of military public or public service and must certify that the signature is good. Some of my conclusions is the real cost of implementing DNSSEC right now for us is undeterminable , or hard to estimate for a small ccTLD. It's higher, too much higher than only acquired technology. It's not only acquired a smartcard or HSM, it's more than that.

The main cost is related with the new procedures to keep the chain of trust intact and less cost in technology. Obviously the benefit of implementing DNSSEC is evident and necessary and justify its cost, but if the chain is

broken at the weakest link, then we don't want to be the big spender, but we don't want to be the weakest link too. Then it's a good thing to do the necessary work, the necessary investment to provide the – a good trust in this change. I think at some time, at some place in the future, the process of signing (inaudible 3:44:31) for somebody to keep the links of chains strong, then it doesn't matter if it is a multi ccTLD or is a huge ccTLD, the process related with the signing and keep the chain of trust intact will be the same.

Henry Chan: Thank you very much, Luis. We have one more presentation. Chris is getting very nervous because he knows we are behind the schedule, and I'm asking myself who caused that actually? Who chaired the first session that made the problem?

Patrick Sherry: Who sets the program for the (inaudible 3:45:18). Five minutes for Hiro.

Henry Chan: Hiro, please go. We could take some questions maybe afterward. Are there any questions, just quick one, to Louis? Apparently not. So thank you very much, Louis. And the last presentation is from Hiro Hotta.

Hiro Hotta: Okay, since we have Adrian, our lunch sponsor is here, I have to be quick and quit before he changes his mind. So it's coming? I hope it's coming. Okay, in summary– [Laughter] Alright. I have to be in five minutes speech. So as you know, the registry itself cannot make domain names available using the DNS servers and also that it needs servers for use for all the internet users. Then I think I have to do this – I have to skip this – so to make the cooperation better between the players such as ISPs and registrars, we do information sharing or provision regarding in Japanese because there are a lot of documents in English that, to share such information in the local community we have to translate it. So it's a lot of work to be done for the translation. Website, announcement, and meetings and so on, our efforts are against abuse.

So we strengthen the authentication for the registrars, to communicate with us, and the pruning and appropriate manage domain names in cooperation with the registrars, and some analysis for cases which happen. For example, the phishing and so on, and education, of course. Cooperation in DNSSEC, so on top of the DNS operation, we do some work on the DNS, the authority server side, and resolution side. So the players are the same for the pure DNS, so we have to have cooperation among the players. To cope with this hard to understand DNSSEC

operation among the players, we do kind of very careful steps to introduce and then to educate the players gradually, so we have designed six steps to go through this test and before the deployment of a DNSSEC.

It lasts about one year, so it's a small picture step one, just test your rs, our level test, and for the DNS secondary operators, we do tests and then ISPs joins us for their resolvers to check if the name servers works well for DNSSEC, and then with a harder vendor, many routers, and then we test with all resource whether they can register the ds records and so on, to our registry database and finally we do the whole kinds of unified tests with the activity of so-called DNSSEC Japan, which is a community initiative in Japan, and with some abroad companies, such as New Star.

So this is a community initiative, not ours. And what is DNSSEC Japan, I have four more slides, or five more slides – it's a forum for domain name registries, registrars, and so on, with aim of introducing and deploying DNSSEC that has the security of the DNS. The chair is from IX and one of the vice chair is from our company, and we are the Secretariat. So Secretariat does the announcement and the website hosting and so on. And participation principle research set to carry out activities based on mutual cooperation by participants. Objective – I skip this.

Activities, to sort out nic issues regarding the adoption of the operation of DNSSEC. To conduct technical verifications and accumulate expert advice for introduction of DNSSEC, and to develop bdb and to deploy DNSSEC through preparing results of its activities. The schedule is the test will conclude next year, but as a registry we will start our service at the end of this year or at the first of next year.

The current activities – I will skip this. And in summary, this needs community cooperation and to make the collaboration better we do information sharing, and of course Secretariat DNS results in usual DNS operation, and secretariat of DNS Japan which prepares for the coming DNSSEC era, and so on. And DNS needs sophisticated cooperation within the community, and to accomplish cooperation among players we – our initiative and community initiative are both needed in harmony to lead the DNSSEC to operation, and to raise knowledge literacy of DNSSEC. To observe much operation of DNSSEC, the DNSSEC environment before remains to be seen. Okay, that's it.

- Henry Chan: Thank you very much, Hiro. That's a perfect example how to promote and deploy DNSSEC within a country. Is there any question that can be answered in twenty seconds, please? If not, please contact Hiro and all the speakers offline. Thank you very much the DNSSEC workshop is over.
- Chris Disspain: Okay, it pay time again. Pay time. So the registry has brought us lunch and wants to talk. So we're going to do that. Jon, you're doing the presentation? Jon is going to do the presentation, which I'm reliably informed will take ten minutes. Lunch is in the same place upstairs where we had it yesterday, which is easier to get to from here, because this is on the same time of time zone continuum, unlike the room – nice rescue there, Martin. Is everyone okay? – unlike the room from yesterday, so that's up two stories from here to number 5. I'm going to call it that we're going to start at 10 past 2, not 2 o'clock, to give everybody a bit more time, but we are going to start at 10 past 2, so everybody please be here. Are you ready yet? Have I extemporized enough, or? Nothing so far. Ladies and gentlemen, let me pass you over to Jon Lawrence from OZ registry, he's going to take us through the presentation. Thank you.
- Jon Lawrence: Thank you Chris, and thank you everybody for the opportunity to speak today. Firstly I know an issue everyone is very excited about is the yellow t-shirt seen here, I have to unfortunately announce that we are now sold out completely. We are getting a new batch in tomorrow and they are already oversubscribed, so if you have not yet ordered a t-shirt, I'm sorry we're going to have to disappoint you. If you have ordered a t-shirt or if you have already received a t-shirt, please wear it along to the public forum tomorrow. We'd love to see a sea of yellow there and we have some –
- Chris Disspain: I'd just like to announce that I'm setting up a secondary market in yellow t-shirts – so if you want to sell your yellow t-shirt, come and see me.
- Jon Lawrence: Thank you, Chris. So I'm going to do a very short presentation just about the IDN world, IDN ccTLD world we've been doing a lot of work in lately and some of the issues we think we need to work on as we move forward. So where to now? Okay. So as I think everyone would be aware, there are now already four IND ccTLDs delegated into the root, so we have .emirate from the United Arab Emirates, .masa from Egypt, .alsaudi from Saudi Arabia, and .rf from the Russian Federation.

As Jon mentioned earlier we have I believe three more, two more that have now been added to the string evaluation completion phase which is Singapore in both Chinese and Tamil if my memory serves, and also another Arabic one for Syria. So it's all happening and it's an exciting time to be involved in this phase, I think, certainly from our perspective. I believe there are something like 31 applications currently processing with IONA which is a pretty significant expansion of the root. But of course, putting IDN ccTLDs in the root is one thing, actually getting them to work and get used, to use them and so forth, is a whole other question, and there's still a lot of work that we need to do to ensure that these are actually successful top level domains.

There's a lot of questions that we need to answer, many of them remain unanswered, and I'm not necessarily going to have the answers for you today, by any means, but we need to wonder what's required to make these from the great opportunity they are into viable and sustainable products for the long term. Build up a market around them. We need to think about product demands, whose going to be the early adopters, and the brand advocates, and the anchor tenants and leading marketing components in that sense. How we're going to position IDNS, is it going to be a premium price, or we going to have a volume approach? Will the marketing message come through? Is it a message about uniting and enabling language communities, or is it – how are registrants and end users more generally going to react and adjust to using IDN ccTLDs, away from the ASCII world?

We hope it will be positive, but there may be challenges there. To what extent do registries and registrars particularly need to invest in marketing and education? Because there is I think, a big education requirement there to ensure this is successful. I guess one of the real big questions that we're interested in is how IDN ccTLDs will affect the search market, and how will Google particularly react? There are also as I think everyone is aware, still a number of challenges at the end user level in terms of applications; some work, some don't. So we need to understand how we can ensure, for example, that application developers are taking a uniform approach to the implementation of IDNA's so that end users get a uniform experience that they can understand, and I think that's one of the really big challenges that we have to deal with.

Clearly, opening up the domain space to other language communities other than the Latin alphabet gives us opportunities to increase internet

penetration. It's going to be interesting to see how significant that penetration becomes, as a result of this. Will governments get onboard and support this as a key part of bridging the digital divide, and that approach. And will we see online businesses come on board and start using IDNS as part of their core strategies as well? Registrars clearly, core model for those registries that have a core model, and it's going to be interesting to see how they review IDNS; will they see it as a viable business opportunity, and get behind it and promote it? Are they going to adopt a volume pricing strategy or market place as a premium offering? And to what extent are they going to be involved in the education marketing out to the registrant base and to the end user base?

We believe there is a really big marketing opportunity here with IDN ccTLDs and we think they're going to take off. It may not happen immediately, but we're pretty excited to be involved in this. We need to see, I think one of the big questions is, how will some of the major brands in the world react to the IDN ccTLD implementation? Are they going to adopt it as part of their core marketing strategy in the particular markets in which these language groups are associated? How will they drive end user utilization, and as I said, what is the real impact of these on the search market industry? That's going to be a real interesting question to see the answer to.

So there's a number of questions, not too many answers, but we're very excited to be involved in the IDN ccTLD project. We're working very closely with our clients on working through and trying to find that answers to many of these questions, and we look forward to the opportunity of working with many more of you to help you also work through these questions and find answers that make sense in your countries and in your environments.

Is that guy injecting himself with something, or- He picked that one. Rolling up his sleeves. Well, just very quickly, a little bit of an update on what we've been up to. As many of you might be aware, we are supporting the implementation of the .emirate Arabic Script IDN for the UAE with Mohammed Al Durine and the gentleman over there, we're also in the process of building a new registry system for Qatar, and for .qa and the .qatar Arabic Script IDN; and also excited to note that we've recently started a project with Vica and the team in South Africa to help build and define some specifications for a new central registry for .za ccTLD, which we think is going to play an important role in encouraging the

development of the domain space, particularly in South Africa. So we're pretty excited about that.

