
TORONTO – ccNSO Members Meeting Day 1
Tuesday, October 16, 2012 – 09:00 to 18:00
ICANN - Toronto, Canada

LESLEY COWLEY:

Okay good morning everybody. We're going to make a start. If I could encourage you to take your seats, that would be wonderful. I always end up sounding and feeling like a teacher at these events.

So welcome everybody to the ccNSO meeting and welcome particularly to the many familiar faces that I can see and also the new faces. A couple of you have come up to say, "This is my first ccNSO meeting," so I'd like to particularly welcome the newcomers this week. A special thank you to Byron for a wonderful room with windows and our own terrace.

We like rooms like this. We will need to work on achieving better rooms for our next meeting in Beijing – no pressure. Okay, and thank you also to the Program Committee for what is a very full and varied program for our next two days. I'm going to do my best to try and keep us to time to that program which is a bit of a challenge, but we'll try.

The observant amongst you will notice you've been given some colored sheets and there may be times during the meeting where we want to get a feel for people's views on an issue or whether there's interest or no interest. So how this works is green for yes or green – I'm really interested in this matter; red for no – I don't care or definitely not.

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.

And this kind of strange orange color for somewhere in between, so I'm not really sure – maybe I need to know a bit more. Okay? So we will try to use those as we progress over the next two days.

So for today we have a busy program. We are going to begin in just a minute with our discussions on financial issues, strategic plan of ICANN. Then we have our excursion to meet with the ICANN Board. After coffee and the Board, we will go on to IANA – one of our favorite subjects; the Framework of Interpretation group and an update on the WHOIS protocol. And all that before lunch.

After lunch we go to our meeting with the GAC and I have to say we are one of the few supporting organizations meeting with the GAC this week, so we were very keen to keep our regular slots and the GAC were very keen to have us return. Their schedule has been a bit affected this week by their whole day – the high level meeting yesterday.

We carry on in the afternoon with the IDN PDP update and marketing DNSSEC and an introduction to the new My ICANN which was trailed in the opening ceremony yesterday, so a busy day. Let's make a start. For our first session, pleased to introduce Byron Holland who is Chair of the Finance Working Group and Olaf Meyer who is Chair of the Strategic and Operating Plan Working Group. Over to you guys.

BYRON HOLLAND:

Well good morning and welcome everybody. As the meeting host I say a special welcome to Canada and to my old hometown of Toronto and also just let me say that for all of us in the Country Code community, if there's anything that I or my staff can do to help make a restaurant



recommendation – whatever it may be – please don't be shy to ask and welcome to Toronto.

In terms of the Finance Working Group, as most of you know I'm the Chair of that and today I just wanted to provide a status update. For those who were in Prague and are familiar with the work that we are doing, Xavier the CFO of ICANN met with us in Prague and discussed the fact that he wasn't comfortable with the expense area grouping methodology that we've been using to try to allocate resources expended by ICANN on behalf of the Country Code community.

So we got into a discussion about what is the best path forward going to look like. We also had a number of ad hoc or organic discussions that came out of the Prague meeting as a result and I think that one of the key elements that came out of that was it gave us time to pause and reflect on are we on the right path because fundamentally the path chosen was around a fee-for-service-oriented model and that the Country Code community and the Finance Working Group in particular were responding to comments from ICANN and from community members.

It gave us the opportunity to, like I say, reflect and take a more proactive stance on how we were going to approach it. And in a sense, organically, we came to the conclusion that perhaps there was a better way, a better path forward, and as a result of the pause or the space created by ICANN, we took a look at is a fee-for-service model the best path forward.

And I think that the Finance Working Group is coming to the conclusion – or is close to coming to the conclusion – that perhaps a straight fee-



for-service model doesn't really capture the nature of the relationship between the CC community and ICANN cause really the conversation and the conversation that has been going on for years – pre-dating the Finance Working Group here – is ICANN delivers services; we should pay for it – what's the number.

The tact that we're looking at now is more around what is the value that ICANN provides to this community and equally important – what is the value that this community provides to ICANN. We know that our distinct part of the ICANN ecosystem – we run our own environments; we don't utilize the policymaking engine *per se* from ICANN or the compliance engine or a number of others.

But we also bring significant value to ICANN. So the discussion has become more about what is the holistic value exchanged between the two parties – the Country Code community and ICANN itself. And I've had the opportunity and we've had the opportunity – the Finance Working Group – to speak to Xavier about this; we've had the benefit of having some conversation with Fadi who is open to it and understanding of the position.

So that is the path that the Finance Working Group is going down. It is a slight change in direction but I think taking the extra time to pause and reflect on it is going to be worthwhile in finding a better final outcome.

So just to give you a sense of what this means, the way we're describing it is not just a fee-for-service, but an exchange of value between the two parties. And not only is it an exchange of value, but within that there are two parts to each.



One is the quantitative value – what can we easily put a number on? And then there’s the qualitative value – what is more difficult to put a dollar value against, but that we know provides value to one party or the other?

And by way of example hopefully I can flush this out a bit. It’s very important to ICANN to internationalize. Well, who better reflects the international nature of ICANN than this very group? Who has offices in 133 countries around the world? Who has “boots on the ground or feet on the street;” speaks the languages; understands the local culture; is close to local governments often – some more than others – some closer than they wish I suppose.

But no community probably better represents and actually lives that ideal of internationalization than this community so that has significant value to ICANN. Now can you monetize the value of it; can you put a number to that? It’s very, very difficult but we both recognize that there is significant value there on behalf of the CC community that ICANN takes advantage of.

So if you think of it really as the value exchange as a four-part equation from ICANN to the CCs; from the CCs to ICANN – both quantifiable – how much does IANA cost? There’s a very specific number. It would be reasonable that we pay a portion of that clearly identified number. So there’s the quantifiable part and then there’s the qualifier or the subjective component of it like the international component that I just talked about.

So that’s where the Finance Working Group is headed in conjunction with Xavier who I think has bought into this notion to some degree.



Xavier is going to speak to us in a moment or two so hopefully he'll validate that.

The other thing that we've been working on is the notion of principles because there's two parts to the overall discussion. In a sense, what is the number? In other words, what financial contribution should we make. That's half of it. And then the other half is how are we reasonably going to allocate that number between us as the Country Code operators? So two pieces – what's the number and how are we going to divvy it up.

If we believe in the value exchange methodology - which I believe that I can say the Finance Working Group is getting to acceptance on - it's important that we have a basic set of shared principles that we agree on before we get to the "how do we divvy it up" stage because without a doubt there's going to be very differing opinions within this community on the best way to do that.

And I think it's important that we share a set of fundamental high-level principles as we go into that part of the dialog and discussion to have agreement on what those principles are, to allow us to guide the conversation before we get into the nitty-gritty and potentially contentious discussion around how do we divide up that number in a reasonable, justifiable way.

So that's the other thing that we've been working on and trying to get agreement on – a set of high-level principles. It's remarkably challenging. We had a very I would say robust and good discussion on Sunday around some of the proposed principles. We're not by any means there yet in terms of a set of principles that I'd want to put



forward - which we will do - to the community but it's still very, very early days on that.

But that's the work that we've been doing. We've changed the dialog with ICANN, we're sort of changed the paradigm through which we're approaching it. I think it's going to be a much better one in the end though a little bit more complex in the interim and part of what we're doing is agreeing on a set of principles that are going to guide that discussion and help insure that it's a justifiable and equitable one.

So that's what we have been up to. We have a fair amount of work to do between here and Beijing because certainly we would like to come back to you in Beijing with a much clearer picture of where this discussion is headed than we're in right now.

So had a bit of a stumble in Prague but we're back on track and I think we're going to have a better outcome as a result. I'd like to welcome Xavier up to the stage who is going to present or walk you through ICANN's view of what I have just said and hopefully you'll see that there's some similarities to it in a relative consistency. So welcome, Xavier, and I know you have a very busy week so I appreciate the time that you're taking with this community.

XAVIER CALVEZ:

Thank you for the invitation. Again, you've noticed that I'm sitting on this side as well so that she doesn't beat me up. Thank you for this recap. You mentioned Prague. You may remember in Prague that we exchanged on the past and the tools that were laid out in the past to try to work through this difficult exercise.



And as Byron recapped, I think I certainly felt that it was a difficult path to carry out in that there was a more comprehensive view that we needed to bring into this picture, even though it may complexify the first step. This process to Byron's point, I think will get us to a more valuable result at the end.

We have worked since Prague, both in collaboration with Byron and separately within the ICANN staff to try to develop a little bit our perspective of the same subject basically. And I think that the session on Sunday was confirming that the path that we're looking at is very much looking like the one that the Finance Working Group is going down and we are definitely very close to each other I think.

We have to try to go through that very quickly. We have a presentation that we made to the Finance Working Group on Sunday that just tries to put on paper the thoughts that we've had so far and how we're working through this exercise at this stage. And I will stick to this slide for just a second.

This reflects our perspective to what Byron was just saying earlier on the value exchange approach that we have been talking about and to try to reflect. You can see there's a lot of things on this slide and I won't go through every piece of it but I just want to emphasize the left and the right column.

The left column is trying to list the value that the items that contribute to the value that ICANN delivers to the CCs. And the right column is doing the opposite – what value is being brought to ICANN by the CCs. So I won't go in the details of that but I'll take just two examples. And Byron pointed out to some aspects that are very tangible, very clear,



very measurable and others that are very much not so. I'll take two examples – one in each category.

Let's take the meetings for example. We're in a meeting here; ICANN organizes those meetings; ICANN pays for the hotel for a number of consultants that support the infrastructuring zone. But as you all know – and Byron painfully knows right now – the host when there's one incurs a lot of costs. I actually know the amount or at least what the budget demand was for Byron. It's not insignificant; it represents a very meaningful portion of the overall costs that are incurred to host a meeting by various parties.

So if we just take two of those parties that are ICANN and the CCs there is a certain amount that's put through by ICANN and there's a certain amount that's put through by the CC. Those two amounts together represent the cost of the meetings. And we need to take that into account because otherwise we're completely one-sided and this is not a true picture of the value that's delivered by both parties to each other.

So that's a very tangible example, not that it's a simple measurement, but it's a factual one. There's a list of costs that we can come up with on both sides, put that together and see that as a global picture.

A less tangible one is – Byron took the example of the internationalization which I completely agree with and is reflected here. I'll take another one. What is the value on the multi-stakeholder model that ICANN brings to the CCs and the CCs bring to ICANN?

It is obvious that the strength and either the power or the meaningful role that ICANN can have on the governance of the internet through



multi-stakeholder model is very much strengthened by the presence of the ccTLDs in that multi-stakeholder model.

What value would the multi-stakeholder model be without the CCs – with everybody else but without the CCs? That would make a lot less sense. So the participation of the CCs through the ccNSO and the rest of the activities of the CCs in the multi-stakeholder model of ICANN strengthen the position of ICANN in the internet governance.

On the other hand, ICANN can't buy its multi-stakeholder model also strengthens – and I'm sure this is an arguable notion generally speaking but I'll formulate it nonetheless – ICANN helps the CCs strengthen their own multi-stakeholder model at their own level by providing legitimacy of the internet governance on a worldwide basis through a multi-stakeholder model. So this is a very intangible notion; this is not easily measurable by any sense but there is a value exchange there as well.

This exercise on this sheet of paper that's just summarized there – it was an attempt to look at all those pieces and lay them out on the ground so that we can have a comprehensive and fair – as much as possible – understanding of the value exchanged by the two parties - which I don't really see as two parties but as a group that works together – to try to come up with a contribution model.

