
CR – BOARD / ccNSO

Tuesday, March 13, 2012 – 10:00 to 10:45

ICANN - San Jose, Costa Rica.

LESLEY COWLEY: Good morning, everyone. We're going to restart in a few minutes. Could I invite Byron and Keith, if they've managed to make it here so far, to join me up front, please.

STEVE CROCKER: We apparently don't have projection of the questions.

LESLEY COWLEY: We also seem to have lost the vice chair on the way, which is slightly unfortunate.

So good morning, everybody. Apologies for our slightly late arrival. We came all the way from Bougainvillea. It might have been quicker to come from the Marriott, actually. So I think I have lost some ccNSO members on the way, but I think we will make a start. We have a rather long list of questions that we ideally would like to get through with you today.

STEVE CROCKER: I think the best thing is to jump right in. Under the new -- under the setting we have been doing things the past few times, having substantive and rather direct interactions on specific topics instead of probably the more pleasurable social kind of interactions, I think the

Note: The following is the output resulting from transcribing an audio file into a word/text document. Although the transcription is largely accurate, in some cases may be incomplete or inaccurate due to inaudible passages and grammatical corrections. It is posted as an aid to the original audio file, but should not be treated as an authoritative record.

right thing to do is just jump right in. And I appreciate the preparation. And I'm impressed that the room seems to be filled and still filling.

We may want to do something about how we choose the room the next time. Let's go for it.

LESLEY COWLEY: We could have one closer. That would be wonderful.

STEVE CROCKER: Closer would be nice, yeah.

LESLEY COWLEY: So Question 1 was from the ccNSO on the topic of the IANA contract and the recent announcement. The ccNSO was a bit surprised that there were no proposals received by IANA that met the RFP requirements. And recognizing the importance of the IANA function to ccTLD managers, we are curious what happened and what are the next steps from the board perspective, please.

STEVE CROCKER: I will take this one. So I think there's three points. There's what we know, there's what we can guess and then there's, as you asked, the next steps.

What we know is exactly what's been published. We don't know anything in addition to that. The government basically halted the procurement process. And in doing so, there was a couple of steps in rapid-fire order. But the net of it is that they extended the existing

arrangement by six months and stopped the procurement process for the next contract and said that they will issue a new RFP and restart the process. A standard part of that kind of situation is a debriefing -- a formal debriefing by the contracting agency, contracting officer, to explain what the situation is. We have not had that. We will have that relatively soon. Don't know exactly what we'll learn from it, but that will be one part of the next step. So that's the end of the factual information.

The best guess is that despite best efforts in the proposal that we submitted, if one interprets the NTIA comments that were published, there are possibly some aspects that did not match up. One has to recognize -- And I have some experience of this in my past experience in the government. The way they do this is a whole separate set of people drawn from different parts of the government do a formal evaluation against a preset criteria. This is not NTIA. This is sort of contracted out to another part of the government. And then they run this process as a way of being rigorously neutral and independent.

And for whatever reasons, which we don't yet know, one would guess that what we submitted and how the RFP was interpreted by the people doing the evaluation didn't meet some -- one or more conditions. We'll find that out and we'll deal with it.

What I don't believe is that there is a larger more complicated or conspiratorial plan. I don't think this is linked to anything. Opinions on that vary considerably, but I think we should not imagine more complicated things. My estimate is to tree this relatively straightforwardly.

The important thing with respect to next steps is without question, the ICANN staff and the ICANN board are going to be focused very, very closely on what the status is, tracking the next steps, making sure that we have the resources and the attention to focus on this so that the next stage goes through much more smoothly.

LESLEY COWLEY: Thank you, Steve. We look forward to receiving updates as and when they are available then.

STEVE CROCKER: Yeah. I think that the world in general seems to have that, and so we will also have to attend to the communication side of it. But I hope that we are -- we will definitely attend to the communication side. But the key thing is going to be sure that we focus on the substance of the matter.

LESLEY COWLEY: Thank you. I think I saw a hand up from Sabine.

SABINE DOLDERER: Thank you very much. I just have a follow-up question. As you say, it is more a formal thing which happened. Do you also think that the timing of the announcement is just accidentally now happening?

STEVE CROCKER: The short answer is yes. I think what you have is a sequence of events that were not carefully orchestrated. The end of the existing contract

was March 31st, so they were coming up against a deadline that needed something. That was not -- it just happens that we're meeting in Costa Rica in the middle of March, and that's coincidental with respect to the timing. And we're in the middle of the gTLD application window.