Last slide, and then we can go to lunch. Just a little bit of new branding we've come up with. We have various products built into our domain name registry service, so we have what we're calling unity technology which is the fully IDNa 2008 compliant component of registry system. We have domain guiding technology which is a proprietary configuration and security setting, and DNSnow which is our real time DNS updating system. As some of you may be aware, we also do significant amounts of consulting with various clients. We had a three phase proprietary consulting methodology that we've developed over a number of years, and we find this is a very useful way of helping projects get off the ground and get strategic objectives set correctly and move forward. So as I mentioned, our current clients; the .ada, the UAE, .za in South Africa, ICT Qatar in Qatar, and of course (inaudible 4:04:47). And that's all I've got. Thank you very much, I hope you enjoy the lunch.

Chris Disspain: Thanks Jon, thanks OZ Registry. It's nice to see that ada gets a mention, if only very briefly. So Gabby, is this the best way to go through – both ways. And Gabby has tickets and once again there are only a certain number of tickets, and Christina has tickets. I'm sorry. What are we calling you now? Gabina. It's a combination of Gabby and Christina, so it's Gabina we think. See you at 10 past 2, please do not be late.

[Break for lunch]

Byron Holland: Good afternoon everybody, thanks for joining us for the strategic and operating planning committee workshop and forum, panel forum. I know it's just post lunch so we're going to keep it entertaining I'm sure and I've organized that as a result of this selected panel. I've mixed up the agenda a little bit because we do have sort of some SOP business to take care of which initially in the agenda, for those of you who I'm sure downloaded the presentation early, would know. We're going to do that first I'm going to flip that around so we'll go with the panel first and then release those of the panelists who are not CC members for the back part while we do the SOP business.

Anyway I want to introduce the panel, we have some folks who are not from the CC community who you may not recognize: [[Alexa] Rad] who is the CEO of .org, and Rob Hall, who is a registrar with a momentous

group of companies and just for full disclosure Rob is known to me because he is one of Canada's largest registrars, so needless to say I know Rob a little bit. Rob has also been to thirty-five, thirty-six? Thirty-four ICANN meetings, so he also has a sense of history and perspective that I thought would be interesting to bring to the table. And then we have a few usual suspects who you might recognize, with Lesley from .uk, Sabine from .de, and Fahd from .jo.

So I thought I would mix it up with some folks from the CC community, but also bring an outside perspective in terms of, you know thinking around strategic issues and some of the big picture issues going forward, both for our community from the inside and outside perspective, as well as the broader set of issues effecting ICANN. So the goal today is to for the first part of it, have a discussion with the panelists around four broad questions and then start to put it to the floor. I think the interesting thing we're going to do here is some real time voting. So ideally, what's going to happen is we're going to get you logged; everybody has a computer? logged into a survey tool and then as questions and issues come up we're going to put the question up and you'll actually be able to vote real time to give us some direction or sense of what the group here thinks.

So I believe it's the first time we've tried this methodology with the CCNSO so first time hopefully the logistics all work. I'm sure it's going to go well but we thought it would be a really great way to immediately get a feel for the room on any particular issue. So with that, these were the four high level questions that we put to the panelists, and also that we put out in a presentation earlier; and just to quickly read them, what will the most important drivers of change in the DNS and internet generally be over the next five years? This is a question you might recall from the last time we did this. We want to again take the temperature on what those issues will be. What are the most important political factors that will affect the CCNSO activity over the next five years? I think that's particularly interesting, given some of the activity we've seen in the last day or so coming out of the GAC.

What are the most important things for the CCNSO to be working on in the next three years and what should ICANN as an organization be working on? And we no doubt will have some different views on what that should be. So those are the high-level questions that we want to ask and we're going to begin with the panelist speaking to those questions, and like I said in the back half we'll turn it over to the floor and Patrick

Sherry, who I think everybody probably knows is going to be moderating this session. So I strongly encourage you as I always do, please participate, please make your voice heard, and we look forward to hearing everybody's opinion on where ICANN and the CCNSO should be headed.

[Indistinct conversation with someone without a mic.]

Byron Holland: Sure, that's a good point so of course with the SOP group we're focused on responding to and thinking about ICANN's strategic plan, and ICANN's operating plan/budget, and in that cycle, as I think most people here would know, we produce a document that speaks to the main issues. As we come around the horn right now on the operating plan and budget, that's kind of behind us and we're trying to get out ahead of next year's strategic plan, and that's where this session is coming from. To start to take the feedback from the community and that helps inform the SOP, do its work in terms of collecting what is most important to the community, and doing some work on behalf of the community and feed it back out to help make it easier for you guys to then do your own admissions and respond. That would be the high-level context and at this point I'm going to turn it over to Patrick and I'm going to sit down and be a participant.

Patrick Sherry: Thanks, Byron. Okay so we'll start by getting some views from the people at our top panel table here, and we might disperse that with some other comments on the way through. I thought I'd start, Rob given that this is meeting number thirty-four; you're a man who's seen a lot of change in DNS and the ICANN world and all that's associated with that. What do you see as the big changes that are likely to happen over the next five years?

Rob Hall: Let me start by saying it's good to be back. So most people may not know, I was one of the founders of the initial ccTLD group, in that I was the chair of CYRA, the .ca at the time it was incorporated back in 1999 so I attended these meetings as a registrar, but also as the .ca presenter back in the old days so it's good to be back in front of some old friends I see. The biggest change you're going to see in the internet generally is, I believe, the increase and the rapid increase of growth in what we'll call non-English or non-traditional spaces on the internet; so the Internet is very English dominated, very US dominated, and we're certainly seeing China coming on 11 percent online now, as that number moves to 50 percent the actual physical population numbers we are talking about here are huge.

With ccTLD IDNS, I guess and with IDNS in the new gTLD process, you're going to see a change I believe in what type of people use the internet and certainly in the number of people who use the internet, and their voices are going to want to be heard. So in ccTLDs you kind of lead that front. I think the most important thing in regards to ccTLDs you're going to see in the next five years are the introduction of new gTLDs. I think the most important thing for all of you, is you're going to go from being the dominate one in your countries, ane one of a handful of TLDs, trying to stay relevant. I know that may be upsetting for some of you, but you're going to have to find a way to stay relevant in the face of potentially hundreds of competitors.

We're – there are ccTLDs as non profits, you're going to have to start to compete for your business, certainly within your own countries, but also imagine an Arabic county who speaks Arabic predominantly, that has a ccTLD that has been predominantly been English, now finally has a ccTLD that is Arabic and thirty or forty gTLDs that are also in Arabic. How do they differentiate themselves ,and more importantly, you should be starting the debate if you already aren't, because the other registries certainly are; how do you get shelf space on a registrar?

How do you get a registrar and what are you willing to pay for that? Because I can tell you as a registrar we certainly have registries coming to us saying we want to be number one in your search criteria or we will pay money to sell our domains, and I've never seen a ccTLD do that to this date but the gTLDs certainly are, and are certainly thinking that way and the larger registrars are going that way. So I think the change in demographic online to those who are not predominantly English, and I think the change the flood of new competitors for you are the two biggest hurdles to overcome in the next five years.

Patrick Sherry: That's great, thanks Rob. Now thankfully, on the way through this Sabine was going no. So Sabine, why are you going no?

Sabine Dolderer: I actually I don't say no, I think they are very confident to stay relevant or to be able to stay relevant even if they, I'm confident ccTLDs maintain being relevant for their expertise areas, even if there will be thousands and ten thousands more gTLDs. Actually I think they will stay even more relevant than they are today, because they are safe harbors. We might disagree on that, because they are the one people know, so I think from my

perspective I think it's very good for our business because people will come to me again.

Patrick Sherry: Now Sabine, you can't make a brave statement like that and not tell us why. So why do you think it's actually good for your business? That it won't actually be a threat that people will want to continue to come to you?

Sabine Dolderer: I think because they have a certain confidence about the websites that will find below .eu; about the persons behind the shops, they have a certain confidence about that's what they know. So I think there's a lot of, it has a lot to do with commodity and that's what you're used to. So I think that's why I'm nodding my head, I think it's my it could be actually the other way around.

Patrick Sherry: Okay, that's interesting. Lesley from the .uk perspective?

Lesley Cowley: A couple of things. I mean I can identify with commoditization, because I've heard like Rob was just saying, the idea of paying for shelf space which to me feels a bit like sliced bread in your local super market, you know the one that sells the most is the one that's right in front of your eyes. Equally, I think for ccns there's an element about that, if you want to play that game; and I think those ccns that could develop end user demands may be able to push back against the shelf space argument, because from my perspective the whole recognition of the cc and the trust of the cc within the community, is the key that helps with end user demands, and frankly my registrars will respond to end user demands.

Can I also push back on something that I think you were inferring? You mentioned nonprofit, and then kind of saying nonprofits entering into a competitive situation may be uncomfortable; nonprofit doesn't mean that we're not commercial, and doesn't mean that we're not business savvy, and I'd like to kind of push back against that assumption, I think there's a whole shuttle load of savvy ccns in this room and I would like that realization to be a bit wider.

Patrick Sherry: Hey Rob, having heard all that, does that spark any thoughts from you?

Rob Hall: It further entrenches me in my position. I didn't mean to imply that nonprofits couldn't be commercial; my experiences especially in the ccTLD world and relationship with registrars, they have tended to not be as aggressive shall we say as the other registries. There, the argument of

do you have a large market share now? Yes. Are you a commodity? If you think you're a commodity you're in real trouble; so part of Sabine's argument is "We're not a commodity, we're Germany; you've got to hang on to that." If you just become a commodity, the way you determine shelf space on a registrar in a commodity world is your say "Who's my biggest profit margin off of, and what domains are available?" and the one other thing that you don't necessarily have going for you, which is, what's the easiest for me to deal with down the road?

So I'll pick on poor Byron here and say 90% of our customers service is .ca related because of the policies and rules they have in place, 10% is .com related, but yet we have far more .com customers than .ca. So it's not just always about price and availability, it's also about hassle down the road when one of your customers wants to sell. I agree that if you can get to the point of consumers demanding it, registrars will start to sell it. But now you've limited yourself to the consumers with in your country, and the thing you've got to realize is as a registrar I'm going to sell what I can sell the easiest, for the most money, with the least hassle, and the least customer service, because to me it is a commodity.

So and the registrars are the ones the people go to and say; the existing customer base is one issue, the new customer base coming online goes to the registrar and says what should I have? I want this name. And what the registrars tells them back is available is by and large what they're taking. We know if we put .ca as the first offering and .com as a number two more people will take .ca than .com. If I make that .biz, all the sudden our .biz sales go through the roof; so it's very relevant how we portray it to the customer, because they're looking to us as the trusted party, saying what should I buy. This is what I want.