Just so that you understand a little bit how far we've gone so far in this exercise on our side, we have tried to give a shot at the measurement of that value exchange model because there was a lot of words on the previous slide – not easy to put figures behind them – but we've started getting down that path to see a little bit how things can be formulated.



At this stage we've tried to conceptually create three notions. The value items that are very specific – those that are very tangible – the cost of the meetings is an example of something that's tangible but we've created three buckets that we're thinking will help us capture the entire set of values.

The first one at the top is the very specific costs - the actions that are very specifically defined and that are very narrowly supporting specifically the ccTLDs. Let me take an example that everyone will understand.

Bart's costs and the value that Bart delivers to the ccNSO is very defined, very specific to this organization and exclusive to this organization with a minor set of actions. So that's what we call a specific service in value. We will need to determine how we measure that value. Is the cost the right measurement for that value is a question that we need to answer down the road.

Another bucket is the shared services. So there's a service that can be received by the ccNSO but that's also received by other groups as provided by ICANN. The meetings is one for example. We incur costs for the meetings rooms for example in this hotel and everyone benefits from it to various degrees of intent. But it's a specific service but that's shared among more than just the ccNSO.

And the third bucket is the more global, less tangible sometimes more conceptual types of values that are exchanged. What I was mentioning earlier about the multi-stakeholder model value that's provided to each other between ICANN and the ccNSO or the ccTLDs generally speaking. It would fit in that bucket.



I won't go further than that; I don't think it's necessary, just so that you know we've given a shot at putting numbers through the approach of cost measurement to the specific bucket. We have provided these numbers to the Finance Working Group. I'm not sure how much of interest it is to go over them, but just so that you know, we've tried to give a shot at that exercise and shared with the Finance Working Group so that we'll have a picture of where we could be headed if we think altogether that this is the right path to go through.

When we define those three buckets that I went over just before, one thing that became clear as well is that as much as some items are clearly in one bucket versus the other, others are not necessarily as clear. And the exercise led us to understand that these conceptual buckets that we have formulated are just conceptual buckets.

The boundaries between some of these values between very measurable, very tangible or very intangible and difficult to measure are not clear-cut and I think we will be confronted further with that issue when we go down the path of this exercise if we all decide that's what makes sense.

BYRON HOLLAND:

Thanks, Xavier. So that gives a sense of what the Finance Committee has been up to and where we're at right now. I think that between ICANN and the CC community we believe we've found an appropriate path after a brief course correction coming out of Prague. And as Xavier has said, ICANN or Xavier in particular has taken a stab at producing some numbers just to make sure we have general agreement on where we're headed and I think that's been very positive and constructive.



As I mentioned, I've had the opportunity to speak with Fadi who comes to this discussion and debate with no pre-conceived notions and I felt quite positive about that because as I'm sure you will all recognize, that's a change in tenor from the recent past.

So we don't have a conclusion yet but I'm optimistic that we found a better path and that there's a willingness on the ICANN side to look at this relationship on a more holistic level.

At this point really it is just a status update but if there are any questions or suggestions or concerns while we have Xavier here, be happy to entertain any right now on the work of the Finance Working Group. No?

LESLEY COWLEY:

Thank you for the update. I'd like to just get a feeling from the people in the room as to whether CC managers are comfortable with the direction of travel so far because this is a very important issue for a number of us.

So the current direction of travel is thinking about the value that CCs bring to ICANN and the value that ICANN brings to CCs and then using that dialog to then continue the discussion around allocation of fees I think is what I'm hearing. Are colleagues comfortable with that – this is where the cards come in? Yes, no, don't care. If you don't have cards, could you put your hand up?

Okay, that's really helpful. I'm seeing a lot of green cards and just one red so that's helpful. And for the room at risk of beating people up, this is a conversation that's been going on for an incredibly long time and it



would be nice to see it end. Equally it would be nice to see it end with a good conclusion. Is there an update on the possible timeline for things coming to an end? It would be nice for us not to start a meeting with a discussion around finances forever.

BYRON HOLLAND:

I couldn't agree more. You know, the goal was to be able to produce something for this meeting actually in Toronto; we've been waylaid. The time between now and Beijing is actually fairly lengthy amount of time in terms of time between ICANN meetings and you know, within the Finance Working Group still our goal will be to produce something for comment by the Beijing meeting.

Now that said, we have taken a fairly different tack so it's yet to be seen if we can do that between here and there, but that is certainly the goal. You know, one of the challenges is in trying to come up with a set of principles you think some of them would be very straightforward and easy, but of course, once you get into them, words become challenging sometimes or even the very notion that you think you share has very different interpretations within the community and even within the Finance Working Group where there are only a dozen or so of us.

For example, one of the principles – and we're trying to keep them to be high-level and few in number – is that contributions by CCs to ICANN should be voluntary. So one would think that that was a fairly straightforward understood principle but there was very significant debate on that with some folks thinking, "You know what? It's time that we should stand up and pay full stop. It shouldn't be voluntary; everybody should pay something."



So at principle No. 1 we stumbled on something that we thought would be clear and had a very good and fulsome dialog about that particular question and that proposed principle. So that was principle No. 1 and took some time just to walk through that.

That said – that’s a long-winded answer, Leslie, to my goal would still be to be able to come back one meeting late with a set of suggestions for comment and critique by the community overall.

LESLEY COWLEY:

Okay thank you. I have another clever question if you want one but I don’t want to hog the mic. Anyone else have any questions or comments? Annabeth?

ANNABETH LANGER:

Annabeth Langer - .NO. I just wanted to say that I think I talk for all of us that the Finance Group is doing a very good job and it’s complicated questions and it takes a long time. And also I would like to thank Xavier and ICANN for listening to the Finance Group and it seems like it’s a kind of movement in the right direction. So thank you all of you.

LESLEY COWLEY:

Indeed it’s a lot of work going on in this area. So I’m not sure it is a clever question actually but the question that I am being asked by others that I seem to be asked to ask is that for some people this looks like a conversation around principles so we get you to agree to the principles and then, ah-ha – so that means you’ve agreed to the sum of money at the end. So just maybe can you talk us through what options



CCs will have at the end of this because some are feeling slightly bounced into agreeing principles and then ah-ha, because you've agreed to those principles this is now your bill. And I'd just like to address that straight on.

BYRON HOLLAND:

That's a fair question. I can just say categorically there is no pre-determined outcome; there is no number that we're trying to get a set of principles to back into a number that's already there – that is absolutely not the case. The idea of having a set of principles is as we go into potentially – and I'm not saying it will be but just given that it's about the allocation of money, it has a potential to be a contentious discussion or at least a robust discussion – the notion is having just a set of generally understood principles that could help guide the discussion.

Not guide it in a direction, but have a common understanding of some of the goals like should it be voluntary or not – that was one what we thought would be basic principle. We looked at a number of different elements. And the reason I don't want to put them up right now is literally it was just a first stab at kick the can as the expression is.

So we'll be happy to circulate them once we come to a slightly more well thought-through set of principles and get feedback on them. But there is no goal in having a set of principles get us to a conclusion before there's any sort of conclusion. It's just a way to help us frame the dialog and have a fair and equitable debate about the issue.

LESLEY COWLEY:

Thank you, Byron. Save?



SAVE VOCEA:

Just an additional comment that I think that subject but not necessarily very... or not entirely in the same area, but from a process standpoint I think that from an ICANN perspective we will need – I will need – to insure communication within the ICANN management and staff to progressively keep updated the management of ICANN of the progress that we’re making down the path of the contribution model definition – whatever that model will be – so that I insure that all steps I have the minimum understanding of where we’re going and where we’re at so that at the end we do have buy in on our end if that’s the case.

I’m assuming this is something also that will need to happen on the ccNSO’s side. Just as a concluding comment, there’s nothing that will happen in my views – that’s a pure personal opinion – there’s nothing that will happen on that subject unless we’re in it together – ICANN and the ccNSO.

And that’s as controversially as I’ve done it in Prague, this is exactly what I had in mind. We need to be in by saying what I said in Prague that I didn’t think we were going down the right path because we need to go down the right path together and without doing it together, it’s not going to happen.

BYRON HOLLAND:

Any other feedback or comments? Alright, thank you very much.



LESLEY COWLEY: Okay can we just quickly say thank you to Byron and the Finance Working Group? Save? Thank you. Okay the second part of this agenda item is an update from the Strategic and Operating Plan Working Group for which we have Roelof Meijer from SIDN as the Working Group Chair.

ROELOF MEIJER: Thank you, Lesley. Maybe as a reminder, first you're probably aware the SOP Working Group has the objective to increase the involvement of ccNSO membership in ICANN's operational and strategic planning processes. So the major part of our work is that we provide input and command input for and commands on both ICANN's Strategic Plan, as well as the operational framework and the operational plan and budget.

We had a meeting last Sunday here in Toronto and we looked at ICANN's draft Strategic Plan for the years 2013 to 2016 – this plan came out in September this year. And the idea was that in this session I would share our first observations and I would share the way we would proceed with comments and how to follow with ICANN.

But on Sunday we got some insights and the major insight we got is that first of all our own observation – that there was very little change in this plan as compared to the 2012-2015 plan. We commented as a working group on that plan – I'm sure you've seen the comments. Very little of those comments was taken into consideration if you look at the 13-16 plan so that was our first conclusion.

We had a session with ICANN staff and we asked them to explain to us why there was so little change in this new Strategic Plan. And the



response to that question was that, “Well yes, we have a new CEO and of course, he’s going to influence ICANN strategy, but he is not yet ready to do that,” which is logic. I think he has been there for just over a month now.

But we felt obliged to follow the process that we’ve all agreed upon so we added another year to the plan and we changed what we thought necessary. We had a lengthy discussion with them about that. Kurt Pritz was there as well and he explained to us that somewhere in the course of next year we can expect a completely new approach to ICANN’s strategic planning cycle.

The Strategic Plan will have a five-year time span instead of a three-year time span. It will be on a higher level than the present plan. Quite a few of our recommendations in fact seemed to be taken into account in that process.

So in the end we just came up with a recommendation and it was that ICANN stops working on the 2013-2016 Strategic Plan because there’s no point in adding another year – 2016 – to this plan if we know for sure that in 2013 the whole thing is going to change. It seems to be a waste of time and it seems to be sticking to a process because we agreed upon it, although nobody is going to use the outcome of that process.

It’s a recommendation I’m also going to repeat in our session with the ICANN Board but it means that I don’t have a lot to report to you here. And it also means that you will not get any recommendations from us on this plan which you can use to file your own comments on this 2013-2016 draft Strategic Plan.



What we will do, however, is two things apart from talking to the Board – and I will say the same in the public forum on Thursday – we will come up with a written recommendation which will state what I’ve just said – stop this process; stick to the 2012-2016 plan. If you think that there’s really something that you have to tell the community with regard to this plan, make it a separate document and send that out.

And the second thing that we will do is that as a working group, we will go over our main recommendations and input that we’ve provided over the last few years on the Strategic Plan and we will put that forward as input for the new strategic planning cycle that is going to start somewhere in the first half of next year.

Those two documents of course will go through the membership first before we send them out. And that’s about it, Lesley.

LESLEY COWLEY:

Okay, any questions or comments for Roelof please. Are people generally content with us suggesting that they carry on just with the bit of the plan rather than going through a process for the sake of going through a process? I’m kind of hoping you might be but you never know. Okay. That’s helpful. Thank you.