These are not synchronized or orchestrated events. It is very, very easy to line those things up and say, Because these things are correlated in time, therefore, there must be a cause-and-effect relationship, I think that's overreaching, in my opinion.

LESLEY COWLEY: Thank you. We had Nigel next.

NIGEL ROBERTS: Nigel Roberts. Thank you for the information so far.

Can you hear me okay? Nearer to the microphone. How's that?

Thank you for the information so far. The stated announcement -- was it yesterday or the day before -- said that no proposals were received, and I think the expression was "that met the criteria requested by the global community," or words very similar to that.

As you got the six months stay of extension, admittedly you have got to wait for this debrief that you mentioned. But would it not be a good idea to proactively engage with the ccTLD community amongst others in order to try and improve the chances next time?

STEVE CROCKER:

So this is a formal contracting process. And the only way I can put those pieces together in a meaningful way is that NTIA took inputs from the global community, embodied them in the RFP, and then the result is, as I said, that there was a determination that ours and whoever else might have submitted didn't meet the criteria so they stopped it.

NTIA issued its own statement, which everybody I presume has seen. And I'm not sure that I could understand exactly why they chose to say what they said.

But the way that I would interpret that is, just winding it backwards, that in us not meeting those criteria, they then said the criteria were not met and from their point of view those criteria represented the global community.

Going back to the global community to figure this out would bypass the process that NTIA went to of taking inputs from whomever they took it from, distilling them, putting them into the RFP. And at this point, it wouldn't be the right sequence. It wouldn't accomplish anything because the action is in this government procurement process.

NIGEL ROBERTS:

I take your point entirely. I was thinking of more of an informal method, as I said, of proactively working with those of us, including me, who are very happy to work with anyone from ICANN to improve the service of the IANA. Thank you.

LESLEY COWLEY: Nigel, thank you. Sorry, the ccNSO did, in fact, make input to the procurement process in the original kind of formation of the requirement stage as well. So I know that our thoughts were, indeed, taken into account as part of that process. But I think I hear an offer of help to the ICANN board, if that is of help.

Let's move us on.

STEVE CROCKER: I will just say thank you. I'm not sure what to do with it or whether to do anything, but I appreciate the offer.

LESLEY COWLEY: Let's move us on because we have got a number of equally exciting things to talk about.

The second question was a question from the ICANN board to the ccNSO on the subject of WHOIS verification.

What are some of the experiences with ccTLDs with WHOIS verification? Which ones require full authentication? And I suspect -- we had some pre-discussions on this question. We could spend an entire day on WHOIS, and probably we only have about five minutes or so.

So we thought a good use of your time might be to just draw upon two or three case studies, people who've been coerced into volunteering to sharing some of their experience.

I hope we have Peter Vergote in the room. Peter, I think you were our first volunteer.

PETER VERGOTE:

Okay. Is everybody understanding me? Thank you.

All right. Thank you for the opportunity to share a bit of our experiences we have with WHOIS. Now, what we do is we have two procedures in place. Since we are not a very large-sized registry, we still have the luxury of doing a very rough, superficial screening of all WHOIS data that are linked to new registrations.

Actually, we got some feedback from government that they were slightly worried about the overall of WHOIS data in our registration database. And so we figured out that it would be cost efficient, manageable to do a very rough screening of the new registrations.

What we are typically looking for is to discover the key stroke entries and the Mickey Mouse kind of registrant in order to connect back to the registrant to alert him and to make use of our second procedure, which is actually much more important.

We do have a kind of warning procedure that if WHOIS data is not accurate and we do a verification of it and if it appears to be the case, we get in contact with the registrant, giving him 14 days' notice to adjust the data. If he does, nothing happens. If he doesn't, we withdraw the registration. So, in essence, that's it.

Is it scalable? Is it usable for other TLDs? It all depends on the resources that you have, on the level of screening that you want to do. If you stick to very basic screening, it's manageable for a TLD of our size.

We have approximately 1.2 million domain names in the dot be zone.

I can imagine if you are running a registry of several million, it gets more difficult. But it is the way we chose to proceed in order to try to overcome the worries of our governments. Thank you.

STEVE CROCKER:

I would like to ask a question. Yesterday there was a long session, a very good panel, on the RAA progress report and WHOIS data validation workshop. It sounds to me that what you've just described is a useful contribution that is comparable to the several contributions that were made in that workshop. And I don't know whether you're connected or communicating with them, but that would be perhaps a useful way to join forces.