So these are the services I want, hosting email, tell me what domain I should buy. So where the customers get their information is by and large at the registrars. Within a country, I would agree .ca is certainly more prevalent in Canada then .de, so I'd have a hard time convincing a Canadian they should buy .de, unless they're doing business there. But if I'm a pizza company, and I can get Joes.pizza I'm probably going to take that because it sounds cool to me over joes.ca or even Joes.com. And .com is a bit of a different animal out there, but ccs aren't.

Patrick Sherry: Sabine, that obviously sparked a strong response there. Let's hear that quickly, and then we'll go on to our other panelists.

Sabine Dolderer: Actually, I think I have to respond. I think you're seeing it very much from a global registrar perspective. That it is, and of course I understand that perspective, I have also global acting registrars in my - booking with us, but they are only a minority. Only ten percent of our members are global acting registrars and the other German based companies, selling basically German based TLDs. Of course, we are the country code for Germany; we're not outreaching and saying we want to be one - we really want to sell our domain Delaware, and go to global organized registrars and say "Hey, we have this great domain, please give it to Delaware and sell them." So it's very much about a service for our community. It's a service for the community, it's a service for registrars for the community, and of course we deal with global registrars, and I know that within the rating for global acting registrars we rank quite well with regard to our policies and procedures and our interface; and I know that a lot of German registrars actually are success in global market because they come from a competitive environment and they deal with this.

Patrick Sherry: Now Fahd, do you sell commodities?

Fahd Batayneh: Not really, but I would like to emphasis a little on one of the drivers I believe would be pushing the internet forward for the next five years, and that is international domain names. Many communities worldwide have requested international domain names to increase internet penetration in their countries but then there are issues that have not been resolved yet, mainly security issues, and I think these kind of security issues could at times reduce customer trust, in that okay, I have an international domain name and there are official issues, there are security issues so I mean, it's - in my case international domain names would have pros and cons.

Patrick Sherry: Tell us a little bit about both sides of that argument.

Fahd Batayneh: Okay, so the pros are that it could increase internet penetration in many countries worldwide. The cons are that there are security breaches regarding for example, various communities have various script tables, and in some scripts there are characters of the diacritics that are prohibited to be used for registration.

Patrick Sherry: Okay. [Alexa] is the other non cc manager here. What did you make of all that debate?

[Alexa]:

Well one of the things that always, I just saw the questions now. As I was listening to the debate one of the things I think that we as an industry ought to be doing, is when we're talking about drivers of change and the internet, we have to take of the industry filter. In other words, a lot of the debate I hear is we think in terms of products that we already have. IDNS, domain names, etc. Yes, I think the growth of internet users overseas is a driver, I'm not sure that internationalized domains area a driver because that's a means of something. The need of people is always eternal; in other words, people have always needed to communicate, to have an identity, to be able to congregate. The means with which they have done it has changed throughout the centuries.

So if we keep the industry filter, I'm afraid that we are in that horse and buggy industry and we simply think a different horse and buggy with four doors instead of two doors is going to solve the problem. You're not going to be able to swim up against consumer behavior. The trends that I see, are those that are troubling a little bit for us. Number one, as identifiers go, people are not entirely relying on URLs. Think about how many time you're seeing face book, Twitter logos on advertisements. This to me, is akin to - it's an identifier it's a way to get you to information it's a navigation, exactly what URL's are.

So URLs ultimately are IP addresses, it was just a user interface if you will, and an easy user interface to an IP address. Are there other easy casings for the IP address? I think DNS is going to grow because there is going to be a lot of applications that are going to continue to rely on DNS. I think the struggle between scalability and security is going to continue. I think it begs the question, security verses privacy, however; I think the old context for which we've been thinking about security is out dated. In other words, we think it's a zero sum game. The more security you have, the more privacy you ought to give up. I disagree with that because I think that discounts innovation. If you are able to have more innovative ways of approaching security, you are able to also provide more assurances in terms of privacy, individual privacy.

So just to kind of summarize; I believe international users are a significant driver. I think additional applications coming on and really relying on the DNS or additional drivers, I think a worrying trend is we are going to be commoditized because users have alternative ways for navigation and identity, not just domain names, and it is not for us to determine if we are

a commodity or not it is for the user. The only defense you have which is a short term defense is to brand yourself and to provide differentiation.

Patrick Sherry: Terrific, thanks [Alexa]. Lesley?

Lesley Cowley: I just want to make an observation in terms of linking that to the important things for the CCNSO to be working on, and I think that is a very helpful contribution in terms of taking your eyes up a level. And some of the discussions we've been having recently, name drop, with Tim Berners-Lee, have been about things like the semantic web. And actually one of the useful things we could as a ccNSO is share some of that insight and information more readily with other ccs because I think there's a whole load of interesting developments there that we could usefully share with others, just to get a better insight at that higher level, and we don't currently use the cc, and so really as an opportunity to do that we have the tech date, technical developments but were not kind of looking strategically maybe as far as we should be. An observation.

Patrick Sherry: For those of us who don't get to have coffee with Tim, exactly what were you talking about when you were talking semantic web?

Lesley Cowley: He was talking about a lot of the work he was doing with both MIT and the University of South Hampton on opening up data, opening up government data particularly in the UK. And some extremely interesting to techies engineering around semantic web and how he sees that developing. I just think some of that much, much more strategic and innovative thinking tends not to be on our radar screen very often, because we're very focused on our area.

Patrick Sherry: Now that's good and one of those great things about having those different perspectives on the table. Rob, if the identifier is - if not dead but declining, what does that do for your business and your future and that does make you think about.

Rob Hall: It's a great question. I agree completely with [Alexa]; it is disturbing in the long term to see. The big winner in all of this, certainly with new gTLDs, if there 500 or 1000 of them, are the search engines. They become much more relevant. People right now and there's a whole community out there who makes a lot of money off of mistypes, because they type into the address bar this is what I want. Chrome, with Google's browser, changed how people think of that. If IE goes that same model we will all

lose relevance of typing in the URL because it becomes a search engine; so [Alexa] is quite right in that if the larger companies can figure out how to start to brand and get into third party companies advertising. Twitter and face book has been very successful at it and I have to congratulate [Alexa] on that because her company is all about branding, and trying to say we're .org and we're different from everybody else and I think she is exactly right county code should start looking at that and how do we brand that way? I'm sorry I'm not really answering your question am I?

Patrick Sherry: I was wondering what. You're obviously thinking about that and not just identifying as an issue, but thinking about what the future might look like.

Rob Hall: Yes, absolutely. So if you think about the future of ten thousand gTLDs; lets say they get down to a price point of thirty, forty thousand dollars and I get into the vanity area. I want .rob I want .hall; it's simply my identifier, and like I was saying earlier we always focus on the web, but email's a huge driver online. If I can have rob@hall as an email which works by the RFCs but doesn't work in the Microsoft exchange of limitation, so it won't come in the next round, but if they go back to the RFC if I can get something relevant to me for a low price I'll do it. So if you get ten thousand domains or twenty thousand domains, the consumer mind set changes, so there's been this big battle between VeriSign and I for the last three years running debate of do new gTLDs make .com better and more relevant or less? Well I'm on the less side.

Right now with info in .aero and .museum, and. coop, I can't tell you how many of my friends say "Well, what the hell is that? I never heard of that. Is that really a domain? Does that really work as an address?" So the consumer is still very much focused on ccs and .com. They know their cc and they know .com, they know .net and .org. As soon as you get ten thousand of these things, the consumer mind set changes to, oh my it's not only about .com, it's about a lot of anything and I don't know what it is, I better search for it. So I think search becomes much more relevant in the future and I think ways of driving people, what worries me is not so much the Facebooks and the Twitters. They could all go bankrupt in three years for all we know.

What worries me is what's the next revolution of domain names that we don't yet, as an identifier for a person. If there's an .eBay, then they go out and say "All of our customers now must have an .eBay address. So you're shoes.eBay or momentum.ebay under one TLD. So we can see that

behavior as well, where a large market segments under a new TLD as stores or as web sites.

But what's next after that we don't know, and I don't want to be, I don't typically deal with being afraid of the unknown and I don't want to, there's now boogey man out there. But we're rapidly progressing, and this little device called the iPad, I tell people it's changed my life in the last month and a half and they look at me like I'm crazy. But, how I do business on-line and how I interact with the internet is known mostly through this, and it's a different philosophy and a different theory of how we do it then lap tops and desk tops, and always being connected and pulling it out.

I was joking with [Alexa], I needed lunch quickly and I pulled it out and I had an app. for where's the nearest McDonald's to where I am now? and it gives you a route to it. It just changes the way people interact and communicate with each other. So its technology like this that didn't exist a year ago that changes how people interact. That will change our space, and it's going to continue to evolve and we need to be reactive to that and continue to maintain not only relevance of country codes, but domain names as a whole. Because just as [Alexa] said they're just an identifier, if there are other identifiers people would rather use, we're in trouble.

Patrick Sherry: Thanks, Rob. Excellent. [Alexa]?

[Alexa]: Thank you. Rob I agree with you. I think profusion of gTLDs, it is ultimately going to confuse the customer, right now they're going more and more towards search than through direct navigation and implementations like chrome and so forth, are only going to accelerate that. Not only that guys, the fact is with all these new TLDs where's the incentive for the application providers and the spam filter. Guys, to actually incorporate that, there is no financial incentive. So you've got something where email may not work because it's going to get caught, it's not going to get recognized.

Forms are not going to recognize a particular TLD, so there are investments that are needed beyond what we typically think about. Again our industry filter is; let's think about summarize, let's think about IP and trademark. But we need to be thinking more about the consumer and not so focusing on - gazing at our own navels. The other thing is when we think about search, how many of you remember the Boolean search? They

are - and that's changed right? And now search has gone, if I take a poll on how many people have the iPhones. Raise your hand if you have an iPhone.

Okay, now the navigation is not making out because you're typing something. You're not bringing up a browser every small word, using the small keypad typing the URL. The way you're doing it is with navigations, and more than likely with applications that are sold by a third party, that do a very, very specific thing, for which you pay. So the whole concept of search is going to change and I'm willing to bet that, and by the way there is no URL anywhere in there that you see okay, so I'm willing to bet that this is going to change as well, because users want more convenience, they want more personalization but at the cost of security and privacy, and I'm willing to bet that there's going to be other ways.