And for colleagues’ information, I have already raised concerns about the ccNSO inputs not really being heard with the ICANN Chair and it’s on my list of things to discuss also with Fadi when I meet with him later this week. So we have been cited as a good example of a community very well engaged with the Strategic Plan and taking a lead in providing



constructive comments and I guess the frustration is that if that's not heard, we can do something better with our time.

So certainly I'm very much hoping that the Board will also hear that there's no good using us as an example of that if you're not actually doing anything with the input. So hopefully the new process can insure that when input is made – we're not naïve. We don't expect all of the plan to be edited to suit what the ccNSO community wants, but 50% would be acceptable apparently. [laughs] Only 50? Higher, higher, higher.

ROELOF MEIJER:

Yeah, maybe something that I maybe also better share with you is that in Prague ICANN announced that they would create something which is called the Finance Ad Hoc Community Working Group. This Working Group is going to look at the strategic and operational planning cycle from three perspectives – the planning itself; the timeline and the structure and the content of the plan, especially the operational plan and budget.

I've been participating in this working group. They had a session here yesterday and they presented the outcome of their work which I think in principle is a good result. But it's also going to be influenced by this new process which will start somewhere in the course of next year.

I brought it forward and the ICANN staff that was present confirmed that, although this was something very useful, it was not sure that things were going to go exactly as was now decided because of this change in the process.



LESLEY COWLEY: Thank you, Roelof, that's helpful. Can we just be clear – is the comment on the new process also part of the remit of your working group, given that you're very close to that current process? It might be helpful.

ROELOF MEIJER: That's a good question. I'm not too sure. I was participating not as the Chair of the SOP, but just as myself, so this was not an SOP participation and we have not filed a comment as SOP Working Group.

LESLEY COWLEY: Okay, then we will need to think about how we may comment on the new process is my point.

ROELOF MEIJER: Yeah, okay.

LESLEY COWLEY: Okay. Thank you. Anyone else any further comments on this one? We're running ahead of time which is cool. Okay, let's just thank Roelof and the fellow members of the SOP Working Group. I know they've been doing a great deal of work on behalf of the ccNSO which is really appreciated. Thank you.

Okay so the next item on our schedule is the meeting with the ICANN Board so we have time to have a luxurious stroll through the skywalk and then on the left we are meeting them in Metro East at 10:00 a.m. so hopefully that gives us a chance to catch up with colleagues and find our



way to there by 10:00. We'll see you there and then we are back after coffee at 11:00 in this room. Thank you.

[break]

LESLEY COWLEY: Alright welcome back everybody. And we are now going to re-start. We have a section on the meeting agenda concerning IANA and very pleased to welcome back our regular feature – Kim Davies from IANA to give us the IANA update first thing, following which we're going to talk about the IANA contract renewal with a colleague from the NTIA. So Kim, over to you.

KIM DAVIES: Thanks, Lesley. As always, it's good to update you on what we're working on at IANA and get feedback on whether we're on the right direction or not. And I think particularly at this juncture it's an important time to hear back from you.

As you'll hear in the next session in particular, a new IANA contract period with a new set of provisions came into effect on the first of October. We're busy preparing a lot of work that is part of the deliverables under that new contract. Much of the initial publication of those materials is kind of in the 30 to 90 day mark of that period so that the first of the materials relating to new contract deliverables will start coming out in November.



I'll focus firstly on what most of you are most interested in, naturally root zone management and some of the improvements associated with how we do that in accordance with the contract.

Firstly there's a provision in the contract for releasing user documentation for the root zone management function. The goal here is we want to provide clear, open and transparent process documentation.

I think historically it's fair to say that the details of how the root zone management function has been undertaken has been somewhat opaque and having a full understanding by everyone of how the process is conducted, what the requirements are so everyone comes into it without needing to ask additional questions is obviously a goal of ours. It makes the process more efficient and it meets everyone's requirements of being clear about how things will happen.

Now to develop the kind of documentation that will be most useful to you we need feedback. So collaboration with the stakeholders that rely on the documentation of the root zone management function is critical in developing something – a product that everyone can stand behind and find useful on an ongoing basis.

So like I said, one of the requirements of the contract is “user instructions,” effectively documentation of the processes and how you apply for certain types of changes, what the requirements of those changes are and so on.

The aim here - and I'll state the concrete timelines in a lot more detail in these slides are in the ICANN's proposal for the contract. So you can go



to the NTA website, look at ICANN's proposal and you'll find a lot more detail about the items I'm talking about here today. Obviously I'm happy to answer questions and talk to you individually as well, but this is just a high-level summary.

But in essence the first drafts of that user instructions and documentation will be circulated around the side of 2013 and the goal there is to solicit feedback on the content, including whether the nature of the documentation is satisfactory; whether the way things are described is satisfactory and so on.

And the way we'll do that is we'll publish a draft that's being developed by staff and we'll follow the standard ICANN process for engagement. So there'll be the 42-day public comment period; you'll be able to post public comments through that mechanism and those comments will feed into further iteration on those documents.

And of course we're willing to accept feedback whichever form it takes. If you wanted to grab me today in the corner and say, "Here's some feedback right now," me and my colleague is very happy to take that kind of feedback and feed that in as well, but there will be a clear opportunity to follow the ICANN public comment process to respond as well.

Another aspect of the contract deliverables is improved performance reporting. The goal here is we'll publish improved statistical reporting on processing times. Exactly what that looks like is not yet determined. We did put some prototypes in our proposal – it wasn't the intent that that's how it would look.



It was really there as a starting point to demonstrate the kinds of statistics we're able to generate easily. But the actual nature of the reporting function will be largely dictated again by the response we get from you in terms of our stakeholder engagement.

So I encourage you to think about the kinds of reporting that you would find most useful from the IANA functions and feed that into our process of engagement so that when we come up with a reporting standard for the functions, it most addresses your concerns and your needs with respect to how we report to you, how well we do our job.

So I'm not sure it's that valuable to go into detail in the graphs. They're really just samples to stimulate discussion. Like I said, they're in our formal proposal if you'd like to read them, but I wouldn't focus on it too much. I would suggest think about the kinds of reporting that you want to see ICANN provide in relation to the IANA functions and feed that back to us.

There's a number of other aspects that are being modified or adapted in accordance with the new requirements of the new contract and this is just one of the many things that will come up I think during the course of developing this documentation – the accountability and transparency processes and so on.

Right now when we process delegation or re-delegation requests, both... well, for ccTLDs, right now under the process under the previous contract the first time the community was made aware of those was publication of or notice that it was being considered at a future Board meeting.



I guess the open question there is what information should be made public in terms of pending delegation requests and how and when should that information be shared. So it's completely an open question and I just put it in here to sort of plant a flag and seed some thought into how would you like to see ICANN notice pending delegations and how would that process work moving on into the future.

Another aspect of the work we're doing is improving the automation systems we use. I think those that are regular attendees are familiar with the long story of our automation system that we launched in mid-2011. It's been successfully running now for almost 18 months; it's been well received but we have got a lot of feedback.

So we have things we can improve; things we can polish; things we can make a little clearer. So we have a wish list that's been slowly growing and our goal is to implement that and develop a new version based on that feedback to improve the system.

Now of course we're anticipating a number of new gTLD applications to go through the new gTLD process and once they're approved through that process, pass their pre-delegation testing and enter a contract with ICANN, they'll then need to come to the IANA in order to lodge a delegation request.

This is something that we've done in the past, for example, gTLDs in the previous rounds went through a similar process and then most recently in the case of .post, once they've completed contracting, they're ready to launch their registry, they submit a request to IANA and IANA goes through the process of adding them to the root zone.



But recognizing that there was only seven TLDs in the last new gTLD round – and I think we’re expecting more than seven this time around – we want to make that process as efficient as possible. So we’re trying to identify ways to leverage that automation system to make the process of applying for a new gTLD delegation fairly streamlined.

It’s worth emphasizing for those that aren’t aware that with respect to new gTLDs, the assessment of the applicant against all the various criteria is done external to IANA. There’s a whole new gTLD application team; they’re responsible for handing that application. It only comes to IANA after that process has been completed and once the registry has executed a contract with ICANN.

So really the IANA piece is more akin to sort of the routine root zone changes we do day-to-day as opposed to sort of the heavy lifting we might do in the case of a ccTLD delegation.

So I’ve really said what’s on this slide already, but in essence the process is that once an application has gone through the new gTLD application process, once they’ve completed what we call pre-delegation testing which is done outside of IANA, once they’ve contracted with ICANN, the way it’s going to work is that through this other system that manages that process called TAS, TAS will then issue them with instructions on how to launch the request with IANA.

And the registry will have some discretion about when they do that. We know historically some registries are raring to go on the first day. They’re registries already; they want to get it in the root as soon as possible. In other cases, once they’ve executed the contract and got all

that approval done, they need some time in order to establish the registry to hire staff and so on.

So it will vary on different circumstances when that will happen, but when the applicant is ready to have that entry in the root zone, they then approach IANA to seek delegation with the gTLD.

The exact process of that test handoff is being finalized but we anticipate it to be relatively straightforward. We're looking at ways that information that already has been connected doesn't need to be re-collected to try to make it as streamlined as possible.

And like I said before, really the goal here is how we make this process as close as possible to a routine root zone request, bearing in mind IANA's not responsible for that – the bulk of the assessment – as it is in the case of ccTLDs.

I mentioned before I think the improvements expect to see over the next year to the system. We'll update the web interface, in particular some of the email and web software we use as a basis for the system was state of the art in 2006 when we started writing [RZM], but not state of the art today. So we have some ideas on how to improve that and make it more efficient and easy to use.

There's a couple of aspects of the program where we see people trip up in their understanding of it so we have ideas on how to make that a bit clearer, whether it's adding some explicit instructions or slightly rephrasing how things appear on the interface.

And we're also noticed that a lot of contact confirmations fail in that the way contact confirmations are done right now we ask the admin and



tech contact for every domain to consent. We have some sort of explicit instructions in that email. You can either go to a web link – do it *via* the web or you can respond with a very precise phrasing that says, “I accept,” or “I reject.”

And it’s an automatic system; it looks for those precise words and if those precise words appear on the first line it triggers. But we’ve looked through the last year where the correspondence and a lot of people would write, I approve; I agree; yes; why are you emailing me – a bunch of things. But it’s not as robust as we’d like now.

It’s never been a problem in the sense that whenever that happens it doesn’t go into a trash can; it goes to a staff member to review. So right now the process is that if you don’t follow the instructions explicitly, goes to one of our staff; the staff review the email; if the intent is clear, we then manually mark it according to what we think the intent was.

But we’d like to make it as streamlined as possible because it’s in everyone’s benefit that the system automatically recognize as many responses as possible.

So just some other IANA developments – well, it’s no surprise – the IANA contract commenced on first of October and part of the new obligations under the new contract, part of the growth associated with new gTLDs and so forth were in need of additional staff. We have more work coming towards us for a variety of reasons and the team needs to grow to accommodate that.

I think we’re relying a lot on existing systems and processes that have been streamlined so it’s not anticipated a huge amount of growth but



I'm just looking at the simple work chart of the IANA program right now. Under the request processing side which is run by Michelle Cotton, we're looking for one additional person to work in that area.

And on my side which is the sort of development area, I'm looking for an additional person to help with development. So a modest increase in IANA staff but a necessary one in order to accommodate the new systems and new requirements coming at us in the next 12 months.