It was a quite good spectrum of experiences based on a lot of history from people working in the field. And yours, I think, would be a good addition.

LESLEY COWLEY:

Thank you. I think we also had a volunteer in the shape of Annebeth.

ANNEBETH LANGE:

Hi, everybody. I think I have to make it short because my voice has disappeared during this week.

We are an even smaller registry. We only have 550,000 domain names.

And what we do, we have quite many restrictions in Norway, as many of you know. When you are going to register with dot no, you have to give up your trade organization number, which is entered into our WHOIS

database. And then it is washed towards the register continually. So then when something happens and it is not a match, then we will be alerted at once so we can send a notice to the registrant and ask them to update their data.

And what we see is that the most -- not accuracy with them -- is that they shift legal c's, they forget, and those kind of things. But that will be discovered quite easily this way.

LESLEY COWLEY:

Thank you, Annabeth. There's a number of registries in the cc community that are involved in similar activities. I think the best thing we can do in the interest of time is alert the cc's to this dialogue and offer to share our experience.

Nigel, I think you also wanted to make a point.

NIGEL ROBERTS:

I will try to be as quick as I can. I wasn't a planned volunteer, compulsory or otherwise.

About a year and a half ago, we undertook a fairly large data migration exercise to go from one system to another. During that time, we took the opportunity to build in real-time registration and modification time of domain names with automatic validation of address and telephone data in the registry data.

It is based on the contact record, and we have a fairly detailed dissection of the United Kingdom, the United States, Norway, France

and a few others. And we are adding countries based on the need, on the stats within the domain that it's applied to.

It has been reasonably successful, and we have even managed to sell it to one other ccTLD. So if anybody is interested in automated -- or even wants to cooperate with supplying data about their own details of postal codes and telephones and stuff, I'm available.

LESLEY COWLEY:

Okay. Thank you for that.

Let's move on. The next item which is very close to the heart for ccTLD managers at the moment is the framework of interpretation working group. And with the board's permission, we thought we would use some time to just give you an update on that amount of work, which I have to say has been quite considerable by the team involved.

Keith.

KEITH DAVIDSON:

Hi, I'm Keith Davidson from dot nz and the chair of the framework of interpretation working group. This working group was established as a result of an output from an earlier working group called the delegations/redelegations and retirement working group. And we're tasked with the job of providing some color and depth to the policies and guidelines applicable to the delegations and redelegations of ccTLDs.

The working group has completed the first chapter of its work in recent days and is aiming to have a total of about five or six chapters to complete its entire task, which will happen over the next year or so.

The first topic is the one of -- or first chapter, as I'll refer to it, is the topic of consent and what constitutes consent from a ccTLD manager.

This topic has been through its rounds of ICANN public consultation, and it appears to have met the threshold of consensus support from the community, including the GAC. And we anticipated our joint session with the ccNSO and the GAC tomorrow, that we will receive at least an interim approval from the GAC to bring this paper forward, therefore, to the ccNSO Council tomorrow afternoon. And with that support, we would then be in a position to provide our first chapter to the ICANN board.

The working group is very interested in progressing this work in an iterative way and chapter by chapter rather than waiting until the end and then having approval of the entire process. And our reason for that is this will provide IANA the opportunity to update its procedures as we go to reflect this additional color and depth on each of these topics.

So the question that we had for the ICANN board is whether the ICANN board, if it receives a final consensus-based document from the ccNSO with the GAC approval, would it be in a position to also offer its endorsement or support for that document and enable IANA to update its procedures accordingly? Or would the ICANN board prefer to wait until the end in a year's time and then look at the entire set of chapters and adopt the document in totum? Thank you. That's my report.

STEVE CROCKER: Chris?

CHRIS DISSPAIN: Thank you, Steve. Keith, I can obviously only talk personally, but I will tell you what I will say when the board discusses this, which is that I think that the working group, which I know intimately because I'm on it, has passed the work in a way that enables the board to adopt the guidelines on a chapter-by-chapter basis.

This is important work, and the guidelines that will be provided will come with the information of both ccNSO and the GAC.

My recommendation is that the charter for this working group -- or if it is not the charter, it is somewhere within a ccNSO Council resolution -- is that one of its jobs will be to monitor and watch the board's reaction or, rather, IANA's reaction to the guidelines. And in the event that those guidelines don't seem to be being followed, to launch a policy development process, which is something that I know all of us would be quite keen to avoid if we possibly could.