We're so used to input methods like this where I've got to type. Technologies for voice recognition is already there, we're not using it yet right? And one other point, if you look across our industry in our own minds we're very important, we run the internet. But going to step back and really put yourself in perspective, look at where the innovation in RND is happening and how much we spend on RND versus other industries. History will tell you that those who A) only focus on their own circle and those who spend significantly less on RND than potential competitors, and I don't see gTLDs as a potential competitors, my potential competitors is what's going to happen that I don't know? That's the fear, right?

So are we spending enough on RND, and are we spending enough on RND not necessarily to make ourselves more comfortable, but to actually serve the internet user because I agree with Lesley. You've got to draw them in, long gone are the days where you're doing the hard sell to the customer. The customer has to see something in you and they're going to have to be brought in. So what are you doing to make that happen?

Patrick Sherry: Thanks [Alexa]. Sabine?

Sabine Dolderer: I tend to agree and to disagree. So I agree with the searches becoming more and more and more important. But when you boil it down and you have a search result and you click there, it's the DNS answering. Have you ever send an email to Google and hope it will arrive with nothing, it will never happen. You need unique identifiers, so if you look at the

applications on the iPhone and you click on it, you don't see a URL but it's there. But, I think we as registries are more and more, if you look at the registry perspective, it's more and more as I said, commodity. So it's something you need but will not be so the product. It will not be the product anymore.

And if you look at the DNS because we are talking about the DNS and not about domain registrations in our businesses. if you look at the DNS you will see that the traffic on the amount of (inaudible 0:34:13) are growing, and they are growing far more at times than your registrations, and the money you're covering. So I think that's an important change. And if you're taking about the internet in general, I don't have a technical background, I always like to talk a little bit about technical issues. I think ipv6 is also a big change. Who of you is running and who is server? And who of you have access limits to it? And which of them is the base on IP addresses? Have you ever thought about if someone has thousands of IP addresses and going to a root service, have you ever had to deal with it? I think that's an important and interesting question.

Patrick Sherry: That's exactly how they get our data. They use thousands of IP addresses. There's now a tool bar that plugs into anyone's computer—

Sabine Dolderer: But they use thousands of IP addresses, but when you're talking about ipv6, you're talking about one computer having hundreds of thousands of IP addresses, and you can't distinguish it any more. It will place a lot of interesting problems when ipv6 is coming. I'm very sure about that too. And I think when were taking about the DNSSEC, even if I completely believe them about that solution but I think we will see a lot of important and interesting issues about it. In the morning the talk of a DNSSEC session, which was in parallel with the ccNSO where Alex gave a very interesting presentation about issues which arises from that area and how they've made their analysis, and I think we will see a lot of effects and side effects in our area of operations which we currently can't imagine, for which we will have to deal with.

Again with growing query rates, reducing stable domain cross, and that will be a very interesting challenge at least, I would say.

Patrick Sherry: Good, thanks Sabine. I'm going to go to Lesley and then I'm going to ask if there are any questions out there because that's been a good lively debate. Lesley?

Lesley Cowley: I just like to make a couple of points. There's a very classic marketing article called *There Would Have Been a Mouse Trap*. And that's about somebody who really engineers a mouse trap and so it's better and better but forgets there's not so many mice perhaps. And I do think gTLDs and the focus on gTLDs and then the other strand, which would be search so suffixes won't be as important. Kind of tightening to build a better mouse trap territory, and I can't quite square how there's going to be a proliferation of new gTLDs without them all becoming mouse traps.

So I think for the first time ever there will be gTLDs that fail, and for me that takes us into a whole real big issue around consumer trust. And I think as an industry we have to recognize new g's in failure of registries will take us into to some real trust territory that we have not encountered before.

[Male Participant]: Can you define what you mean by fail?

Lesley Cowley: Financially, operationally, technically, go bust.

[Male Participant]: I don't disagree, so I... I do disagree, sorry. I think financially it's possible for registries to come up with a model that fails. I don't believe there will be one that starts that ever stops operating.

Lesley Cowley: I do, I do. I used to work in solvency; I can see all the signs.

[Male Participant]: But, ICANN is taking very careful steps and I know we, as one, have stood up and said to run a DNS server when you already run one for a TLD is not that hard. So for [Alexa] to go forward and say "Look, I'll take on .dog that failed and run it..." Sorry, maybe was a bad example. I meant it was a dog of a TLD and should have failed. But for me to take that on and make sure as a public service I keep it going, I may not take new registrations in it. Because it's better for the internet so these things don't fail and I know you may not want to do it.

But we've said publicly we'll do it, we'll do it for any registrar we often take registrars from ICANN were they've got a thousand domains and the registrars have failed. We don't make any money off of those; we lose a lot of money trying to figure out how to integrate those to our systems and everything else. But it's for consumer confidence that we say we'll do it. So do I think there's going to be business cases that are wrong? Yes. Do I

think consumers will one day wake up and their TLD doesn't work and never works again, I don't.

Lesley Cowley: When we're our sixtieth ICANN I'll take that back up with you.

Patrick Sherry: I'm just going to see if there are any questions out there because I think we've raised a whole lot of issues. Anyone got a question or a comment on anything that we've spoken about? You'll just have to be more provocative.

Nashua Abdel-Baki: I do fully agree with what you have said now because I personally do not think five years will be a long time, five years is not so long time. So with the DNS I cannot imagine that there will be a big change in the DNS itself. Whether it's a G to T or CC or whatever, but from the contents point of view, and that's the most important point in my opinion. Contents will not stay; will not wait for the top level domains. Today you find the contents you want to find through Google, whatever, you look for that and you find it, wherever you find the contents and the contents are the most important part. As long as we have IDNS I think the contents evolve very quickly, but TLDs not so big important. I'm sorry to say that, that's my opinion actually.

Patrick Sherry: Thanks, Nashua. Hilde, is it?

Hilde Thunem: Yes. I think you raised a lot of very, very interesting points as usually the future is a scary place. One of the trends I see coming out of the whole ICANN debacle, but other places as well, is this increased need, or at least increased perception of security because users are getting more and more used to the fact that the internet should work. They start planning their lives around the that – the way domains work or web works, they plan emergency – and I think there are governments that will do this as well.

They plan as part of their emergency routine, okay the parts down, the radio is down, but we can use the internet to get some information out there about what's happening, so I think that is going to drive costs for us, for all of us, which of course will have to be passed on to consumers, because we are not in the business of printing money. I think also it might eliminate a lot of the small various players that are here today, as we become more and more a commodity and there is more and more pressure put on that in order to actually run the registry you will have to do these things for security. The barriers against entry in the gTLD market as a

registry is fairly high, and you get to the point that there are only a few players that can actually be a registry and there are certainly only a few players that can be back and service providers, so you get a more limited market I think, and with less variety.

Patrick Sherry: Thanks, Hilde. Let's move on to that next question and talk a little bit about some of the political issues. You wouldn't have been my first pick, Rob. I might have thought it would be one of the cc. operators that would want to start, but you're very keen so –

Rob Hall: Let me try and bring the outsider point of view to that. So from a purely political point of view the factors that I see affecting all TLDs and certainly the cc's are right in that mix, are certainly the governments are starting to figure out the cross jurisdictional problems. We see law enforcement here at this meeting talking about what they want in WHOIS, and it doesn't just apply to what they want in ICANN's WHOIS, it's what they want in your WHOIS.

Verification of registrants – something that scares the crap out of registrars, quite frankly. Please, how do we verify registrants? And if we have to go to the level of every registrant must come to our office and give us ID that is government – what does that do to our business models? So that – as governments start to get more intelligent about not only country code domains, but also other domains and the issues between them, I'll bring up the issue of taxation.

You know, in Canada we recently went through this, and the provinces finally getting smart and saying wait, you're in Ontario, and you can't sell a domain to someone in Vancouver and not charge them the local British Columbia province tax, So state level governments are starting to get involved and say we want our piece of tax. On the ICANN level, if I burrow it down to the political factors you have problems with at the ICANN level, again, you're going to have a problem if there are 1000 tlds that they are dealing with, getting hurt. So you're a small group, you've typically kind of done the push and the shove with ICANN.

You don't regulate us, we're sovereign stay away, we don't want anything to do with you. Oh, we'll come to your meetings, we'll participate, we want our own SO. You know, so you've done the ying and the yang thing with them where you've been successful at keeping them at arm's length if you will, and yet still being involved with them. You're going to have to

work hard to make sure that stays that way and you keep them – I use the word relevance again, but you’re going to have to work hard to make sure you don’t get overrun by the noise coming from the other thousand registries about to be created, that all say we have the same problems, hear us, we’re paying you money, listen to us.

Because ICANN will tend to swing toward the path of least resistance, and I’ve seen it over that past eleven years, so I think that’s certainly, within the ICANN world, a problem you’re going to have. Especially as gTLDs look like ccTLDs. Especially as the daughter of a script one sounds and looks and acts to the consumer like a cc, but isn’t. So I think that’s something that you’re going to have to wrestle with.

Patrick Sherry: Sabine.

Sabine Dolderer: Yes. Actually I tried to answer the question and then I go back to something we discussed earlier and registry operators are asking the question. I think what for the most important political factor for ccTLDs; a lot of them are local. A lot of them are local dealing with our governments, dealing with our local situation. So I think, or in Europe dealing with things coming from the commission. So making educate people on the local level, policy makers on the local level, maintaining the infrastructure piece.

I think a lot of the political factors of ccTLDs will be local work, will be work on the European level. When you talk about the ICANN arena, I think it’s important that as long as it comes to political effect on the ccTLDs activities within ICANN, I would say it’s also not only the ccTLDs activities within ICANN, but also how ICANN is dealing with different diverse groups. So ICANN currently in its policy making processes mostly seen and when you look at the application guidebook or something which is just totally focused on the America high industry standard best informed technical community.

ICANN is not really good in addressing issues for the global community which is not how American highly technical, highly capable, whatever. But the internet is also run in India. It’s run in Russia. It’s run in Africa. Huge places in the world, and I think standards in that area don’t have to be exactly the same as they are in the US or in Europe. So dealing with the diversity, dealing with the divertive nature, and dealing with and setting standards – the liberty also that they are usable for those regions, for

people in those regions, might be a real big challenge for ICANN. Because if you currently read the ICANN guidebook and say oh I want to run a gTLD for my Indian Bangladesh speaking community, you will not be able to afford. You will not find a registry operator in that area.