And then really to round out the updates, DNSSEC – I'm always happy to report that we've now been going several years and we've conducted 10 key ceremonies successfully. We've added in the lifetime of assigned root zone 234 DS records without problem; removed 135 as well. I think that process is really going as smoothly as anyone could hope. So we're very pleased with that.

With respect to IDN ccTLDs, it's fair to say the demand has tapered off – it's completely understandable. Those countries that the Fast Track was designed for have mostly exercised their opportunity to utilize the process. We still have a few going through the process today but we don't see the same volumes of requests that we saw in the first year to 18 months.

So right now we have 33 new ccTLDs that are Fast Tracked IDNs. They represent 23 different countries; 23 languages; 15 scripts. The new IDN ccTLDs that we have from this year – Malaysia, Oman and Kazakhstan.

And it's not just IDN ccTLDs. We know that there's been 116 IDN gTLDs applied for under the new gTLD Program. Obviously it's outside of our remit to know how many the number will actually get delegated.



They're going through the evaluation process right now, but the number in IDN TLDs in total is expected to rise when they start coming to the IANA process. So that's really all I have to talk to you about today. I'm very happy to hear feedback on anything.

LESLEY COWLEY:

Thank you very much, Kim. Kim, I'm aware you live and breathe IANA and you referred several times in your presentation to the contract proposal to the NTIA. I'm just kind of curious as to whether we all are as familiar with the contract proposal as you obviously are. So a quick test of the card system and also to see if we're all awake.

To what extent are people familiar with the IANA proposal? I just wonder if everyone is up to date. Is it something you know really well, so you know exactly what Kim is asking us to comment on or nope, don't know or I'm aware of it but I don't really know the detail?

[background conversation]

LESLEY COWLEY:

The contract proposal that was accepted. Kim referred to it as a proposal. Okay, thank you. So I'm not seeing many green cards which is kind of what I thought might be the case, so I think as a community, we're not as familiar with the proposal that was accepted as we might be.



Therefore we're probably not yet in a position to be able to give you informed comment back. So that's something that we will need to address somehow.

KIM DAVIES:

And that's completely understandable and I think those in the room here are the most up to date and there's a whole community of ccTLDs outside of that that don't have the luxury of these updates.

I think that's part of the challenge and when we explain to the community why we're doing these consultations, we're going to have to explain the contractual basis on why we're doing them; the constraints that are imposed upon us and why we're effectively doing it. So a lot of it is incumbent on us to educate the community about the process, the timelines and so on.

LESLEY COWLEY:

Okay, so do I take from that that there'll be an abridged version for us to then be able to make input on how you implement that?

KIM DAVIES:

I think that we can save you reading hundreds of pages of documents by pointing you strategically to the sections that refer to these consultations which is not a large aspect of it. So whether that's an abridged version or just sort of the Cliff Notes... But I think we can point you to the relevant sections.



LESLEY COWLEY:

Okay. If there is to be a consultation, obviously the quicker the CCs can get to the key areas, that would be great to see if maybe some of the new coms team that you have now within IANA, within ICANN could assist with that, that would be great. The last thing we need to do is wade through hundreds of pages to find the one section that we need to comment upon. Okay, any questions or comments for Kim please. Nigel? Do we have a mic, Christina?

NIGEL ROBERTS:

So thank you. I was just scribbling some of this down as you were saying it. But we're all very interested at the moment in the question that you posed rhetorically about what should be made public and when. And I think this is a very important thing, a very important thing that we should be clear about and everybody should know.

I've got two things. If you'd like a comment on my view about that, which I'm happy to share with an email to you as soon as we're finished, and I've got a bit of a question which you may or may not have. It's a statistical question – you may or may not have the particular figure at your fingertips but if you can get back to me later in the day that would be helpful if you don't.

What should be made public and when? Well, I think the IANA is bound to follow three things, bound by three things – ICANN's Bylaws; the IANA contract – the latest one – the proposal that was accepted and the existing policies such as RFC 5091.

Now you can interpret those, you can take the sort of guidance into account which is perhaps GAC-Principles; perhaps the working progress



immediately notify the admin and tech contact for that domain, advise them of this request and seek to ascertain their position on the request.

NIGEL ROBERTS: Okay, I'm not going to press you on ancient hypotheticals, so I'm going to take the answer to be all of them in the current...

KIM DAVIES: Yeah, in practice, yes.

NIGEL ROBERTS: Yeah, okay.

LESLEY COWLEY: Okay anyone else? Eberhard? And whilst the mic is... Also you've referred to a consultation? What is the timeline for that consultation?

KIM DAVIES: So there's various different aspects of consultation. In fact you might have consultation fatigue in six months because each different aspect of deliverables under the contract has a different requirement for consultation. And broadly speaking, all the different aspects of the contract require consultation.

So we've provided in our accepted proposal timelines and they're staggered over a period so that we don't launch 28 different consultations all on November 1, so we're trying to spread the pain out



a little. But we do have definitive timelines in our proposal and like I said, I'll provide references to those.

LESLEY COWLEY:

Okay so as Chair I'd be interested in when those are due to start and when they're due to end, particularly given the number of red and orange cards earlier where this is an area that's key to ccTLDs, therefore, we might need to get more up to speed before we are in a position to comment on any consultations. Eberhard?

EBERHARD LISSE:

I almost overheard in that sense when Nigel asked you how many changes for... Sorry – Eberhard Lisse - .NA. I almost overheard when Nigel asked you how many changes for manager are pending, but I clearly didn't hear you answer it. Can you please answer that and I would like to place on record that this question has been asked and I would like to get an answer. How many changes for managers are currently pending?

KIM DAVIES:

The answer that was relayed to me was six. I don't have my computer in front of me.

EBERHARD LISSE:

Okay, six. I just wanted to make sure.



LESLEY COWLEY:

Okay, anyone else? Alright so we'll look forward to hearing a bit more on the consultation timeline if you could and the communication that enables us to get more up to speed would be really appreciated. And in the meantime, can we thank him. Thank you.

Okay and I can see at the back of the room we have next up Vernita Harris from the NTIA who's going to speak to us continuing the IANA theme on the IANA contract renewal updates.

Keith has very kindly volunteered because he already has Q&A developed for you, Vernita. If someone could fix the screen in the front, that would be wonderful. It's flashing on and off. Okay, over to you both.

KEITH MITCHELL:

Okay thank you, Lesley and welcome Vernita. I guess everyone in the room recalls that NTIA went through a process of public consultation over the IANA contract, starting with a Notice of Inquiry, followed up with a further Notice of Inquiry and it became fairly obvious to us all I think as a result of that further Notice of Inquiry that NTIA was listening and prepared to make changes to the contract based on the input of the stakeholders.

So I think a lot more people took the further Notice a bit more seriously and committed to making submissions and I think now we're seeing as a result the contract has clearly been significantly modified. I think this is our first opportunity since that contract has been signed and put in place to actually talk to NTIA.



And behind NTIA's efforts to do that, as Vernita Harris who has I think been listening carefully to us and Vernita, you came to us immediately after the [Cinta] meeting so some of our [Cinta] members have probably already heard some of what you're going to say.

But I understand you've got a presentation first and then we've got some Q&A specifically on the new contract and certainly this is an interactive session, so if you're paying attention and not doing your email, prepare your questions and we'll have plenty of time for that. We have I think 30 minutes in all, don't we, Lesley? So I thank you, Vernita.

VERNITA HARRIS:

Thank you, Keith. I'm Vernita Harris from the Department of Commerce, International Telecommunications – NTIA – Office of International Affairs. I'm the Deputy Associate Administrator for that that office. Fiona Alexander is the Associate Administrator.

So a little bit about myself – I took over the management of IANA functions contract for the Department of Commerce in 2008. My background is more spectrum, it's more radial spectrum, regulatory-based for government users and this was a new portfolio for me. It's very, very different. Policy for radial spectrum is very different from policy for internet governance issues and it was a huge learning curve.

So I apologize because I know I've probably made some mistakes but I think I've learned from them. One of the biggest drivers for me when this contract was expiring was I want to understand what it is that the community expects from this contract – what's involved in it; what's



included – because I wasn't very clear. And my predecessor, Kathy Hanley, was awesome. She sat down with me and she really for a couple of hours, she walked me through the different aspects.

But I was like, okay, I got it; I get it, but I still wanted... when I went to meetings I heard very different views and some of them were not... they weren't nice and it was a very hard pill to swallow I would say. And so I wanted to do something different.

So I asked what was the process for engaging the community on the expiring contract? What could we do? What were the limits? And I didn't have any limits actually. This had never been done before for the IANA functions, so we did an NOI.

An NOI basically just asks some questions based on what I had heard in the community since 2008 and so we did that – went with an NOI and I thought that the responses were very good. I thought that they gave me an insight into what the community was expecting. Saw some frustrations in the responses and so based on those responses, we decided to do a further notice of NOI which would then include the Statement of Work.

And my understanding based on the historical records at NTIA, the Statement of Work had never been put out for bid – ever. It hadn't changed since the first contract in 2000. So that was a huge milestone for us but I thought it was important and Assistant Secretary Larry Strickling thought it was important.

Similar to our process with Affirmation of Commitments, we have wanted to develop an environment at NTIA that all the issues were



done in a multi-stakeholder environment. They were just not in the government's purview because for us the multi-stakeholder environment includes everyone on an equal footing.

So the procurement process is we took two consultations – the initial request for proposal – I know some of you probably was counseled because based on the new Statement of Work which had a number of enhanced requirements, none of the proposals met those requirements and that was pretty important.

It was a very difficult decision to cancel the [recitation] because we understood that we would be criticized for this but it was also equally important for us that we get this right. We did not want to be criticized as to giving a contract to an entity that didn't meet the global requirements that the global community had requested, so we took that chance and we cancelled it and it was reissued on April 16.

So the implementation roadmap for us – it includes the multi-stakeholder environment. I'm just going to get it out there very early. I know that since 2008 I've heard this – that the U.S. Government has unilateral control over the internet. Well, I wish I understood that, but I'm here to tell you that we don't going forward, and I can see how that could have been the perception based on the old contract, but the new contract – this is a shared responsibility.

It is a responsibility that the U.S. Government takes very seriously because of its stewardship role. But going forward, this contract will be shared by the global community. No decisions will be made on this contract without input from the global internet community.



Multi-stakeholder and governance – that’s extremely important to us. At NTIA we have since Assistant Secretary Strickling came on board, we have all our issues on internet governance have been done in a multi-stakeholder environment concept and mind. We’ll ask the community questions; we have tools available to us – Notice of Request for Comments; we can have public meetings.

Some of the feedback on our consultation process for the NOI has been we think, yes, you heard us; yes, you’ve incorporated but maybe you didn’t get some of it right. Perhaps if you had a dialog that it would have helped to have a better understanding of the comments. And I take that criticism, I say, great; that’s a good point, so going forward we will try to implement in any of our public consultations a dialog period so that we could have a dialog on the comments received.

These are the stakeholders for the contract. This is not an exhaustive list but these are the main ones that I think that have a major input into the IANA functions contract.

Your root zone partners are ICANN, NTIA and Verisign, but the root zone partners are basically implementing the policies that the community has developed. Where the root zone partners are not doing this in isolation it is in conjunction with you. Again I can’t say this enough – this is a shared responsibility going forward. Policies will no longer be developed just by NTIA; they will be developed by you.

So the consultations that are in the contract will be extremely important. There are a number of them; I can go through them with you but this is your contract so the consultation is the ICANN proposal



proposes a path forward and every deliverable in the contract has to have a consultation and your involvement is extremely critical.