So that's what I will say on the board, that we should adopt the guidelines on a chapter-by-chapter basis. Thank you.

STEVE CROCKER: I want to say just a couple things. From my point of view, I'm very, very keenly interested in this work. It was evident to me that we have a missing element in the way the IANA folks have to deal with redelegation requests in particular. And this guidance that will come is -

- I think will help fill a void or a -- maybe it is not a complete void, but help rectify it.

In this incremental approach of submitting chapters, do we get an overview of what elements are going to be in which chapter so we can look ahead a little bit? Yeah, I see shaking heads positively.

So that's great. I have been keen to see this, just speaking personally. So I don't think you will have any trouble getting our attention.

ROD BECKSTROM:

Just a very quick comment, Keith. On behalf of the staff I have spoken with, they are encouraged by this work because additional guidance in this area -- it is so difficult to make these decisions for the IANA group and ICANN staff and the IANA team in particular is in a very challenging position. I think they are encouraged by the important and difficult work you are doing to bring greater clarity to that going forward. Thank you.

KEITH DAVIDSON:

Excellent. I think one of the issues that we have within the working group is that -- while that would be quite a useful idea to wait till the end to see the final, total document, the problem with that is in a year's time we have forgotten all of the fine detail that went into the particular decision. So doing it iteratively makes a great deal of sense to us, and it also gives IANA the opportunity to adopt its changes to procedures in a gradual and stepped and measured way.

So we felt this was the best alternative if it was palatable to the ICANN community most broadly.

LESLEY COWLEY: Not wishing to introduce an element of uncertainty. But, of course, it will be important to go back over the entire chapters to check that they all are coherent and make sense at the end. I'm sure they will.

STEVE CROCKER: A broader comment which applies here is, in general, I'd like to see more communication at earlier stages and provide the opportunity for feedback rather than the formalized "Here's our work, we're done with it, and that's the end of it" because that makes it hard to deal with any issues, large or small, that might come up. So, I recognize that the team doesn't want to get too distracted and wants to get settled in its opinions before it shares. So we have to choose what the right point is, and I don't want to over-specify it. But it would not be unwelcomed -- I'll put it that way -- if preliminary versions were shared and feedback was asked for and so forth so that it -- when the chapter finally comes out, as I say, applies to many other pieces of work that I see, that the results are not a surprise and the parties that are supposed to receive such reports are already positioned to take their part to the next step.

LESLEY COWLEY: I think I had a hand up from Bertrand.

BERTRAND DE LA CHAPELLE: Good morning. Bertrand de La Chapelle.

Just a quick remark regarding the fact that, indeed, the work of this group is very important and particularly on one of the most sensitive topics that we all know is the question of the local community support because fundamentally on the IANA delegation/redelegation process, there is a sort of range that could go from one extreme to the other.

One extreme would be an excessive observation analysis. I mean, let me put the absolute extreme of having a sort of accreditation and system of inspection, whether the process is okay, and people getting in and asking everybody. It is obviously not possible and not desirable.

The other extreme is turning the IANA in terms of a delegation/redelegation as a mere recording of the decision that's been made at the national level by whatever authority is in place. But there is a decree. This is the redelegation period in ICANN, and the IANA function would have no role in there.

Finding the right balance in between is the most delicate element, and the reason why I highlighted two extremes is because one is clearly not at play, the most intrusive part.

But the one that is the less -- or the mere registration of decisions is potentially at play and it is important not to get too far in that direction.

KEITH DAVIDSON:

If I can respond. And I think also to -- or, firstly, recognizing governments in their role as a stakeholder amongst the local Internet community has been quite a difficult and challenging chapter 2, which is currently out for consultation. So we would appreciate your input, Bertrand, in that regard.

But, yes, noted. And we are really starting to deal with that substantive issue of measurement now. And you're right, it is extraordinarily challenging.

STEVE CROCKER: How many chapters are there?

KEITH DAVIDSON: Five or six.

STEVE CROCKER: Ah.

[Laughter]

If we're short on time --

CHRIS DISSPAIN: Can you remember what they are, Keith? Just so that everyone has got an idea of where we are headed, it would be useful, I think.

KEITH DAVIDSON: The topics are: Consent and what's meant by consent for delegations and redelegations.

The second topic, which is out for public consultation currently, is significantly interested parties or local Internet community and what that might mean.

The third is revocation and unconsented redelegations. This is where we get into the current debate on what constitutes under RFC-1591 substantial misbehavior and what IANA stepping in might mean as a result of misbehavior.