So it's really a huge barrier to the global community to enter into it. So that I think. But I want to come back a little bit to – I still think, I don't take your point that registries aren't allowed to become involved, because why in the hell should we guarantee the service for everybody? I have here, you can go out there, it's from the dottyu, it's a page, and it shows very much about the accessibility of web page below our second level, and you will see that roughly 20% of all gTLDs websites on the second level are not reachable, so have failed. You will also see that ICANN actually finally shut down .su with 300,000 active domain holders. Why in the hell shouldn't new gTLDs coming in not fail. I still put the argument back. Businesses fail, why not in this area?

Patrick Sherry: We won't pick that argument up or we'll be here all afternoon. I would, you got some good responses or interesting waves of hands there, about the bigger political issues. [Alexa], and then I'll come to you Rob.

[Alexa]: I think one of the lessons that we've got to – again, let's look outside of our ICANN conference and ICANN arena – think back to last year, think back to when we were in Sydney, there were two major events that happened. The death of Michael Jackson, and the Iranian democracy movement. Now, admittedly for me, one was more important than the other, and it wasn't Michael Jackson. There were two things that happened, and it really didn't have to do with registries, because we really couldn't do anything. Changing an address in a routing table, and this has happened with Facebook, for example, I believe that the Pakistani government changed the address for Facebook in a routing table, and because of the interconnected nature of the internet, nobody is singular.

We all are connected, we all get impacted. So what last year's Twitter/Facebook taught us has nothing to do with registries, and all the rules and regulations that we have, governments will try to control, and they will find means to control speech. Right? And whether we agree with it or not, that is happening. And it's easier to do, and there are multiple ways of doing it. So what does that mean for us? How relevant are we going to be if we want to keep the internet a fabric, a holistic fabric, not only for commercialization, not only for development, but really how it

was initially created was for self-expression. People didn't have shopping carts on every page when they first put up a web page, it was here's all the things that I'm interested in and exactly what they're doing on Facebook, it's exactly what they did on Twitter, was get the news out when the journalists couldn't do it.

So by being able to think a little bit higher up than URLs and registries, I think if we truly believe in the principles that we espouse, right, we truly believe in it, then we ought to try to think a little higher. Otherwise, we're just paying lip service and those principles are hobbies for us and nothing else. So that means figure out how we can become relevant. How can we not allow registries to fail? Because if they do fail, it not only affects me, but it affects my customers.

Patrick Sherry: Thanks [Alexa]. Rob?

Rob Hall: That's exactly my point too, a registry failing. So we've talked about bankruptcy, I think there's going to be business models and companies go bankrupt that run registries, no doubt. I think it's incumbent on us as the internet community, and specifically the DNS community to ensure that operationally no one is impacted by that, or certainly that impact is as little as possible. So while I don't doubt that someone who gets a bad TLD will fail business wise, we've got to put in place things so it tries to keep working as much as possible. I know that I, while you may say that I don't care about a second level tld goes down, it does it all the time, and every time that happens, and it happens at the tld level, it erodes consumer confidence.

So politically what I see happening is governments love to try and control. They love to pass regulation to try and control what the population is doing. What the internet does is exactly opposite to that. It enables speech on an individual level on a mass level like never before. What we're trying to figure out in our strategy is what do consumers want? Because governments are not going to control them as well as they think. They're not going to be able to pass regulation fast enough, they can try, and ICANN can try, but ultimately at the end of the day, the consumer is what is going to drive growth in this industry, whether we, as a domain community is relevant or not.

So to [Alexa]'s point, we could easily be jumped over if we get too restrictive. If we place too many rules around it. If we try and tell

consumers this is what you have to have. Consumers are going to find a way to communicate on the internet. We can try walling off the internet, we can try making it more restrictive. Look at, and I'm sorry I don't know. I'd love it if when you speak from there you'd tell us what country you're from, and I'm sure someone is here representing China – what they did with the .cn domain name, by restricting and putting more controls on it. To Sabine's point, it won't necessarily be a Chinese company that owns the next domain that is relevant in China. They won't be able to control it the way they do now. It won't necessarily be an Indian company, or anyone from India at all who owns the next domain that people in India choose to use for free speech.

So if governments get too restrictive and try to control what's in their border, which they're good at, people outside their borders will start to give their consumers services that they can use, that they want, because ultimately consumers are going to win here. Not us, not governments, the consumer, the end user, the little guy is going to win in this debate, because that's what the internet does. It frees people to speak individually.

Patrick Sherry: Thanks, Rob. Fahd, in your part of the world, what are the political factors that are likely to be significant in the next few years?

Fahd Batayneh: Well, I am from a region where the governments usually initiate any new activities. So for example, I actually hail from a more technical background and I am more into IDNS mainly, so I like to talk much about IDNS and security. So for example, in my country, there was a little or negligible awareness about IDNS, so it was actually the government who initiated the entire IDN program, and we were the ones who had to, of course I represent my government in Jordan, so we had to initiate all the public consultation and all the technical aspects and all the security aspects and deal with the intelligence service in Jordan to make them understand how IDNS operate and how different is it from ASCII domain names.

And so I would say, in my country specifically, it's actually the government who is really driving things, but then they don't impose their laws on our community, in a strict manner. They just say okay, there's this technology, we would like to introduce it to you. Here are the pros, here are the cons, and it's open to everybody. Of course, in terms of policies, we – like, for example, Jordan actually applied for an IDN ccTLD and we got approved recently, so the set of rules and regulations we are going to

apply for with the ccTLD is going to be a little bit different than an ASCII top level domain, due to various reasons of course. I think the same could apply to several other countries in my region.

Patrick Sherry: Thanks, Fahd. Now Lesley, you've had a politically interesting year. Would you like to make a comment on the political part of it?

Lesley Cowley: We never have uninteresting years, actually, at Nominet. I think no shadow of a doubt, the volume dial on political interest has been turned up, not only in the UK, but worldwide. And some of the things driving that, yes, of course maybe concerns within the nation, but more generally we're seeing statements about the economy's relying on the internet. We're seeing statements about using the internet to develop your economy, to position your country internationally, and we're also seeing, increasingly I suspect, the internet being viewed as a way to save costs.

So we have a controversial budget in the UK at the moment, and a lot of the assumptions in that budget is around using the internet as a way of communication and a way of dealing with government services, and so again, that will lead to another turning up of the volume dial, I think. For many of us, where we see that happening internationally and nationally, it's very useful to cc's to be able to demonstrate our public interest, elements of our work, and indeed within ICANN's affirmation of commitments, the commitment to public benefit, public interest I think was key in that respect.

I think to also respond to the question in the sense of how it affect the ccNSOs and the ccTLD activity, the one great thing we have going in our favor is that often governments are very slow. I say governments are very slow compared with this community, but I think as this community we need to find ways to be much faster, because governments will become faster, and if we are going to demonstrate that we are responsible and responsive in this community, we will need to find ways of addressing problems before governments realize that they are a problem. I think we actually have a huge opportunity to be much more creative and much more inclusive in our policy process and bring solutions as opposed to a you can't do this because it's too difficult, and I think that is a real opportunity for this community.

Patrick Sherry: Thanks, Lesley. I'd like to move to the last two questions now. We've had a quite good and vigorous debate about some of the things that might

impact us in the next few years in the ccTLD world. We need to turn that into a so what. So what is it that we need to be doing as a ccNSO community, what's the things we should be working on in that regard? Sabine, would you like to take our first stab at that?

Sabine Dolderer: Actually I think as a ccTLD community we should, one of our challenges is how can we integrate ccTLDs in our group. Are there potential other groups having a similar setting? Let's say we have a .eu which is not a real country. I think that an issue, and actually I think an issue is, as I said earlier, how we are able to force the diversity, how to be more diverse, a process toward diversity in a way that we are more inclusive than we are currently.

Patrick Sherry: So the ccNSO is more inclusive than we are currently?

Sabine Dolderer: Not only the ccNSO but also help ICANN in providing policies that are more addressing the diversity of the community.

Patrick Sherry: Thank you. Lesley?

Lesley Cowley: I think there's an opportunity to improve how we work, and particularly how we work with larger numbers of members or constituents in this community, and how we improve our working with other elements of the community to – I very much feel that I talk a lot at ICANN and I feel very conscious of that sometimes because I'm the only woman from the UK contributing again. And I don't know if that's because I'm the only one that kind of does English, hopefully, or because I'm quite opinionated.

But there are a number of people who contribute and always contribute, and it's not always clear whether we're agreed with or if we're kind of suffered as having opinions. I think we need to find a better way of engaging across the whole community.

Patrick Sherry: Okay, good. Fahd, what do you think?

Fahd Batayneh: Okay, again IDN ccTLDs. actually looking at the various sessions within the ccNSO on the workshops being held in the other halls across the other meeting. DNSSEC is a – has a quite heavy weight within these meetings. So now implementing DNSSEC on the ASCII TLDs is a priority, then there should be a mechanism to integrate them into IDN ccTLDs, because

probably they would be some sort of a different integration. That's one part.

The other part is we should encourage them in communities or on an ASCII script communities to implement IDN ccTLDs, but at the same time, this community should encourage their local communities not to forget the ASCII ccTLDs. I mean, if IDN ccTLD communities just start to focus on registering IDN domain names, and neglect registering ASCII domain names, then their content for their websites or email or whatever would just be accessible within that community and there would be deprived of the rest of the world.

Patrick Sherry: Thanks, Fahd. Now, Rob. What do you think we should be doing here?

Rob Hall: Trying to move as fast as you can. So I agree with some of these points. You've gotten lucky, ICANN is giving you a head start, so by virtue of having a country code, you got a fifteen year head start on anyone, you've now got, call that a one year head start on IDNS? So you're the first group of people to have new TLDs, and they're relevant. They're language based. They're country based. You know, they're in different languages. If you don't apply, and if you wait, and if new gTLDs get out first in your language and in your countries, they will become dominant over anything you try and do.

It's about brand. Get them out there, but take the time to brand yourself. As Sabine said, why is de better than anything else that will come. That's what you should be doing as hard and as fast as you can. Get out there in the language of your consumers, because they are going to decide. And if they don't know who you are, and what you're about, and why you're better than everyone else that is coming, and they are coming, you'll lose. It's as simple as that. So speed is of the essence here. You've got a short window where you can take this new thing you've been given and use it.