I will be guided by four core values/principles when I am implementing this contract – integrity – so I have three kids ages 9, 11 and 9. As early as they could speak or have a conversation with me, they understood that trust was extremely important to me; that is my No. 1 value for my kids is that you're always honest with me.

And integrity is extremely important because if you're honest and people trust you, they will never question your integrity. So I don't want the global community to ever question the integrity of me as a contract officer/representative in this contract because that's extremely important and I live it my day-to-day life – that's integrity and trust and honestly is one of the values that I think that you cannot skip on – that's how people judge you.

And so what I mean by that – even if no one's looking you can expect NTIA to do the right thing. We're not going to do anything without the community knowing about it.

Integrity – based on honesty and trust, the NTIA will do the right thing, even when no one's looking. So you can expect that we will implement this contract and like I said, integrity and trust is the foundation for us.

Intent – decisions are shared. NTIA does not intend to make unilateral decisions meaning if there's not a policy in place, it won't get implemented. So it is imperative that for every change, there's a policy in place for it.



Results – consensus policy decisions developed by the global community will be implemented. This is your contract; we will implement what you tell us to implement. It's a shared responsibility; it's not NTIA's responsibility unilaterally to make a decision.

Capability – policy development will be bottom-up and transparent. The processes for implementing this contract will be transparent and we have the capability to scale in our office to do what is required to implement this contract.

So these are the core values; these four core values will be the cornerstones for implementing this contract going forward. So at NTIA I have a very open door policy – you can call me; you can contact me – I will try to get an answer, working with our contractor we will try to get you an answer to a question.

I've heard in the past that NTIA wasn't accessible. I don't want you to think that we're not accessible because we are; we are listening and we're going to continue to listen.

So I found this quote from Warren Buffet and I thought it was pertinent here. "It takes 20 years to build a reputation and 5 minutes to ruin it. If you think about that, you'll do things differently."

And NTIA has a very good reputation about implementing – well I think we have a very good reputation for implementing and not doing anything that the community doesn't like. So I want to keep that reputation; I want to maintain that. That is extremely important to me.

So the new IANA functions contract – I think we've said this before – is based on open procurement process. Just so you know, in the past the



contracts have been sole source; going forward, the Department says no contract can be sole source anymore so it had to be fully competed.

And I thought that was a very... the contract was not something that our contracting folks had understood because it is a no-cost contract; there are no fees associated with it. So some of the requirements on the procurement process didn't apply and it was difficult to try to get them to understand, but once they understood the sensitivity and understood that the Statement of Work that was developed with the community could never change – it couldn't just arbitrarily change because it didn't fit with the vehicle that we had – that was smooth sailing; it was fine.

The proposal that was implemented are based on the requirements of the global community. The award of the contract is on NTIA's website. You could go there and see and the link it here.

The Period of Performance is October 1, 2012 to September 30, 2015. If all options are exercised, the contract will expire in 2019. So I have a little faux pas; I need to go back.

It wasn't necessarily a unilateral decision but it was an editorial that was a mistake in the R of P that was on April 16. When we cancelled it we didn't make a change. So the delivery dates in the contract changed and you should see on the website soon that it was unfair since ICANN was the contractor that won the contract again, it was unfair to them to implement the old contract and continue to be responsible for it meeting the deliverables of the new contract cause there were a number of deliverables in the old contract that they had to fulfill.



So we did an amendment and the period of performance is the same, but the delivery dates changed. So the delivery dates now correlate with the start of the contract, October 1, so all delivery dates are from October 1. So if you saw six months, nine months in the delivery schedule, they have changed.

The core functions – the core functions remain the same. They remain the same basically but what we did do based on the NOI and the FNOI, we moved ARPA from other services and we moved it to protocol parameters because that was where it belonged. But basically everything else is the same.

The enhanced requirements – clear separation between policy development associated with IANA services; robust company-wide conflict of interest policy; heightened respectful local national law; consultation reporting requirements to increase transparency and accountability.

So clear separation – that’s where you come in – is the contract requires consultation with the community on every aspect of the new requirements.

Robust company-wide conflict of interest policy – that has been implemented. Heightened respect for local national law – one of the issues that we heard repeatedly when I was on travel between 2008 is that there was no respect for national law. Why was a private sector company approving ccTLD delegation re-delegations?

So with that the new contract does not require the ICANN Board to approve ccTLD delegations. They can, however, look at to make sure



that their staff – the ICANN IANA staff – has followed the agreed process by the community.

Consultation and reporting requirements – in this contract there are no performance standards. The Department did not – and that was something that the Department didn't understand – that we didn't have performance standards – we did not feel at NTIA that it was our responsibility – well, I shouldn't say responsibility – it would be inappropriate for us to set performance standards for this contract.

Because the performance standards that we may agree to may not be what the community agrees to so the community now gets to set their performance standards. How long should it take for a name server change? How long should it take for a delegation change? That will come from you. That information comes from you. You get to set your performance standards; it's not set by the Department of Commerce; it will be set by the global community.

So I have this blank slide. What will the IANA functions canvas look like in 2015? What will it say? What do you want to get out of it? What are your expectations? I'm listening; I want to hear.

This is your contracting representative team. I'm your lead and I do have an alternate - some of you may know her as Ashley Heineman. So this is our contact numbers. You can contact me any time. Thank you.

KEITH MITCHELL:

Thank you. Thank you, Vernita and could I just say by way of comment that certainly I guess through my role as the Chair of the Framework of Interpretation working group and delegations/re-delegations working



group, the need for information from NTIA has been probably more significant than the average ccTLD would go through. So I guess Larry, Fiona and yourself have been proven to me to be very accessible and very forthcoming with information.

So I'm verifying that in fact, approachability is a key and Vernita, since you've been on board, both with the .NZ submissions and in terms of requesting you to attend Asia/Pacific IGF meetings and talk about the contract, you've been most willing and most open so thank you for that.

Can I pose a couple of questions that are really, really important to me and then I'll open up to the floor for questions. Firstly, what do you see as the relevance or the importance of the work that we've done within the ccNSO on delegations and re-delegations and the Framework of Interpretation that we're currently working on? What do you see there in terms of its importance to the future of the contract?

VERNITA HARRIS:

So I can tell you that I did read the huge working group document before the Framework of Interpretation and I tried to map it to the current policies and some of them I could and some of them I couldn't. The most important – I think it's very, very important that we have clear guidelines for delegation and re-delegation.

I think going forward what I would like to see is a report format that the community has agreed to. It doesn't need to be text. What are the requirements for delegation and re-delegation based on the policy that exists today - RSC 1591 and the GAC-Principles. And whatever the

framework interpretation, however, they enhance those two policy documents - I think that's important.

I think that when a delegation request comes to the Department or to me, it should be, "Yes, it follows those policies. This is a policy," and it's done. To be honest, it takes me 30 to 60 seconds to do a routine change. I'm making sure the process is followed.

However on a delegation/re-delegation I do have to read reports, so I'm looking to make sure the language is standard; to make sure if it's a hostile delegation, that all the processes have been followed. So I think that the process could be clearer. I think that the documentation for a re-delegation could be clearer but again, I'm looking at the community to do that.

KEITH MITCHELL:

Okay, so potentially then, given the expiry of the existing contract as 2015, it's possible that we may have a frame well before that that may be able to be activated by IANA. Would you see the 2015 renewal as being a point at which you could codify that into the contract in terms of a framework that provides greater color and depth actually being embedded in the contract or is it something that should exist outside and alongside and be referred to by the contract?

VERNITA HARRIS:

So the current contract has under the delegation/re-delegation for CCs, it says that RSC 1591 and the GAC-Principles or the policy and any enhancement by. So I can already see that it's already included in the contract. If the community sees that it's better to embed that even



further to have whatever the community comes up with as an amendment, that could be done as well.

But the only danger I see in doing that is that every time you amend the contract to include, if it changes you will have to do an amendment. So I think that we could find some innovative ways to do that without necessarily having... But you know what – it's up to the community. I'm not going to pre-judge, so whatever the community would like.

KEITH MITCHELL:

Okay thanks, Vernita. And my other question – the new contract does impose a fair grade of separation between the policies and the operations of IANA so policies are seen as a discreet area developed by a true multi-stakeholder process and not guessed at by IANA staff or ICANN Board and certainly in the delegations/re-delegations report you'll see some decisions that were made by guesswork rather than by established policy and so on.

And I think internet .NZ does part of its submissions on FNOI were very, very stringent on this idea that there must be distinct and unique walls and policy development must be done at arms' length from the implementation and so on.

So I guess it's more an observation than a question but thank you for taking note of (inaudible) and its concerns. We're very much a principles-based organization; we do everything based on principles and we see the structural separation need quite often not adhered to. So thank you for responding to that and any further comments on that.



Was there any tension on you? Were there any competing tensions in that regard?

VERNITA HARRIS:

No, I don't think so. I think that if you read the comments from the NOI and FNOI, especially the NOI number of commenters, it expressed concern that there seemed to be no separation between the development of policy and the technical implementation and that there should be a clear separation.

I think the first iteration of the Statement of Work appeared to say that the IANA function staff could not even engage to provide clarifications and I think that that was fixed in the contract going forward.

However, I would like to say that for instance – I give the protocol parameters as an example – their policies are such that they're developed in RFCs – their other policies. So how does the IANA functions staff work then? In that case it's extremely appropriate for them to assist in developing an RFC because that's their working methods.

So I guess what is the working methods for this space to provide comments or to develop the policy? Is it just the NFOI because I do see that some CC managers aren't members of the ccNSO. So it is extremely important that we strike this balance and I'm not sure what that balance is so we will be looking for feedback.



KEITH MITCHELL: Okay, just noting that RFC 1591 was developed at a time where perhaps it was a bold move that ensued public policies and what's normally a technical sort of standard. So I'm not sure that the IETF would be too keen to entertain an RFC process that purely says public policy.

Anyway, we've got a few minutes for questions so can we open up the floor? Eberhard I think is first. Sorry, just to interrupt, could you also advise which ccTLD you're associated with just for Vernita's purposes.

EBERHARD LISSE: Eberhard Lisse - .NA. You say GAC advises policy. I don't recall any policy development process in these regards so I always was thinking that government GAC advisors advise, not policy. Also how would an RFC apply to a ccTLD that was established before the drafting of that RFC?

VERNITA HARRIS: So I'm going to repeat your question so to make sure that I understood it correctly. GAC-Principles are advice and not policy and that how do you deal with a CC that was... I'm not sure I understand the term you used – that... pre-1591 – is that your question? Okay.

So if you read the contract – and this is... so the Government Advisory Principles and Guidelines – so policy maybe isn't... in a sense it's not in the same sense that you're speaking of; it's not a policy development. But they're the principles and based on the Notice of Inquiry the GAC-Principles were mentioned by just about 99% of the respondents.



And so for us that was, okay this is extremely important to the global community – these GAC-Principles – so they should have a place in this contract as policies that have impact on ccTLDs or ccTLD dates.

As far as the CC before 1591 – that’s a good question. I’m not sure of the answer and I don’t want to give you a wrong answer. I don’t know. I think it’s something that the community needs to discuss. It’s not something that the Department can interpret. I think that’s one of those issues that should be discussed in the community.

KEITH MITCHELL:

It’s certainly noted within the Framework of Interpretation is doing anyway that we have often noted that the position relating to pre-1591 delegations is unclear. So whether or not there’s a need for a policy development process or just leave it as unclear is unknown. Nigel?