Then we have a glossary or terminology paper to provide color and depth to the terms used.

And then, finally, a set of recommendations for IANA reports on delegations and redelegations.

LESLEY COWLEY: Okay. Obviously, we'll keep you informed on the development of our book.

STEVE CROCKER: Will it be available on Kindle? Never mind.

[Laughter]

LESLEY COWLEY: We can try.

The next item that we'd like to discuss with you is the progress of the ccNSO finance working group. You board members and others will recall that the subject of financial matters has been a hot topic for all of us, and to really inform that conversation going forward, the working group has done a survey, and we'd like to share with you some of the key findings from that survey.

I have Byron Holland to speak, who is the chair of that working group.

BYRON HOLLAND:

Thanks, Lesley. I'm Byron Holland from dot ca and the chair of the finance working group of the ccNSO.

Just as a very quick reminder, in terms of what we're actually trying to accomplish, we're really looking at the contribution model that the cc community has into the ICANN process, and as such, we've had this committee in place for roughly a year. Our end goal is to come to some conclusions and recommendations by the Toronto meeting, and we're looking, really, at three distinct elements.

One is contribution models. Today, we have a voluntary banded style model, but there are others, so we're looking at the actual models themselves.

We're looking at what we, as the community, are actually contributing and getting a more fulsome view of what that really looks like.

And then the third piece is getting a much clearer understanding on what ICANN believes to be expenses associated with supporting the cc community.

Each of those threads is important in coming to a final set of conclusions and recommendations, the original goal being October in Toronto.

We've had a pretty robust discussion on the models thus far, and today we wanted to talk about the survey results that have gone out to the community for their input, and we are still working with ICANN staff on

the ICANN component of this in terms of expenses associated with the ccTLD community.

So like any survey, I just wanted to put some qualifiers in front of it.

It went out to every ccTLD. It is a self-selected group, in that it was voluntary participation in it.

55 country code operators actually filled out the survey, which was a very detailed and robust survey.

Just to give you a sense, there are 255 cc's in the IANA database, there are 126 cc's as of today participating in the ccNSO, and 55 cc's completed the survey. Just to give you a sense of that.

We had very good representation geographically, though we did over-index somewhat in Europe, North America, and we were somewhat under-indexed in the African region.

But by and large, we had relatively good -- relatively good feedback.

So I just want to set those qualifiers in place, because I think this is a survey that gives us good guidance, but as a self-selected voluntary one, there is some bias, of course, to those who actually participated in the survey.

I think one of the interesting things, to begin with, was a distinction, perhaps, on what ICANN thinks it delivers to the community versus what the community is thinking it's receiving or wants to receive. And that was the first fork in the road that I thought merited some information.

And typically ICANN sees these following elements as core to what it's providing to the cc community.

First and foremost, of course, is the IANA function, but also significant presence in the regions, outreach, engagement, capacity building in various stripes, policy work in the secretariat, and of course the overhead component for operating ICANN in general.

cc's seemed to have a slightly different take on it in that they notionally believe, you know, we run our own shops in our own domestic environments, we develop our own policies and implement them, we typically create our own compliance environments and manage them, we certify and manage our own registrars, have our own agreements, all of that stuff, and we typically operate our own local WHOIS and all of the policies surrounding WHOIS in our environments.

So you can see there's a -- it's like bifurcation of what we think we're getting versus what we think we're giving as ICANN, and I think that's important to note.

To give you some better color -- and it looks like my graph is slightly chopped off in presentation here, but I think you'll get the point -- is that these are the activities that cc's use, or resources that they use from ICANN.

So root zone -- the IANA function, I'll tell you -- I won't leave it a surprise, based on what you see here -- is a hundred percent. So the IANA function is utilized across the board.

Information and policy updates and newsletters, just general information, is highly utilized.

And delegation/redelegation services is also something that is utilized by the cc community in a meaningful way.

After those top three high runners, as you can see it starts to tail off quite dramatically, and after travel funding, it starts to get down into the 20- -- only 20% or less are utilizing the services.

So this, I think, gives a pretty clear view of what the cc community thinks of when they think of what services am I getting or utilizing, which then of course rolls into how do I think about paying for these services.

And I think this is an important slide, or an important data set, for all of us to consider in this discussion.

This is simply a reflection of that same set of data, but dividing it among the large -- larger cc's, as defined by over a million domains under management, a hundred thousand to a million domains under management, and under a hundred thousand.