Now, in Canada, unfortunately, we're kind of in trouble because they haven't got an IDN ccTLD they can promote, so .ca I'm happy to say is out there trying to brand, as much as it can through its channel of registers, we're .ca. here's how we're different, here's how we're better, here's why we're relevant, but in countries where the language is not English, as a predominant language of your consumers, get out there with your IDNS. Get people using them, because they're going to start to see that exact similar script that's not country code related, and doesn't necessarily have

all your policies and isn't even necessarily even run by someone in your country. Very shortly.

Patrick Sherry: Thanks Rob. [Alexa]?

[Alexa]: Thank you. I don't profess to tell you guys what to do, what I can tell you is what I would be thinking about, and hopefully that is of help. I think all of the things are very valid. These are all things that you know of. Either you've identified, you may not have answers to them. The worry, or the surprises if you will, always come from the things that you don't know that you don't know. Okay? So those to me, are be careful of being in a horse and buggy business when everybody is heading to the airport. Be careful of long held assumptions, the assumptions that we have about how governance works, how there is a zero sum game between security and privacy.

If you believe the trend line, if you look at the latest graphs, or the latest ccTLD and gTLD market, it is no different than a product maturation graph. Apply it to any industry, and that says commoditization is either coming or it's here for some of us. So in order to compete, you have to be efficient. All of you guys, to some extent, run a similar business. You serve a channel. Find ways to collaborate with one another to share best practices so that you can reduce your costs. We just announced that we did DNSSEC implementation on the second level today. Our philosophy is to share that knowledge and help. So you know, ask. When you can, there's nothing wrong with asking for help. So help yourselves, ask those who have done it.

And I think ultimately, think about the idea that we spend so little on R&D. We spend so little on R&D. And what does that really spell? What kind of surprises can that bring to our industry? And does that mean, I use the example that the improvements that we make are on a horse and buggy when people are building an airport.

Patrick Sherry: Good. Thanks, [Alexa]. Let's take some comments from the floor. Chris.

Chris Disspain: I just wanted to agree with Lesley. Yes, you do talk too much. [Laughter] No, I'm teasing. I think there are two things and they both have to do with governments. The first is that we should be individually working with our governments, and as the ccNSO working cooperatively with those governments who wish to see off the challenge from some governments to

have this whole thing taken over by whatever, the ITU or whoever. That's the first one.

And the second one is I think we should actually be working in the ccNSO to come up with a sort of bullet – there's no such thing as bullet proof – but a bullet proof as possible response to something that I think is likely to happen even more and more as the internet becomes even more pervasive and even more critical; which is that governments and politicians will start to say why aren't we doing it? Why aren't we running it? And I think we can all help each other by putting our heads together and using our brains effectively to come up with a stock standard answer to that, that really does answer the question.

Rob Hall:

Chris, I agree, and it has always amazed me that this community hasn't been able to do that. So there's two registry communities in ICANN. There's yours and there's the gTLDs and they're busy competing with each other, because arguably .net does compete with .com. You don't compete against each other, and yet you don't work together that much either. So especially in the cases of R&D, and that's everything. So I'll give you an example. I sit on the Board of Volleyball Canada. We have 13 provinces. Our AGM was last weekend. We got all the heads together and one province says we did this, and the others go, well that's a great idea, why didn't you tell us? We would have loved to do that too.

So you all, the wealth of knowledge in this room about how to run a registry is unbelievable, it's bigger than all the gTLDs put together today. But I've never seen anything from your community that says we're going to work on building an EPP server and sharing it. We're going to work on standardization across us all, so that we can be the best of breed. Everything tends to be pulled back in, and we're sovereign. We have to do that with our own company in our own country with our own people, we want to be a little different than everyone else. There's almost this desire to be different because you're sovereign. And I get it, but from a registrar's point of view, when we come to you and say we want to sell your domains, well our epp implementation is a little different from everybody else's.

Our policies are a little different from everyone else's. It drives us bananas, because it's a real cost to us then, to take your product on. We'd love to see some standardization as a registrar, but I think if you got together as a group, and started on technical, as [Alexa] mentioned,

DNSSEC, why weren't you leading that? Why are gTLDs leading that implementation?

Chris Disspain: I agree with some of the things that you said, but I just want to quickly respond on the standardization point. It's why people, why square loafs of sliced bread are declining, and sales of funny shaped odd unsliced bread in improving. Because actually standardization doesn't necessarily mean you're going to get more. It might make it easier for the supermarkets to sell the bread, it doesn't mean that the customer necessarily wants it.

Patrick Sherry: Thanks Chris. There was a hand up over there—

Pedro Veiga: Yes, Pedro Veiga from Knowledge Lab. I came in late, apologies for that, but there's one thing I missed in the list, and what you see happened in technical floor is people are starting to use DNS for other means that just as we know it. You see pressure about commercial softener fabrics, and Google to add location data into the DNS for doing routing, you find the same stuff which content providers, which could be completely different dimension to DNS than what we know here, which is kind of a problem.

Patrick Sherry: Good. Thank you. One from close to the front here.

Mathieu Weill: Yes, Mathieu for manager. I'd like actually to be a little provocative in saying that the panel has shown a remarkably consensual way of looking to the future. Especially considering how the internet is considered. I think it was Lesley that said the internet is more and more seen in our society of a way of saving cost and growth, I think that's only part of it. What I see, for instance in France, in the political side, is a growing vision of the internet as the source of all crimes. The mother of all crimes. The internet is the mother of all crimes, and therefore I think we will be witnessing a strong tension between developing the internet and controlling the internet. obviously what happened in a number of countries including the one [Alexa] mentioned, is precisely this tension that we're seeing.

And what is actually very relevant to us, is especially ccTLDs, are seen by governments as the gateway to controlling the internet, and therefore I think there is a strong challenge for us individually with our local communities, but also probably at the international level in explaining our role, explaining – defining also best practices to ensure that at an acceptable political level, and preserve the open nature of the internet. That would be my first comment. The second tension I would like to

underline hasn't been mentioned yet, is basically in the US what is called the net neutrality discussion. Once again, I really think we providers of a service of the open internet are at the center of this debate, and this time is more or less the ISPs, who are really willing to get better control over the customers in order to leverage their market share toward content providers.

And that has a lot of implications for the DNS due to futurings and DNS lines, resolvers, and so forth. That's also something that we have to discuss at the international level, and it leads us to better engagement of the – not only the people in our community that are not around the ICANN table, but also the other people in the industry chain like ISPs among others, and they are not on the table at ICANN, and that's probably a big challenge for ICANN in the future. Thank you.

Patrick Sherry: Thank you. We're almost out of time, but I would like to take a few more comments from the floor if there are any. I've got Annabeth.

Annabeth Lange: Thank you. I just wanted to come back to the lack of cooperation. Because in addition to the ccNSO it consists also of a lot of regional organizations that work very closely together, Center is one of them, LAC, TLD, a lot of people working hard together and share their best practices, and what we learn and experience in the local communities, we really want to share, but it is as Chris said, that one size doesn't fit all. We are serving local communities and you should not forget that that is a different market . Thank you.

Patrick Sherry: Thank you. Hang on, I'll just see if there's anything else out there, Rob, and then– That's fine. We'll take any last very quick comments from the panel, and then I'll hand to Byron for a few words at the end.

Rob Hall: I agree. You're all loaves of bread, you're all different loaves of bread. That's not the problem, okay? We've been selling all of you. The problem is I'm the store, and if you tell me that you're going to bill me by carrier pigeon and you're going to show up on a bicycle to deliver it, and I say no I want a truck and I want it electronically, and you make it hard for me to sell your loaf, I'm not going to sell it. That's the risk you face just now. All of a sudden you've gone from 200 loaves of bread to 1000 loaves of bread, the stores are going to sell the ones that they can deal with easily, and they can integrate to easily, and that operate the same way they do.

The only exception to that, the only exception to that, is that one that consumers demand, that the store has to carry because the store feels that's the one that my consumer says I must have, or they won't come into my store. So consumers win and decide things in the end, but you've got to think like a consumer now, that store should carry your loaf of bread because it's better, but if there's two loaves that are similar, the stores going to decide which one to sell.

Patrick Sherry: Thanks Rob. Any other last comments? Sabine?

Sabine Dolderer: Actually, I have to have a comment to Rob. I know he wasn't in our industry in the very beginning when we met – but with all respect I think you haven't followed the development of the ccTLD community global. So I think there is a lot of cooperation, there's a lot of technical cooperation. There are products out there which we share where the whole community benefits from. Because we don't produce what you want, doesn't mean that we don't cooperate.

Patrick Sherry: Thank Sabine. Lesley?

Lesley Cowley: I think where the bread example fails is more in terms of thinking about this community and the economic importance of the internet, etc., and I think it is easy to forget that in some areas the importance of security, reliability, and trust would increase as the volume gets turned up, and that means that registrars too, will need to work on that, not just registries, and that will be a shame for that to be lost from the argument.

Patrick Sherry: Thank you, Lesley. [Alexa]?

[Alexa]: Just one last response. And I'm very delighted to be here and thank you for having me, it's great to be listening to different perspectives, as I'm learning as well. the only thing, and again, I'm not saying this as advice, but rather something that I think about, which is to really remove the filters that we so often have, the self involvement we have, with the minutia of policy and we spend so much time, and yet there's a whole different world that is developing and changing from a political perspective, a technical perspective, economic perspective, that that is going to affect our consumers, it is going to affect their behavior, and ultimately affects their business. So my challenge is how do I become much more far sighted, and be able to predict better what's going to happen?

Patrick Sherry: Thanks [Alexa]. No more comments? Okay. I think first of all we should have a round of applause for our panelists. Thank you very much for a very interesting and very stimulating debate. I'll hand to Byron for a few – please stay. He promises not to go for very long.

Byron Holland: Alright. Well, thank you very much. I think that was actually a very interesting session, and I want to say thanks to every one of you, especially our non-traditional cc. participants. I thought you brought – from my perspective you brought exactly what I hoped your bring, which is an interesting and different perspective than sometimes we tend to share, so both to [Alexa] and Rob thanks very much for joining us in this community, and for our usual suspects, Sabine, Lesley, Fouaad, thank you very much. I thought you all brought some very good ideas, whether it was talking about removing the filters, notion is something that we probably don't talk about enough within this community, from Rob, you know, critical from our partners is this industry, or at least certainly in my country and I think in others who have a similar model - how are we going to compete in this much larger landscape?