NIGEL ROBERTS:

Nigel Roberts - .gg (Guernsey). I apologize to Vernita for what’s going to be a little bit repetitive because it’s something I said at the Centa meeting only a week or so ago but I think it’s important to put on record here in this community what I said then which is to thank Vernita and her team for actually genuinely taking into account input that was submitted during the contracting process, particularly on my own – not only me and others who made comments about the separation of powers and the rule of law.

And by reading what came out of the process it was clear there was a genuine effort to listen, take into account the submissions that were made in writing, obviously with some time, by everybody who



submitted comments, and the output shows that and I'd like to say thanks again.

I mean the rule of law and separation of powers worked for the framers of the Constitution of the United States; I think it works for us. Thank you.

KEITH MITCHELL:

That's probably quite an appropriate point on which to end this discussion and Vernita, I understand you're here for a couple of days and you're probably joining us for dinner tonight. So if you have some questions for Vernita that you didn't feel comfortable raising in this moment, keep an eye out cause Vernita will be around.

Thank you, Vernita and NTIA for listening; thank you for probably taking more account of the ccTLD community than your other communities relating to the IANA data base. Thank you for the modifications to the contract; thank you for understanding multi-stakeholders and thank you for your commitment going forwards to insure that we become closer rather than further apart. So please join me in thanking Vernita.

LESLEY COWLEY:

Okay thank you. I think that's an item that needs to come back on our agenda for Beijing, particularly regarding these series of consultations where you'll be looking for CC input which I'm sure we'll be delighted to let you have. Obviously IANA is a key area for all of us so we look forward to further conversations. Thank you Vernita.



We're going to move on now to an associated topic which is the Framework of Interpretation Working Group update from Keith and Bernie. I was recalling that we had an IANA Working Group some years back, Bernie, where we looked to IANA reporting and time scales and so on. So that's coming back round again, you'll be pleased to know.

KEITH DAVIDSON:

Quick change of hats – FOI Working Group. My name is Keith Davidson and I'm the Chair of the FOI Working Group. The Framework of Interpretation Working Group is meeting on Thursday and you're all welcome to attend, but I will recover the process that we follow.

So today's presentation will cover the scope of the Framework of Interpretation – the process we're following; the topics; our activities recently; the topic of consent; the topic of significantly interested parties and the topic of revocation which were really the three major topics that we've been focusing on to develop the framework.

So the scope of the Working Group – we look at RFC 1591 and the GAC-Principles 2005 as being the applicable policies and guidelines to guide our way. The Framework of Interpretation is to add color and depth to existing policies and guidelines and out of scope changing applicable policies and guidelines and it's very important to us that whenever we wander down a path that we might be inventing new policy, which we're always tempted to do, we remind ourselves of this being out of scope. We cannot create policy on the fly.

And the IANA functions contract – including contract implementation issues – is out of scope. And probably we should add a further out of



scope, that is, issues of individual or applying to individual delegations or re-delegations are not appropriate for the working group to comment on.

We're increasingly under pressure to comment and participate in discussions on individual delegations and re-delegations and that's not part of our purpose. Our purpose is to provide this framework in itself.

We prepare a draft set of interpretations on a specific topic and we're ably assisted by Bernie Turcotte who many of you remember was formally involved with .CA but is contracted by ICANN to provide support to the working group.

So Bernie and a small executive team prepares a draft set of interpretations and the working group undertakes a series of discussions on that draft, finalizes a draft and then undertakes a public consultation of that interpretation. We review the comments and the input from the public consultation and prepare a final report.

The GAC and ccNSO support for the final report on all topics is sought and expected and it would be a failure of the Framework of Interpretation if it didn't have the support of those communities. And submissions of the final report will go to the ICANN Board from the ccNSO confirming the support from both GAC and ccNSO and a report with recommendations.

And it may be that the GAC at that point may consider either appending the framework to its GAC-Principles or amending its principles to incorporate the Framework of Interpretation but that's over to the GAC. But certainly that would be a way of creating policy without us going



through a ccNSO policy development process because the GAC advice to the Board becomes policy and of course, it can and will. And if it's done cohesively with their support, then it should become useable policy.

So the topics for interpretation – we had the concept of consent and what is meant by consent for delegation and re-delegation requests and that topic we concluded after a public consultation process. We have a final report on that so that was chapter one of our work.

We then went on... significantly interested parties was chapter two. We concluded our work on that and during the public consultation process we had some useful feedback from the GAC in particular and we are just in the process of addressing the final aspects of the GAC's input and preparing our final report so I don't foresee any significant problems in finalizing that section.

And revocation or uncontested re-delegation and our work on that is in progress. Revocation is a term that is referred to in RFC 5091 with no definition and with a revocation forms pattern, an un-consented re-delegation or not is one of the issues that we're discussing.

The NIC stage after knocking over these three significant aspects of the framework, then we're seeking to develop a comprehensive glossary or terminology paper so that during delegation and re-delegation requests we will see a consistent set of terminology used that is well-defined and therefore well-understood.

And recommendations for IANA reports on delegations and re-delegations will be a final part of our work so that's how to operationalize the framework for IANA or with IANA, I should say.

We have met six times by teleconference since Prague. We've published a progress report which is linked to this session and as I said, we're currently working on the topic of revocation. The final consent topic can be found there and it will be included in the final report from FOI Working Group to the ccNSO and the GAC.

The status on SIP, the public consultation is closed. The working group is preparing its final report, taking into account the GAC's input. Revocation – we should publish our initial recommendations on revocation in time for the, well, summer 2013 – it depends whose summer... by the first ICANN meeting next year.

We are meeting here in Toronto on Thursday in Harbor C from 1:00 p.m. to 4:00 p.m. This is probably our last chance to get down to some of the real basic issues that have been annoying us on the last six calls on the topic of revocation and I'm hopeful that we can steer a path through.

We've made some very good progress in the last few days between Vice Chair Becky Burr and Nigel on a couple of sticking points so I think we have a pathway through. But please do come along, anyone, if you want to observe. The working group will have a priority in terms of discussing the topics but observers may get a point to raise their concerns if they have any as well. And that is our report. Are there any questions?

LESLEY COWLEY:

Okay so I can ask one just cause nobody else put their hand up first. Ah good, we have Peter. As the mic is going to Peter, listening to Kim's presentation earlier, there was a reference to consulting on some of the



reporting on IANA and I think that there was an element of that included in the scope of the FOI Working Group.

I'm just concerned to think about how we're going to pick up all of these many consultations that we're going to be consulted on, whether that be through the FOI Working Group or through a technical working group or through some other reincarnation of the IANA Working Group for example. Is this in the work plan?

KEITH DAVIDSON:

Well yes, definitely. Do you want to comment? Yes, definitely, in terms of... I'm not going to answer in terms of any other working group, but in terms of the FOI Working Group, we've had some initial discussions already with Kim and when we were initially proposing that we would do a chapter-by-chapter approach, we were starting to get to a level of detail about implementation along that path.

But because we've backed off the "let's finalize each chapter and implement immediately," since we've backed off from that we'll do that at the end of the report. But certainly it is probably the most critical final feature rather than just having a report that's there that nobody's ever going to look at.

LESLEY COWLEY:

Thank you. Peter?

PETER VAN ROSTE:

Thank you, Lesley. My name is Peter Van Roste from CENTR. Keith, we had a recent discussion on this by coincidence this morning but it might



be interesting to let people know as well that, while obviously you're not looking to specific cases of delegation or re-delegation and will not be forming an opinion or suggestions on that, people are sometimes asking whether they can still feed information into your fact-finding. Is that closed or is that still welcome, and if so, how can they best do that?

KEITH DAVIDSON:

Formally it's closed. Fact-finding was the Delegations and Re-delegations Working Group which closed and came up with what it saw were the discrepancies. However, if there's a whole new set of discrepancies emerging, I guess it would be appropriate to be aware of them, but it's just that we're not [compelled] to act in any way.

So if people have issues relating to a re-delegation that's occurred I think we'd be happy – Bernie or Becky or I or the three of us – would be happy to listen to the issues but we can't act in any way.

PETER VAN ROSTE:

Thanks.

LESLEY COWLEY:

Okay, so we have Nigel and then Eberhard.

NIGEL ROBERTS:

Thanks. I waited to the last because as a member of the Working Group it's important to give everybody else a chance to ask questions. Something that came on the slide which I think is of quite some interest - and it's to do with the formal process rather than the actual work



we've been doing – which is that the buy-in at the end of the process is expected from the GAC and from the ccNSO.

Now I'd be very disappointed if the ccNSO chose to reject what we did but I guess that's always a possibility. And the GAC are also members of the Working Group so I would hope that any objections would be coming out in the work before we reach the point of writing the draft report.

But assuming that something did come out from either the ccNSO Council or the GAC, would it be not appropriate to expect reasoned objections, in other words, reasons rather than just saying, "We don't like it."

KEITH DAVIDSON:

I would anticipate that to be the case and certainly I don't know if you've been following the discussions in the GAC, but the GAC sometimes in open session go into their dialog on FOI matters. And certainly there is significant interest and significant support for the work that we're doing and of course, at each joint GAC/ccNSO session we're repeating it there.

And I think given the depth and color of the participants from the ccNSO, you would have to say if the Working Group comes up with a consensus then it's pretty hard to find an area of dispute. So I think we'll achieve our ends without any major hassles.



LESLEY COWLEY: Bearing in mind we have people who have the strongest opinions on this issue in the Working Group, one would hope that if it can pass you guys, then it would pass the rest of us. Eberhard.

EBERHARD LISSE: Thanks. Eberhard Lisse - .NA. One of the chaps has a strong opinion. To respond to Peter, this is quite right, we don't have a mandate but if there is information that anybody finds pertinent, we are also able to read it into the record so it becomes part of the record, it gets transcribed and it doesn't get lost.

I fully agree with Keith that our mandate is quite defined but I for example also read something in the record in a recent meeting which you can read up which is quite pertinent, but we cannot act on it.

KEITH DAVIDSON: So I think we'll take that as an observation.

LESLEY COWLEY: Anyone else? Okay, so I'm keenly aware that this is one of the most active working groups with a high number of calls at some strange hours in the day. So let's express our appreciation for that work and for the presentation today.

So we're moving on and for our next topic we have an update on the Replacement of the WHOIS Protocol for which I'd like to invite Murray and Francisco. Hi, welcome back. I'm sure they could speak on the IANA update but maybe no. You could do that one too. Over to you.



FRANCISCO ARIAS: Hello everyone. Francisco Arias - I work for ICANN on the gTLD Registry Team on the technical side. I used to be on the other side of this room a few years ago when I was working for .MX so it's good to be back and see some familiar faces here.

So the topic for today... oh by the way, I have to my left... and I apologize for because I'm sure I won't be able to say your last name correctly.

MURRAY KUCHERAWY: Kucherawy. Murray Kucherawy.

FRANCISCO ARIAS: Thank you. So who is the Co-Chair of the IETF Working Group that is developing the replacement for the WHOIS protocol. To give a brief background on this, there are a few reports inside ICANN about this issue about the limitations of the WHOIS protocol.

There is a GNSO report on the technical limitations of the WHOIS; there has been some work on the joint working group on Internationalized Registration Data; there is also the report that SSAC prepared some time ago about WHOIS in which they called for the replacement of the WHOIS protocol between other things.

And the Board at the time took that report and requested the development of a roadmap to replace the WHOIS protocol. This roadmap went through a couple rounds for community input and was published last June. I apologize – I don't have the link here with me. I



can send it to you later. But basically the idea in the roadmap is to do a slow transition to the protocol.