And I think this becomes an important slide because it speaks to how the community is feeling about the current voluntary contribution model.

What the data shows us is that the cc's who use the least amount of ICANN services make the largest financial contributions. That's fundamentally what the data tells us. Which probably is not a great surprise.

This just starts to break it down, and again, I'm sorry, it seems to be off the screen slightly. And it looks at the average -- the average

contributions broken down in those three size categories. And you can see the average contributions based on the size categories and also based on, is there some kind of agreement in place and, as well, recognizes there are a number of different instruments out there. Frameworks of agreement, exchange of letters, MoUs, right up to what I would call a formal contract.

But there are a number of instruments in place there.

And this just is giving us a sense of what that looks like.

I think the other -- another interesting point is, typically as the registries get bigger, they typically have been around longer and are also contributing more, so this just really highlights an evolution of how cc's evolve, both in terms of growth and engagement and contribution, and there's a relative connection to those points.

Not only do cc's, quote, write a check and make that voluntary cash contribution on an annual basis, there are a number of other activities that we engage in which are fairly substantive in terms of both financial expenditure, as well as human resources.

And I think what this just serves to highlight is that the majority of cc's participate very actively in the process, and obviously part of what ICANN needs is that active participation.

And not just simply participation, because as we all recognize, there are passive participants and active participants, but this community is a particularly active participant in the ICANN space.

One thing -- and again, while we knew this, it was, in a sense, somewhat of a surprise to just see it in -- on paper, in black and white. The number of cc's that have hosted ICANN meetings. I mean, clearly we're here. The host is dot cr. They've done a wonderful job and spent a bunch of money.

As somebody who is in the process of working through hosting the ICANN meeting in Toronto in October, I can say I know we're going to spend a bunch of money.

A not trivial amount.

What we see here is that those with agreements, on average, spend \$274,000, and those without agreements spend \$119,000, when they host a meeting. That's not a trivial number in terms of -- of overall real hard cash contribution into the ICANN process, and I think bears mentioning, in and of itself.

This puts a little more color on it in terms of the mean and the median and what people are spending.

But Finding Number 2 I think is an important one in this discussion, in that the financial -- and that is this: That the financial contributions that cc's make really are independent of the instrument in place between ICANN and any given cc.

Statistically, we don't find any strong correlation between what our relationship is and what we pay.

This just starts to break down how we do it: The voluntary basis, is there in kind of agreement in place.

You know, the majority of us have some kind of agreement in place, but there is certainly a significant majority that don't.

And again, this just starts to break it down a little more in terms of the actual contribution by vehicle.

And again, the mean and the median here.

I think what we want to get to is Finding Number 3 is that we would suggest that the ccTLD financial contributions currently disclosed by ICANN are materially less than the actual financial and, of course, the additional nonfinancial contributions made by the ccTLD community. And I think that this is important to know.

This just summarizes the conclusions that we have drawn.

I would also say that we have just received this data, as the working group itself. We have not had a lot of soak time. We will continue to unpack the data that's in there and become more refined in our -- both our conclusions and our insights that we can deliver here.

It is also, I think, important to note here a couple of elements.

One, there are 20% of cc's who are not contributing anything financially.

We haven't had the opportunity to unpack what is the makeup of that 20%. Are they free riders? And without a doubt, there are some.

Are they folks who simply are not in a position to make a meaningful financial contribution?

And without a doubt, there will be some of those.

But it is definitely important to note that.

I will say -- and I don't speak for the community but in my personal capacity here and as the chair -- it is my sense that the cc community believes that there should be a higher level of just pure financial contribution, and that is why we are, in very good faith, going through this process, is to find out: What does that number really look like.

And to date, we've had a good discussion and sense of the models. We now have a much better understanding of how we're contributing at this point in time, and once we get a better sense of the ICANN financials, I think we'll be able to bring this together and come to some - - some of those conclusions.

I think one other thing that bears mentioning is there are 126 members in the ccNSO, so it is a very significant community, but that still represents less than half of the ccTLDs out there.

So we can only speak for those who are in the membership, and we can only speak in a sense with the folks that are in the membership.

Those outside of it become much more just a direct ICANN individual ccTLD relationship.

So that is a -- those are the facts that we have to present today. We will continue to refine our understanding of what we've seen here, but we wanted to share it with you as soon as we could, even though literally it is hot off the press. So thank you very much.