We will have to position ourselves vis a vis the rest of the new gTLDs, what does that mean? How are we going to do it? Are we going to remain being the same? I thought you brought some really interesting observations there. I would just like to take one second, because I can't help but look at those and want to say something. I think anybody who looked from a government perspective or watched what happened in the GAC yesterday, you know, that balance in terms of the communities is changing in front of our eyes, and it behooves us to pay attention to the political factors and understand that governments are getting more aware of how much of the economy and other elements of what they would consider their business are transacting on the internet, and my personal take is we have to recognize and give them some breathing room there.

I think Lesley made the point of when you're seeing these things, let's get ahead of these issues and be the drivers, not the reactors to them. And on the ccNSO stuff, much like the financial system, the internet is based on trust and confidence. Who is on the other end of that wire, or over those airwaves is important. How do we know they are who they say they are, doing what they say they're going to do. And once you erode the trust and confidence, you erode the fabric of the business and the activity that we're engaged in, so how we manage and enhance that via technical solutions,

DNSSEC, or others, that I think is going to be very important for this community to think about in the future. So those are just my two cents, just to jam them in at the end. Thank you very much again. I thought it was a great session, I'm going to assume the feedback is going to be good. Hopefully it's something we can continue in the future. So thank you very much.

Chris Disspain: We have a few minutes of business to attend to. obviously I think that went really well, so the SOP business that we're going to try to get to, I'm going to—

Patrick Sherry: Guys, can I have your attention please? Thank you. Okay, we've squeezed something else in on the end of the agenda. The Accountability and Transparency Review Team wants to talk to us briefly about the review, so this is what we're going to do. Let's take the ATRT guys right now, we're going to have then talk to us, then we're going to talk, Byron is going to talk about something the council is going to be looking at afterwards, and the way it will work is the ATRT will do their thing, Byron will do his thing, and then we'll go straight into the council meeting. So if you can hang on, we'd be very grateful. So. Brian, are you leading this? Okay. Over to you. Ready when you are.

[Female Participant]: We do not think you are loaves of bread.

Chris Disspain: Well, unless we're wrapped in transparent packaging.

Brian Cute: How much time do we have, Chris?

Chris Disspain: Twenty minutes?

Brian Cute: Sure, that's fine. That's fine. Okay. Good afternoon. My name is Brian Cute, I'm the chairman of the Accountability and Transparency Review Team, Thank you very much for your time today. We only have about twenty to thirty minutes to interact, so I'll be very brief. The team has been meeting with each of the constituent bodies, or organs of ICANN this week, to begin our data collection phase of work. We have to deliver recommendations in December that map to paragraph 9.1 of the affirmation of commitments and make specific recommendations about improvements for ICANN.

So the purpose of meeting with you today is to listen, to hear from you. We also have to open up, I have to open up with an apology. We have posted some questions for comment to the community that are currently on a public comment schedule, we did not post them in the other UN languages of ICANN, and I apologize for that, that was our error. We have asked the staff to make those translations, post the questions in the five UN languages, and create a 45 day comment period for responses to those questions. with that, let's introduce the team, and then we'll get on to hearing from you.

Warren Adelman: Warren Adelman, President and CEO of godaddy.com.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Cheryl Langdon-Orr, current Chair of the At-Large Advisory Committee.

Olivier Muron: Olivier Muron from the France government, Paris.

Becky Burr: Becky Burr, ccNSO council.

Fabio Colasanti: Fabio Colasanti, until recently with the European Commission, now with the International Institute of Communications.

Erick Iriarte: Erick Iriarte, LATLD.

Brian Cute: So our purpose here is to collect data, again, and to hear from you. There are specific questions if you want to use the questions as a guide in responding to us that's perfectly fine. If you have specific instances where you think ICANN's processes or decision making has not satisfied or hit the bar of accountability and transparency that you believe it should have, we're interested in hearing those as well. Part of our work will be to identify perhaps a hand full of case studies where we can analyze and research how an ICANN decision making process took place, were there any flaws in the process, are there flaws in the structure? Identify those and then make recommendations. Our work is not intended to undo the past, our work is intended to make recommendations for work in the future. So with that, we have the questions on the screen. With the short time we have, it's an open floor and we're interested in hearing from you.

Becky Burr: I just want to add that one of the challenges about this task is that the notion of accountability depends of various – from situation to situation, so the way in which ICANN is accountable to various stakeholder groups in the community depends on what ICANN owes those stakeholder

groups. So one of the things we're also looking for input on, specifically is what are the things, where are the areas where you need ICANN to be accountable to cc's and the cc community in particular?

Brian Cute: Your comment.

Chris Disspain: Just so everybody knows, I don't know how many of you were in the main session that these guys had on Monday. I made a comment in that session because I know that this team is very keen on, if it's possible to have specific examples of something that you think is not as transparent as it might be; it's very easy to stand up at a microphone and say, well, of course we all know there's a huge amount of secret business going on in a small room, somewhere at the back of this conference center, but I can't give you any specific examples about that, I just know it's there. So the example that I gave was the – under the Delegation/Re-delegation Working Group during its research for its current document discovered that the Board had stopped publishing the reasons for its decisions on delegations and re-delegations.

That appeared to be a decision that was made sometime last year, and we don't know why, and it just happened. So that's a specific example of something that happened. Now, that could just be a mistake, quite possibly, but nonetheless it is an example. Now, that's not to say that you can't talk about anything else, in the sense of not having anything specific, but you feel you want to make a statement. But this community, the cc. community is not unknown for it's sometimes loud views and these guys need to hear from you, so I understand somebody might not be comfortable speaking in the room, you might want to send in your comments, but they need to hear from you.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Chris, we will be giving a whole lot of opportunities and modalities for people to get this information to us, but if I can just get another example from just a constituency in the GNSO I won't tell you which house, you can probably work it out for yourselves, when we are sitting in a room with a few more people than are in this room, and a question – they did a straw poll, and they asked the question, how many amongst you feel that your responses to public comments have not been accurately reported into the assessments and surveys, and there was more than 60% of the hands went up. That's a metric. That's exactly what we want to hear. If it happens.

Chris Disspain: Sabine.

Sabine Dolderer: I'll make a comment, and I think ICANN is sometimes very open and transparent in what they are doing, but they are not very open and transparent about the process and how long a process might take, so when you have, for example, the IDNS; we started talking about IDN in the top level it took five, six years until the IDN went into the top level. They talk about the gTLD process, it's a never ending process, but there is not a clear start and a clear end, so there's usually not a real project (inaudible 1:32:00) that my first masa, my second masa, my third masa, and then done, I take a decision.

But it's very much about endless processes without clear -also in the main sessions when it goes about the gTLDs it goes how much guidebooks do we wait for? And the answer was something like yes, uh. yes, uh. When there are less comments we think we are done. But that's not really a transparent process.

Chris Disspain: I actually have a theory that the reason why there are so many draft application guidebooks is that ICANN has realized that the final application guidebook will be a fag, and that's not something that they're prepared to actually publish.

Louie Lee: We could have final version 1, final version 2, and so on. Hi. I apologize for my lateness. My name is Louie Lee, and I'm the Senior Network Architect at Equinix, and I am serving as the chair of the ASO address council.

Brian Cute: Thank you for those comments. Anybody else? Martin –

Martin Boyle: Thanks. Martin Boyle from Nominet. actually if I can build on Chris' example, because going back a very long time now, and with requests from ccNSO and from the GAC, into a rather better advice to people about the process of delegation and re-delegation , and the criteria and what the criteria meant, this is something that just keeps coming up and I think people are taken by surprise by the amount of information they need to give, by the things that they are requested to go back and do, because they just do not properly understand what that process is, and I think that is actually a very, very difficult environment in which to be. Thank you.

Brian Cute: Let me ask a follow-up question, Martin. Has ICANN made any recent modifications to that process? Or not?

Martin Boyle: How do you know, if you can't see what the process is? We are aware that they have done various work internally on what the process might be, but that which is shared is shared in confidence.

Chris Disspain: Brian, you should, on that point, you might be surprised to hear a lot of the things we discuss with you or we do on Delegation/Re-delegation that sort of thing – we've just – we have a Delegation/Re-delegation Working Group, we just published 110 page report which is an analysis of a number of ICANN Delegation/Re-delegation decision, comparing them to a matrix, saying were they within policy, were they without policy, etc., and I think you might find that very useful. It's not a blame document, it doesn't say that these people are to blame, it just says – well, for example, it doesn't say this was a bad decision, it might have been a good decision, the question is was it made within the policy or not. And if you like it, if it wasn't made within the policy, it isn't very helpful.

So we've got – that's public, it's on the website for comment, and I would commend it to you. Becky knows all about it because she's on the Working Group. So I wanted to give you another example of the problem with – there's a – I'm a lawyer, and as a lawyer you learn that there's a fine balance between statements about transparency etc., on the one hand, and on the other hand the fear of liability and what may happen. So I understand that, but the problem is that people tend to forget that when they introduce some opaqueness, it's usually for one reason, and over time the opaqueness creeps, and it becomes – more things become opaque than necessarily need to.

So to give you a really specific example, in the fast track, the deal was that an application would come in, it would go through stage one which is a technical check to make sure it was acceptable, etc., and at a certain point it would then be published. But it wouldn't be published before that, because it would be embarrassing quite correctly, for a country to put in an application for .whatever, and then have that refused because they hadn't noticed that it was incredibly similar to .com or whatever. Perfectly understandable, and logical that that should be the case. But the – that became a rule, if you like that said we cannot discuss, under any circumstances anything about an application ever. The result of which was, when a particular country put in an application that we had

specifically written some rules to deal with, and the technical community said there is a problem. Instead of coming back to the people who wrote the ruling in the first place and saying this rule does not work; in which case we would have been able to say no problem, we'll rewrite the rule.

The whole swath of things occurred which lead to what is now euphemistically referred to as synchronized IDNS, which have a huge (inaudible 1:37:45) effect, and may influence the gTLD world in the future, and may not. All because there was a decision made about, quite justifiable and necessary decision made, about the need to be opaque but it got carried away to the point that we ended up making far, far more work than we would ever need.

Brian Cote:

This sounds, again, like a potential case study. I would encourage you to provide us, or point us to the documentation. I have to stress that we need to produce recommendations that are objective, that are independent, that are researched, that are well-founded. We need to deal in facts. We recognize that many of us are inside the ICANN tent and it is a sensitive concern of ours that the recommendations we make be viewed as valid, independent, and objective at the end of the day, so we encourage you to provide us that material. You can rest assured that we will go about the business of researching, verifying, validating, and understanding the facts behind what you presented us, and if we think it's something that raises to the level of potential recommendation, we will do that. Do we have any other? Sabine- don't be sorry. Don't be sorry. Go ahead.