As I was saying the roadmap calls for a slow introduction of the replacement of the WHOIS protocol and in order to do that we need to have a new protocol and that's what Murray is going to talk about now. And I believe we now have the presentation, yes. Excellent, so I let the floor to Murray.

LESLEY COWLEY:

We could have a new game where you could speak to a different presentation and see who notices first. Are we there yet?

MURRAY KUCHERAWY:

How many people think this is easier on Windows? Good afternoon. My name is Murray and I am one of two Co-Chairs of the IETF Working Group called WEIRDS which actually does mean WHOIS Web Extensible... Look it up.

As you're all aware, conventional WHOIS which is defined in RFC 3912 I believe has never been internationalized, at least not in a standard way. I have heard tell that there are a couple of WHOIS servers that do know how to do this or have done it in some kind of reasonable way, but since it's not standard, you can't write a standard client to deal with it. I don't have to go into the standards arguments.

There's also no data framework. Any two WHOIS servers can present you any data in any order in any format they want – dates come in whatever format; there's no standard way to show you any particular



set of data. There's no required standard subset of any particular data set – anything like that. It's completely free-form which does not lend itself well to processing other than by human eyes which is hardly efficient.

We also do not under the current WHOIS protocols have any way to provide special services to special clients, whether those are security vendors or what have you and there are some cases where you do want to do that.

There are also some cases where you want to provide rate limiting or answer different clients differently in terms of what information you show them. And WHOIS can't do any of that right now. The only information you have by virtue of the fact that the connection is coming in over TCP is you have the client IP address which could be anyone – IP addresses are reused, so there simply isn't this capability right now.

And I say at the bottom, I remind, just to reiterate privilege here, privileged access does not mean we can show you privileged information; it might simply mean you can do more queries than the average anonymous person. This has been identified as a desirable capability.

So the IETF WEIRDS acronym – I should really memorize it since I run the working group – is chartered to standardize the data framework by doing... the current work on it is to undertake a survey of what all the current WHOIS servers provide and figure out a common basic subset and develop a data model based on that, deliver objects in an encapsulated sort of standardized way, think about – these are not



promises - but think about things like XML or JSON or something other than free-form text.

Using RESTful services or a HTTP which are buzzwords I don't need to get into here, but they amount to meaning that the capabilities to develop software to do this are already out there. It's very easy to deploy this service based on these two concepts.

We are paying attention to what the CRISP Working Group did some time ago which was the last attempt at producing a WHOIS replacement but has observed almost no adoption for also reasons that I won't get into here unless the questions come up. We want to produce something that is simple, easy to implement hence RESTful and HTTP supporting internationalized registration data which is clearly something we need going forward.

We want to include the capability of doing differential services but not the requirement of doing it and we want to, as much as possible, address the needs of both of the name and number – understand the word constituency means something special at ICANN, but for the IETF side, we consider the name is one constituent and the numbers – the RIR – as the other constituent – and we're trying to cater to both of them with one common solution as much as practical.

So really quick – REST and HTTP provide these capabilities – something that is stateless is very easy to write code for. Representing things with URIs means a web browser can hit it and get a meaningful answer, [curl] and so forth.



The protocol and the services behind them can be layered in interesting and useful ways and it's entirely cacheable – the replies are cacheable which means again, this is very powerful and extensible when you develop things in this way. This is – I hate to say the new hotness but that's kind of how these services are being deployed these days.

The very encouraging part of this is that several of the number registries - I think all but one of them – have put out prototypes of a protocol that meets these requirements. ARIN for example has had one up for some time now and their RESTful WHOIS service gets more hits than traditional Port 43 WHOIS does. So this is already moving much faster, at least on the numbers side, than we had anticipated in the beginning and that's very encouraging. Now the rest is just to write it down in a more standardized way that doesn't focus on number service only.

So the WEIRDS Group was chartered in April of this year. We already have five core documents that we're working on. Some of the authors I have seen walking around here so you can talk to them about that if you want to get into the technical details of what it is they're working on or what difficulties they're trying to overcome.

The main five things are how to do what we're calling RDAP over HTTP in a basic sense; what the query looks like, i.e. how to form a UR item to issue the query; what the reply will look like that's currently JSON is the favorite way to do it; a separate document about security considerations – how do you keep private data private; how does one client authenticate itself over another or differentiate itself from another so as to get differential service if the server supports that and



how to do redirects – you’ve asked in the wrong place – the right answer is probably right over there.

We are scheduled to complete by December 13 and just to be clear that means that the working group completes its work by December 13; there’s still the usual IETF approval processes that take weeks or even months longer than that.

And I have a couple slides here on a process overview but I’m told I should probably skip by those unless people really want to talk about how the IETF works on the inside.

And if you’re interested in getting involved or monitoring the work, the next meeting will be in Atlanta November 4-9 is the general meeting. I can’t remember exactly which time slot we’ve been assigned. I think it’s on the Monday.

If you go to this link you can find the working group’s charter, links to all the drafts in the current states, who the authors are and so forth; contact information for the working group Chairs - Olaf Kolkman of NLnet is the other one; and how to get on the mailing list and view the archives for the discussion that’s happened so far. I believe that’s it.

LESLEY COWLEY:

Okay, so just so we’re clear, the intent is just to raise awareness of this, Murray, amongst the CC community?



MURRAY KUCHERAWY: Yes, an update. Some of you are probably aware that this work has started; it was more to give you a “here’s where we are now and if you want to be involved, here’s how to do it.”

LESLEY COWLEY: Okay, excellent. Any questions then please for Murray and Francisco? Peter?

PETER VAN ROSTE: My name is Peter Van Roste from CENTR. It probably reveals my ignorance about the IETF process more than anything else, but is there anybody involved in the process that would be watching over data protection issues or some of the issues that European Commission has recently raised in respect to WHOIS or some of the law enforcement discussions that are going on with registrars? Is that just a part of the overall thinking in this process?

MURRAY KUCHERAWY: Did you say data protection? Yes. I don’t think we have any specific oversight active in the working group there but it would certainly be welcome. And anybody who wants to make sure those things are covered should bring them to our attention.

Every RFC has to go through a review that involves people dedicated to security and privacy and anyone is also able to raise objections if we’ve missed something. So there are several layers at which that sort of thing can be brought to our attention. I would love it if it was brought



to the working group so it doesn't get caught later and held up but we only have the information we have to work with.

FRANCISCO ARIAS:

So I would like to add a little bit about that. Just to be clear, the protocol is to enable policy decisions; it's not to require any policy decisions. So if a registry decides that it's better for them to publish everything, it's the registry's decision and the protocol will support.

But if the registry decides that it's not good – that they should only support certain elements of the (inaudible) it is also supported by the protocol. The protocol is there to enable the policy options, not to require one specific.

MURRAY KUCHERAWY:

Can you go back a couple slides just to the summary page of where the working group's... So that security consideration document – the second last bullet on the list there – that's where this will be covered. The whole thing being built on top of HTTP, you have HTTPS and you have HTTP authentication protocols and all the kind of thing for protection of data in transit and ensuring that the person asking the question is entitled to the answer you're giving. That's... probably take care of those things.

Specific legal things and policy things – IETF tends not to pay attention to those. We don't work on policy. We try to enable policy and let the operators figure that bit out.



LESLEY COWLEY: I guess Peter's referring to some prior experience we have of some technical solutions that haven't maybe always addressed the legal or data issues and that's kind of why that input is made, I'm sure.

MATHIEU WEILL: My name is Matthieu Weill. I'm the CEO of AFNIC, the registry of .fr. My question is more directly for Francisco but I just want to stress how grateful I am for the awareness raising exercise we've had on this important ITF work. The question is more about ICANN's involvement in this group and it relates to a specific comment made by Fadi yesterday about the WHOIS that was quite striking in his opening speech.

He made an interesting parallel with the Middle East and the fact that we have been working on WHOIS for years in terms of policy without finding issues, finding a way forward. And I wonder whether ICANN is considering that the requirements for WHOIS – including technical ones – may drastically change in the future and that they should take a step back and reflect on this before moving forward because with interacting with the group. How do you react to this new development on ICANN's policy?

FRANCISCO ARIAS: Thank you. So the way I see it, the protocol what this involves have been working on the discussion and the idea of this to have a protocol that supports as many options as possible so the protocol, as I said before, is not there to really dictate what the policy should be.

As far as I can tell it supports either a very restrictive policy or a very open policy, depending on where you're coming from what the decision from the registry is. So to respond directly, I don't think there is any issue in terms of the protocol with respect to what the policy discussions develop in ICANN once the policy side is sorted out in ICANN then the respective policy can be implemented in the protocol. I'm very positive that can be done according to the way the protocol is being developed.

LESLEY COWLEY:

Okay, so I saw a question from Jay and we need to be mindful – this is a presentation on the protocol, not on the Middle East or WHOIS policy generally. Otherwise, we could be here until very late in the day. Jay.

JAY DALEY:

Jay Daley - .NZ. I'd like to know your own view of in order to make this a success, how much of that is down to technology being in place and working and how much of that is down to the bit we're not talking about – the policy bit being sorted? Because I'm slightly concerned that there are people who think that if we get the technology, then this will work.

MURRAY KUCHERAWY:

Are you asking me or Francisco?

JAY DALEY:

You cause you're the one committing and doing the work, so you must have an idea that this will be a success.



MURRAY KUCHERAWY: I mean naturally with any kind of software or protocol development, the easier it is to deploy, the more successful it is likely to be. So from our perspective – especially since this is already... we have prototypes – and ERIN was very quick to embrace this and run with it and make their data available through it – I think that we’ve set the technology barrier fairly low.

It’s easy for a technologist to say that this is going to be mostly a policy problem and they’re going to say the same thing. So I think for it to be successful, there needs to be a payoff, right; there needs to be some reason that you guys want to deploy this. And I think that if we set the technical barriers to entry as low as possible, then some of the other stuff will come with it. The cost is lower; the cost for you to provide the service is lower.

It’s hard for me to gauge though. I don’t work on the policy side at all so it’s hard for me to gauge how much of that is going to be a barrier for you to adopt this once it’s out there.

JAY DALEY: Would you be concerned perhaps that no matter how low you make the barrier to entry, if none of us see any reason for moving to it, then we’re not going to do it.

MURRAY KUCHERAWY: I think that... I wear two hats in that regard. The ITF side of it – you’re right. If there’s no benefit to it, the ITF can’t provide one because we



don't do policy work. As a consumer of this information, I would be skeptical of anybody who refuses to play in this game. I might think you have something to hide.

So I understand that that's kind of a dangerous game to play, but the fact is that there are a lot of people who need access to this information for security purposes and if the information doesn't seem to be credible or if it's hidden, then I have no way to decide that you are a good actor.

JAY DALEY: I think inadvertently you've hit the heart of the problem here – that...

MURRAY KUCHERAWY: I don't think it was inadvertent.

JAY DALEY: The attempt to fix this, it seems, and the attempts of Chris previously came from a consumer point of view, not a provider point of view and we do hold the keys in this respect and it needs to show something for us as to why we might wish to implement it.

And that to me actually sits entirely outside of the IETF process – it's in the policy space about us understanding why to do it. And so we're in danger of creating another piece of technology, thankfully a simple straightforward – this isn't meant to be demeaning but trivial in comparison to other sets of technology.

MURRAY KUCHERAWY: That's the intent.