LESLEY COWLEY: Thank you, Byron. We're open to questions and comments. We're expecting a few.

Who's the -- am I keeping the list?

STEVE CROCKER: Yeah.

LESLEY COWLEY: I had Steve, then Kuo-Wei, Bruce, Lise -- oh, goodness. Start a list.

STEVE CROCKER: Really excellent. Really excellent stuff. I'm quite impressed.

Several different comments I want to -- and I'll go very quickly, but first I want to recognize that our CFO, Xavier Calvez, is sitting front -- sitting in a pivotal position here, playing close attention, which I'm very pleased, and I think this will be very, very important.

Toronto's an expensive city. You probably should make the estimate a little higher for what your expectations are.

The -- the data that you have there, I'm hoping that you'll make that available in machine-accessible form so that other people can slice and dice and consider and so forth and also participate in the process of making conclusions, because I think that the observations that you have are extremely important and will trigger a lot of positive involvements, and it already has, I think.

I want to offer up something that is -- may be a little novel.

You mentioned that the cc's have all of the structure that ICANN has in their own right managing registers -- registrars and that relationship.

The financial model of what those operations look like might turn out to be very informative to the way ICANN manages. So this is not a, "What's the cc contribution, the cost for the cc." This may be how we in the g space can learn from the experience in the cc space. And I've said from time to time that I think that the existence of the cc's as an independent set provides enormous genetic diversity, and this is a very specific application of that idea, and I have no idea what the results will be but it would not be shocking to me if it turned out that there are quite different cost structures and insights to be learned or things to be dealt with in -- in that.

So I just thought I'd stir the pot a little bit on that.

BYRON HOLLAND:

Certainly on the first question, are we going to share it, absolutely.

We want to unpack it a little bit first, as the working group, but the absolute goal is to share as much of sort of the hard data and research as we can.

Needless to say, we did include pretty significant privacy in order to get cc's to really tell us as much as they did, but that aside, absolutely that's the goal.

LESLEY COWLEY:

Can I also add that we've already engaged with Xavier and Xavier indeed came to our meeting earlier on this item, and I'm sure there's some that

are happy to share financial structures and so on, to assist him with his challenging task.

Kuo-Wei?

KUO-WEI WU:

Yeah. Actually, Steve already covered some of it. The first thing I'd like to express is this is an excellent report and really helpful.

Second of all, thank you for the, you know, continuing participation from the ccNSO, particularly in the ICANN meeting.

And I think it's not only in the meeting, but at the same time the most important contributions really are contributions not necessarily only financial, but it also comes in the discussion in the ICANN mechanisms. And so I think I really appreciate that the ccNSO is always the strongest supporter in this whole ICANN community.

Thank you very much.

LESLEY COWLEY:

Thank you. Can I encourage brevity for people, please. As always, we're up against a time constraint.

Bruce.

BRUCE TONKIN:

Thank you. I notice -- it's just a quick observation, I suppose.

If I look at Conclusion 1 and Conclusion 3, I suspect that would also be the same from the gTLD registries and registrars. They would come up with the same conclusion, so there's commonality there.

I notice, which I thought was very useful, that you had a slide that talked about services that ICANN provides to you and which of those you use, and one of the questions I would have is: You know, do you think -- what sort of internationalization side of things do you expect from ICANN? Do you want a location like IANA that handles multiple languages or would you prefer, you know, people like headed in different regions of the world that you could meet face-to-face, would be one question.

And then a second question would be: You know, certainly most of us in the community, we're probably all members of Internet societies and members of museums and various other things, so to some degree, you're expecting a service when you join these organizations, but in many cases you're really making a contribution because you want that organization to succeed.

Have you thought about having a separate slide, which is, what things do you think ICANN should be doing and, you know, to what level of contribution do you think the cc's can make to that, whether it's financial or nonfinancial.

Because I think it's a slightly different pitch here. You know, one is what services you're receiving and we'd like to know about that, but the other bit is what do you think ICANN should be doing and what would you be prepared to contribute to.

BYRON HOLLAND: Sure. I -- on your first question, what specifically do we want ICANN to do, I think right now we're in the process of unpacking that, because literally we did -- we have had one meeting on Sunday afternoon to digest this data.

So it's very, very early days.

As we come into the next couple of finance working group meetings, those are the types of things we'll start to try to understand.

Today, right now, I can't give you a very good or solid answer on that.

Also, as part of that, we will be focusing on what really do we want from ICANN, and trying to get a better sense of that within the working group, based on the working group members as well as the data that we have in this survey.