Sabine Dolderer:

Sorry, again. Sabine from DENIC again. I have also remark for you in regard to does ICANN process in an accountable manner, and when it comes to discussing, does ICANN always stick to their core function and to their mission? So do they really stick to the technical parameters and the technical necessarily or do they actually include too much maybe of other issues that maybe not in their scope, and maybe not that relevant for technical discussions.

So especially when you talk about principles like similar/confusing and things like that, where I say from a technical standpoint things are either equal or unequal, but similar/confusing is something which from a technical standpoint isn't really valid for the IDN debate, so the question is, are the barriers of the scope really defined? When the stakes are taken in the discussion, is it really measured if it's in the scope or out of the

scope, and is there – who and where was the position taken that we dig down that area?

Brian Cute: Thank you for the question, Sabine. What I would encourage you to do is to read paragraph 9.1 of the affirmation of commitments, this is our road map, we have to look at issues surrounding the Board, the Board performance, the GAC and its interaction with the Board, the PDP process, receipt of public input. There's five criteria all together, this is our road map. We need to identify case studies that map to these elements, and if you provide them to us, then we can examine all aspects of–

Sabine Dolderer: IDN process. New gTLDs process. Great processes.

Brian Cute: Thank you. Please. Annabeth.

Annabeth Lange: Thank you. Are we just using examples that Becky knows very much? Since this is something I've been working with in the last year or two years, with geographical names. ccNSO and the GAC raised these problems again and again and again, it really took a very long time before we got any response at all, and we felt a lot of resistance without giving a proper explanation why what we said was not taken into account. So at last, they seem to have understood, and during one – I think it was a Board meeting in Seoul – where the Board told us you don't know what you're asking about, and you don't understand this, so it was kind of a very peculiar situation, so we have worked hard and now it seems like they have understood it and they are taking, so far, into consideration some of our concerns, but the process has not been very good. Thank you.

Becky Burr: For background, for the team, the comment was that in the new gTLDs process country and territory names should not be gTLDs, it wasn't – it didn't strike this community as a very tough call.

Chris Disspain: And the key to it is not whether that is right or not. The key is that sometimes non response looks like it's not transparent, so what happens is that you get no response, or the next version, in this case, of the dag comes out, and nothing has changed. And you've had no response. It could just be that the letter fell off the table and is lying on the floor somewhere under a sleeping Labrador, but you know.

Annabeth Lange: Excuse me, but not five times.

Brian Cute: Any other comments?

[Male Participant]: I think financial transparency is a little light right now, particularly for this community where there's an ongoing dialogue about the contributions that we should make. In order to have that conversation, they have to be a lot clearer about their financial reporting. I think if we looked at a past specifically, they've been very light on why they are so over budget, relatively speaking, so that would be a specific example. They haven't really justified that, but more importantly, going forward, for example, they put a \$10 million price tag on a cc. community, but they don't provide any specific backup and detail at any level of granularity, and I'm not talking about going in there and plumbing their gl codes, I'm just talking about basic allocation. I think there's a significant lack of financial transparency at any meaningful level.

Chris Disspain: And to add to that, another specific example on the financial side is – the ccNSO wrote, asked a specific set of questions in the first comment period on the budget. No response. Then they report after the comment period said we've answered all the questions, so then there was a telephone conference with Kevin Wilson, who does a great job, by the way, and he said "Oh, by the way, I know that there were these specific questions that you want answers to, these are really specific, we'll be done." The last news is there's a blog which he's written, which he's trying to get permission to publish, which may be published in three weeks time, which is after the closing of the thing, and the Board approves the accounts on Friday, or the budget on Friday, etc. Now, you know, it's – I would prefer "I'm not going to answer those questions," to not getting any response at all. Byron, go ahead.

Byron Holland: Just one more comment. It happens to be around this issue, but it's about something else. I noticed that during the process that Chris was referring to, in fact they hadn't translated any of the materials around the financial reporting where there was a commitment to, so then in the comment period, it meant anybody who required translated materials basically got squeezed entirely out of the comment period, and there was no recognition of acknowledgement of that. When I raised it, it seemed to be an oversight; I don't know, but certainly anybody who relies on it from another language, they were completely shut out, and I would say that would be completely intransparent.

Brian Cute: Erick.

Erick Iriarte: Yes, I will take the last comment to use in some respects about the transparency and the multi-cultural diversity. One of the questions is about the necessity of the information in documents in different languages to have access to the information when that makes participation of the people who will be interested in different time on different issues. Do you believe that this is one of the principle points, because we can say there is not full transparency in the process. They have some kind of transparency on the process and the people don't participate because they don't have access to the information in the correct time. That kind of question are very important to understand. Is not only a problem about get the documents on time, is necessary to get the documents in the language that will be useful for the persons.

Chris Disspain: Do we have anyone else? I think we may be done. Are you okay with that?

Brian Cute: Thank you very much. We realize we had a short exchange here, again. This is an open invitation to provide information to us. We have an interior site within the ICANN website if you look on the homepage, left hand side, down the buttons, there's one that says AOC reviews. Click on that and you will find our materials. We are trying to run as transparent a process as we can, putting our documentation or calls and meetings online with transcripts. But please, get us your information, if you have questions, you can contact me.

Yes, Becky? Yes, we were posed a question in the public session about whether we would accept anonymous contributions. We have decided that we would not accept anonymous contributions. We will accept confidential contributions.

Chris Disspain: Good idea.

Brian Cute: And with that, thank you for your time.

Chris Disspain: Thank you. Byron? Yes. Can we put Byron's slide back up please, so we can finish doing what we were doing? And just to remind you, we're going to go straight into the Council meeting so if you're a councilor don't leave. I know you want to talk, yes.

Byron Holland: Hi, I'm going to make this very quick. Just really some administrative business for the SOP. First off, I would like to say thank you very much to

the staff who help this group, who do an awful lot of work for us, so that would be Gabby, Christina, and Bart. Bart's here. So first of all, on behalf of the SOP but I think we all know in this community what they do, thank you very much to them. I know, and I think others could say this, they have pulled me out of the fire on more than one occasion, so thank you. Just a couple of pieces of business.

The term of this Working Group ends at this meeting. As it was constituted and set up, the feedback that we received, mostly anecdotally, has been that there has been a couple of key things. It extends the timeline for this Working Group for two more years, and one of the other pieces of significant feedback was that all the materials that we draft up and send to the community, they don't have the availability to see the light of day and the actual strategic and/or operating principle for ICANN, and we've had a lot of feedback, albeit anecdotal again, people saying that we should submit, not on behalf of the community, or as a substitute for community participation, because the real goal here is to be a catalyst to get you guys to participate, but that as one more form of communication from this community to ICANN so that there is also a statement in there that we would send in the reports, the work, or the documents we have produced as but one more contribution or submission.

So those are the two key elements at a high level, though I encourage you to read them, and provide any feedback you may feel, so short of reading a red line which I don't think we have time to do, those are the key elements that are in there. I'll give people a moment to consider that, and I would like to say – can we flip to the presentation? – that the other thing that is drawing to a close is the terms of the members of this Working Group, and there are a lot of folks that have done a lot of work in producing the documents for this community and I'd just like to acknowledge them, but also recognize that our terms are up, so there are a number of folks on the Working Group who I'm hoping will come back, and rejoin us; stand up for another term, and I'm also going to put the call out for any other folks who would like to get involved with this Working Group, and since I have a good memory, but it's short, if you could put the list up of – because I don't want to forget anybody; up to Paulos going down, we've been on the Working Group since day one, then part way through the term the rest of the folks joined us.

I also just personally wanted to say thank you very much for all the work the folks on the Working Group have done. So thank you. And as

constituted as per our term, this is the end of it, but I would also say is there any feedback on us moving forward as per the red line which I know you've barely seen; but notionally speaking – is there any comment, criticism, concern about –

Chris Disspain: Don't leave.

Byron Holland: -about what we're suggesting. Because again, the goal of this committee was to stimulate and be a catalyst for contributions. We definitely do not want to be providing any incentive for not having anybody else participating, because that's not the goal. It would just be one more forum.

Another thing I would say is that we encourage cut and paste, so anything we produce, if you want to use it, that's part of the point. Feel free to use it. Any concerns? Comments? Should I just keep rolling?

Chris Disspain: You'd hear to the contrary if there was a problem.

Byron Holland: Well, thank you very much for your support, and I told you it would be quick administrative business.

Chris Disspain: Thanks Byron. We're going to start the council meeting in a second. This is perhaps not the greatest way of doing this, but I'm not quite sure how we'll do it. Perhaps we'll just have like lower councilors down here and higher councilors up here. Absolutely. Well, the shorter ones should come down here and the taller ones up there. Before we do, I promised the gentleman from the .cd, the Congo, that he could make a very short and quick statement, so – if you'd take this microphone and stand up –

Jon-Pierre: Thank you. Thank you very much. I am Jon-Pierre [Mohongus], CEO of [Boston Telecommunication] in the Democratic Republic of Congo. I have here my operator, national regulator. I've been given one minute, so as I am a fluent French speaker, I wrote; .cd is going to enter into a transition stage for the management of its domain name. This change is governed by the will to become autonomous and be able to manage its domain in DRC, including the primary DNS server. This change will be made in full respect of the previous and the end users of our extension.

We wish that the upcoming system will be based on a free and open framework as Fred, which will help us to achieve our transition of the registry in a transparent way. This solution will be compatible with EPP

and LO as to reach a good compatibility with many existing registrars. We need to turn the complete voice database from the previous registry, including DNS and client database. This is particularly important, as a country cannot be kept hostage from its previous registry. We will provide ICANN with a complete guideline for this transition, and we hope to have its full support. Thank you.

Chris Disspain:

Thank you very much, and good luck. Especially as .cd is my initials, Chris Disspain, so I'm very much hoping that I will- Thank you very much. Okay, what we've decided to do is that we're going to get the Council, if you don't mind, to take the front row, and I – Bart and I will sit up here with the agenda and do it that way. So if I could ask you to move away from the front row, that would be fantastic. If I could get the councilors to come down to the front row. Christina, is it possible to get the agenda up here or not? Okay. Well, it's been printed. That's good then. No, don't worry. It's okay, it's okay.