JAY DALEY: Yeah, that will once again be something we'll sit there and think, "Well, that's lovely but actually we need to solve some other problems."

FRANCISCO ARIAS: So just quickly, I think the protocol by itself (inaudible) for example, the internationalization aspect should be attractive to many players that are interested in supporting a character set, sort of an ASCII. And in terms of implementation, which is certainly a policy side, not a technical side, on the TLD space I can report that VeriSign for .com and .name, they have already agreed to do this once, this is on the rise. So I think that's a very interesting move from one of the players in that space. They are already committing to do it.

JAY DALEY: Just to finish off very quickly. I think you're misunderstanding something again from provider space here. We as providers do not need to provide a standardized way of internationalization because when we are providing internationalization, it is normally only to our local community that we are providing it.

So Japan, for example, has an internationalized WHOIS that works very well for Japan in terms of internationalization. I don't know how the rest of it works. And there are a number of other countries that have an internationalized WHOIS that works very well for them, okay?

We don't need from our point of view to have a global standardization on internationalization. Similarly, we don't need to have a global



standardization on controlled access to law enforcement and some of us, I suspect, would prefer that we didn't have one.

And so doing this, again from the demand side point of view, isn't actually solving any problems or providing any benefit from us from the supply point of view.

LESLEY COWLEY:

Okay, I'm going to have to truncate this conversation but maybe there could be a separate side conversation about how the technical aspects could be combined with some of the policy aspects. What I was referring to earlier was we had some prior experience with the DNSSEC development where it could be the greatest protocol ever but in some of its earlier iterations, we didn't really have the CCs involved in policy discussion and I think we're trying to learn from that and maybe we could have some suggestions as to how that could be changed.

Okay, I'm going to have to cut that there because we need to talk about food and dinners but thank you very much, Murray and Francisco.

Okay, so we are coming up to lunchtime and we have the lunch sponsored by CNNIC and I think I have Xiantang who's due to present. Whilst he makes his way up, we also have a brief discussion to have on the subject of dinners – this will be a popular one.

So those of you that may not have listened to Council calls or seen Council call minutes might be unaware that we have had long discussions on the topic of ccNSO dinners recently. And it's a good conversation to have because ccNSO dinners have become incredibly popular, so that's a good problem to have.



Dinners were first introduced back in 2007. Prior to that we all used to go out to restaurants and book tables and come together, but of course our numbers are much larger in recent years. And I have to say that ccNSO dinners have become a bit of a challenge to the Secretariat too. So you may not be aware but in Prague we had over 160 people who wanted to come to the ccNSO dinner.

A number of people were extremely disappointed they were not able to attend. We had waiting lists. I don't think we had any auctions of dinners on eBay but we almost could have done, so incredibly popular.

But the trouble is as soon as you leave people out of the dinner, they are frustrated and very much disappointed that they're not able to be involved. I have to say that the popularity of dinners has also become a real challenge for Gabi who's quickly left the stage now that I'm mentioning her.

So the logistics have become a challenge; trying to find a space big enough for us all to sit down has become a challenge and of course, dinners have become increasingly expensive for the sponsors. So we've been talking about this as a Council and trying to think about how we can accommodate everybody who would like to come, how we can get more people and not have arguments around tickets or waiting lists for tickets.

So I hope you understand the problem that we're trying to address is a good problem to have, but we really don't want to disappoint people or say, "I'm sorry, you're not on the list so you're not coming in." And as a Council we think that the best way forward is to trial a format where we might get to have more people.



And what we're suggesting we do for Beijing and for the meeting after Beijing is to have more of a drinks and snacks event where it can be open to as many people as really would want to come. And also by not fixing people to a table where you are there for the duration of the dinner, hopefully we will be able to circulate and network a bit more because obviously the networking aspect of ccNSO dinners is also very valuable and I know very much enjoyed by everyone concerned.

So I'm looking for your support for us to trial this new format with the aim of hopefully not disappointing so many people. It does mean we won't have quite as much to eat but hopefully it does mean that we'll have much more networking and discussion at the ccNSO event. But it's open to you. This is your ccNSO. Happy to take any comments or feedback. Or does this seem a way forward that we're happy to experiment with two meetings and see where we go from there?
Annabeth?

ANNABETH LANGER:

Thank you. I understand the problem. Of course we are so many and we probably will be even more in the future. In the Center last GA we had a solution that in my opinion functioned very well that not on the official dinner but the night before the Secretariat gave four or five options to type of food and you just ticked which place did you want to go to.

And then it was groups going to different more simple restaurants and next time you would meet other people going to that restaurant. So we circulated in that way instead. So that's an option.



LESLEY COWLEY: Okay thank you. Obviously there's a number issue here as well. When I last went to a Center dinner, rather smaller in numbers than the ccNSO dinner. Anyone else? Paul?

PAUL: Thank you. I just wanted to say that as a semi-regular or quite a regular sponsor of the ccNSO dinners, and also having been a host back at ICANN Sydney, I share the Secretariat's pain and strongly support any measures that will help make Gabi's life a little bit easier and overall just strongly support the concept of something that retains the networking feel and if that's drinks and nibbles, then I think that's a very good way forward.

LESLEY COWLEY: Thank you, Paul. You've made Gabi's day I think. Anyone else? Keith?

KEITH DAVIDSON: Keith Davidson. I'm really just echoing Paul's sentiments that we've grown so much in numbers – 130 members of ccNSO now. Three members each going to a dinner is 400 people – that's a large dinner, it's a large problem to arrange. It's hard to get anywhere near the location that the meeting's at and so on and so forth.

So our purpose should be to mix and mingle and I think rather than a sit-down dinner, a casual evening where you can move around and meet people that you want to meet and then go and have your quiet dinner as a smaller group afterwards is probably a better solution than



what we're currently experiencing where you find it impossible to get to the other side of the room in a sit-down situation. Sorry.

LESLEY COWLEY:

Okay so can I just have a brief show of the feeling in the room if we are content with exploring this trial or whether you'd like your Council to go back and come up with some other bright ideas or maintain the current arrangement, but that will mean that we are not able to accommodate everybody. Can I just get some sense of your views please?

Sorry, okay, so green if we trial; red if we stay as we are; don't care/never been. Excellent. Lots of greens. Thank you very much and can I just say we'll trial this for Beijing and the meeting afterwards and then as a Council we will commit to hearing your views on the new formats.

We're very keen to find something that works for the community and it will be on the Council agenda after those two trial meetings. So let's try something different and see how that works for us.

Okay, so continuing our food theme, we have lunch very shortly sponsored by CNNIC and I think we have somebody from CNNIC who is going to say a few words. And whilst they're coming up, let me say thank you very much indeed for sponsoring lunch. Welcome.

XIANTANG SUN:

Dear Madam Chair, dear colleagues, dear friends, my name is Xiantang Sun, the Strategic Operational Officer of CNNIC. Before my short presentation I will take this great opportunity to warmly welcome all of



you to China and we promise a very exciting and enjoyable experience of China. So I'll start. It will be very short and it is already hungry.

Well the internet is shaping the future of China. In the past seven years CCNIC witnessed the development of the Chinese market. Let's have a short look at how the market is. By the end of the day we have more than 600 million internet users. The market is simply very large.

At the moment we have around 400 million mobile users so the market is mobilized. According to our statistical research, most of the internet users are between 10 years to 40 years old, so the market keeps growing and it's still very young.

This is the number of our websites in China. We have 2½ million websites. The number is not large but we believe our market has some potential.

And this picture shows how we use the internet in China. The most popular way is used as communication tools like modern 445 million internet users use [Kukoo], MSN, Google Talk every day, well, probably every single minute and Microblog users is growing very fast. We have 273 million users use Microblog every day and it has become one of the most popular information-sharing platforms in China.

Well, according to our knowledge, the market is just diverse. Simply the market is good and full of opportunities. If you want to come to the Chinese market CNNIC is here to be your reliable partner.

So the next part I will show who we are and what we do recently. CNNIC – the [Weather] Building is our office building. We got another three emergency data in the other side of China and also we have our



software and hardware. Science Park is under construction. It will be finished in two years. So here on behalf of CNNIC we welcome all our colleagues to visit CNNIC.

By the end of the day now we have around 4 million .CN names and around 300,000 IDN names and we have connections and colleagues all over the world. Here I will take this great opportunity to thank you all. Without the help from the community – especially the support from Asia community – we cannot achieve this.

So by hosting the ICANN Beijing meeting, CNNIC is trying to demonstrate our willingness and our readiness to do something in return to the community. And, well, we use [hamzas] and we love IDN and we believe every country is unique so we welcome IDN research with our neighbors, with all the colleagues all over the world.

At the moment we have around 30 top-level nodes all over the world and we are planning to build 100 nodes by the end of 2014. So I'm pretty much sure we've got plenty of work to do but we need your help and your support.

We focus on providing reliable and stable service and we design our own software and hardware so here there's one thing worth mentioning. We just applied a half-million dollar budget to share our experience. For example, we're going to build a lab and provide free training and free software [equivalents] to developing countries, especially for our neighborhood countries.



Please don't feel surprised if you receive email from me regarding to this kind of cooperation in the future, in the very soon future, let us say two months.

Last but not least, welcome to Beijing. Well, Beijing is the capital of China with a very long history, as the Great Wall. And if you like Eastern stuff, visiting Beijing you have a lot of chances to see ancient and Royal Garden for example. It's just simply beautiful and amazing.

But now Beijing is one of the largest international cities and it is very convenient so you won't feel inconvenienced at all if you want to enjoy some art, a museum. And you can enjoy real local and traditional Chinese art for example; the Beijing Opera, the traditional Chinese dance. And if you really want to try some local stuff try some [wutong] and see how the local people live and the life.

If you want to relax, Beijing, well the night life in Beijing – I promise you won't feel lonely at all. And also restaurants if you want to do some morning sites and you can join the local people to do Chinese [kung fu]. So they are extremely friendly. And do shopping – buy some silk. You're gonna relax yourself pretty much in Beijing.

Food – well if in Beijing you don't enjoy good food, so it won't be a very complete trip, so treat your stomach. We have more than 1,000 kinds of fish choices in Beijing so treat yourself. If you don't know how to find a good place, ask CNNIC and call me.

And tea – well, we also have more than 1,000 kinds of choices of tea so enjoy. This is the end of the presentation. Welcome to Beijing. Don't let the panda miss you. Please let me introduce my colleague, Christy.



She is the contact and manager of Beijing meeting organization committee and she prepared a small gift for everyone.

CHRISTY ZHOU:

Thank you, Xiantang. I'm Christy Zhou from CNNIC and on behalf of local host organizer of China, I would like to express our very, very warm welcome to everyone here and today we also prepared a very special gift to everyone here. It's a multi-functional Beijing map. I think a lot of people have already seen our booth and today we also specially prepared one for everyone here.

It could be used as a handkerchief. It is a handkerchief; it's a scarf. It can be used as a wrap so it's a Beijing map. So don't worry if you are getting lost in Beijing.

XIANTANG SUN:

We would appreciate if you can leave your business card to Christy just in case you got lost so thank you and please enjoy the lunch.

LESLEY COWLEY:

Thank you. So whilst we have the most important people here, can I also ask you to organize us a good room in Beijing? Okay, so we are going to break for lunch. Lunch tickets are at the back of the room. We are lunching in the Tula Restaurant which is on the 38th floor and at 2:00 we have our meeting with the GAC so we're not back here at 2:00; we are at the GAC in the Frontenac Room so I look forward to seeing you all there. Thank you.



[End of Transcript]