LESLEY COWLEY: Certainly we'll take your other suggestions on board as well. Lise.

LISE FUHR: Okay. I hope this works. I'm Lise Fuhr from dot dk. I'm a part of the working group and I'm also a part of a subgroup for the working group that has to analyze ICANN's numbers on spending on the ccNSO group, and, well, my problem is, I don't have any numbers to analyze.

We've been asking for these numbers since the Singapore meeting and, well, we got some numbers in September but they are not sufficient, so we would really like to have some numbers to work with.

ROD BECKSTROM: Thank you. We will work on that. I'll consult with Xavier and we'll try to make sure you get some good numbers. Thank you.

LESLEY COWLEY: Okay. We're running out of time. Sebastien, though, I think you're last in the queue.

SEBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Thank you.

LESLEY COWLEY: And Roelof.

SEBASTIEN BACHOLLET: I want to support what Steve and Kuo said.

Just to add one point.

You say that there are a lot of ccTLDs who organize -- help to organize the ICANN meeting in different places.

I would like very much that we have a real figure of the cost of a meeting, and the cost of a meeting is not just what is inside the ICANN budget or ICANN expense, but it's also what is done by the local host and by other people.

And if you can help us with that, I will be very happy because I think if we want to have a clear view, we need to put both into the same -- into the same document to be sure that we know the real cost -- total cost.

And my last point is that I would love that one day we will be able to have all the data accessible. I'd love ICANN to become an open data shop. Thank you.

BYRON HOLLAND:

Well, I'll at least speak to the first question, or statement.

[Laughter]

We have quite robust data on what the cc's are saying they're spending on the meetings, and within the 55 contributors, we do actually capture the significant majority of the meetings and we have all of their individual data for that.

So we will be, like I say, sharing that with respect -- respectful of the privacy, but certainly sharing the bulk of all -- of that data.

So I think we should be able to answer the very question you asked, at least from the host perspective, within the not-too-distant future.

LESLEY COWLEY:

Maybe the open data question is another topic for another day.

Roelof, lastly?

ROELOF MEIJER:

Yes. Thank you, Lesley. Roelof Meijer from SIDN, who runs dot nl. I just want to come back to the first conclusion that's still on the screen, that the cc's that use the least amount of ICANN services make the largest financial contributions. There's a correlation with the size of the domain. We are one of the larger financial contributors to ICANN. I support that model as long as it's based on the capacity to contribute. We see that the smaller cc's very often don't have the capacity to -- to contribute.

That notwithstanding, the fact is that I've been pushing ICANN to get actual figures on how much the services that they provide us with would cost, because I think that will be the best basis to start from.

Thank you.

LESLEY COWLEY:

Okay. Thank you, everyone, for that conversation. We're fast running out of time, I'm afraid, and we have at least three more questions we -- we could have talked about.

But for the time being, let's sum up.

Rod, I think you wanted 30 seconds.

ROD BECKSTROM:

Thank you. I just want to thank everyone in the ccNSO for your strenuous efforts on moving things forward.

Certainly it seems like there's, at a minimum, hundreds and hundreds of hours of volunteer time as members you put in, if not thousands, just

since the last meeting and it's great to see the progress on the financial research front.

And on the staff side, we really appreciate the work on the framework of interpretation. That could give IANA much greater guidance going forward.

And also, congratulations, Lesley, to you as a leader in the continued growth and success of this group.

And a special thanks to CRNIC for hosting such an exceptional meeting and I think that was probably the strongest opening session in a long history of good opening sessions for ICANN, and just a really exceptional speech by the president of Costa Rica. Extremely impressive and visionary for this organization. Perhaps historic.

So just enormous thanks to all of you and I look forward to our continued discussions the rest of the week. Thank you.

LESLEY COWLEY:

Thank you, Rod.

It's nice to be appreciated. We appreciate being appreciated and --

[Laughter]

-- we have an excellent team of ccNSO members and also participants who are not ccNSO members. Everyone is welcome.

Steve.

STEVE CROCKER:

I think the -- all of the right things have been said, and I think this is a good exchange.

That first conclusion is quite compelling. It says that we want to do everything we can to strengthen and grow the ccTLDs. That will increase our contributions and reduce the number of services we have to offer to you.

So thank you.

LESLEY COWLEY:

And thank you, everyone.

We'll move to coffee, and I need cc's back in the ccNSO room ASAP after that. 10 minutes.

Thank you.