
DUBLIN – ccNSO Members Meeting Day 1
Tuesday, October 20, 2015 – 09:00 to 18:00 IST
ICANN54 | Dublin, Ireland

BYRON HOLLAND: Good morning, everybody. We're going to get the meeting underway. So welcome to ICANN 54 in Dublin, or at least the ccNSO Constituency Day's portion of it. I just wanted to set the stage a little bit for the coming two days. We have a very full agenda, and if you've taken a look at the agenda, you'll note there is a considerable amount of time dedicated to the issues of accountability, the work of the CCWG, and of course, the related topics of the CWG.

So there will be a lot of opportunity to really unpack that issue from a range of perspectives and get a clear understanding – or at least as clear as possible at this point – on where we're at today, what the key issues are, and also some discussion about our own decision-making process on the proposal, whatever that turns out to be and whenever it presents itself. So there will be a lot of time for discussion on that.

And I think it's absolutely critical for a couple of reasons, one of which is logistical. This is a critical topic, and this meeting may be the primary venue we have for a face-to-face discussion on

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.

the subject. I think also it's critical because while it is an ICANN accountability issue in specific, it has a direct bearing on the outputs of the IANA transition and the work of the CWG, and of course, that is near and dear to our hearts.

The other reason that we've dedicated as much time as we have to it in terms of the overall program is that the feedback we received from Buenos Aires and the approach that we took to the CWG proposal was very positively received from the community overall. And certainly, from the counsel's perspective, it really gave us a really good insight into where the community was at, and the opinions of the community on the work of the CWG.

So essentially, that provided a template for us to approach the outputs of the CCWG at this meeting, and as a result, Katrina and the Program Working Group put together a very fulsome package around this subject. That said, of course, we have a number of other subjects on the overall agenda, and with that, I would like to hand it over to Katrina, but first, just to let you know in case you haven't been paying attention, the Canadian election is over and we have a new government as of this morning.

Thankfully, just as a small point of interest, we've had ten years of one-party ruling in a majority government, so that is

effectively, in our good Canadian way, a ten-year dictatorship. And as the... I forget who said it first, but we've thrown the bums out and put in a new majority government. And with that, I will pass it over to Katrina, who will walk us through a more detailed version of the program.

KATRINA SATAKI:

Thank you very much, Byron, and I just want to say that [Belgium] example showed that you can go very well without any government for quite a long time, over a year. So good morning, everyone. Welcome you to ccNSO Days in Dublin. As Byron already mentioned, we have very intense and packed agenda, and I'll try to highlight some of the most interesting issues we're going to cover during today and tomorrow.

So first of all, yes, the main... Most of the time is dedicated to discussions around CCWG Accountability and related issues. Again, just like in Buenos Aires, here in Dublin we also have the five blocks and starting with overview/introduction and then slowly, slowly walking through every aspect of the proposal. So today and tomorrow. And don't forget that we have coffee breaks and bigger breaks, shorter breaks for discussions in the community.

Another issue we will cover today – so please be here after we have meetings with the ICANN Board and the GAC – we're going

to talk about the Meeting B, Meeting B strategy, how are we going to proceed with the second meeting of every year starting from 2016? This is something we have to decide as a community.

Then we have many interesting sessions like marketing session today, legal session tomorrow morning, and we will touch upon interesting subjects like is the registry responsible for the content of a website? Is Pirate Bay case in Sweden? We'll talk about .IR case in America and we'll have another presentation on sovereignty and property rights.

As always, one of the most popular sessions we have that's ccNSO news tomorrow. Unfortunately, this time we have only an hour because all the time was really eaten up by discussions around CCWG.

And don't forget that tonight, we have cocktail, and I've just – for you, I tested this place, wonderful place, very good. So you're welcome. Yes, we'll have – I hope we'll have a lot of fun and loads of drinks, but we have to be back tomorrow, don't forget.

And thanks a lot to our general sponsors, who helped us to organize this. Thank you very much. And welcome to the ccNSO and let's start with the program. You want me to...? Yeah, thank you very much.

And so Annebeth, can I ask you, we start with two short updates on the work of – I hope so, yep.

ANNEBETH LANGE:

Hello, everybody. Good morning. While we're waiting for the presentation, I'm going to talk to you about how to proceed with the protection of country and territory names or actually if we should use them as TLDs in the future or not, or if we shall use them under which conditions. So that's what we have been discussing in the Cross-Community Working Group for a long time now.

And what we have done is to, as you know, we have started in the – so can I move it forward or do you have to do it? So as you all know, we take the starting point in the ISO 3166 list and we are reviewing the existing framework and trying to find if it's a way forward to use it.

In this round, we have protected country and territory names and they were not allowed to be applied for in the first round. So the way we do it now, we have this Cross-Community Working Group and it's led by two vice chairs from the ccNSO, [inaudible] Paul Szyndler and myself, and two from the GNSO, and that's Heather Forrest and Carlos Ruiz from Costa Rica. Now it's connection lost, so what happens here. Yeah, connection list. All right. I'll just talk while we're fixing this.

So this is a cross-community working group and the way we do it is to try to divide the three lines of work we have. Two-letter codes, three-letter codes, and the full country and territory names. So we have talked us through the two-letter codes and come to a preliminary conclusion. And then all the working group and both the GNSO and the – or the representatives from the G side and the representatives from C side in the working group agree on keeping up the protection of the two-letter codes.

Both those, of course, that's already on the ISO list, but also all other two-letter combinations. And the reason behind that is that it's not ICANN, it's not us, it's not the GNSO that decides who's going to be new countries in the future. It might [come] new countries and we shouldn't come in the situation that we have taken the two-letter codes and used it for something else. It should be reserved for them in the future.

Now we've come to the three-letter codes, and that's what we are discussing just now, that's a more complex area, of course. Because some of the three-letter codes are already out in the G world and among those, of course, .com and we can't stop that. It will be there forever. So what to do with the rest?

Then we have, as the framework is today, it's allowed to register three-letter codes that's not on the ISO list, and a lot of them have been registered now in this round.

Okay. It's a problem here with.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: Obviously.

ANNEBETH LANGE: Yeah. Okay. All right. We can't do anything here. It's not there. Yeah. Okay. There we are. Good. So [let's go] with the next one. Yeah. Here. No. Where are we? [inaudible]. Yeah. Okay.

So we are now discussing the three-letter codes, what to do. We have developed options through this working group and tried to find the possible scenarios that we can think of in the future how to use them. And we try to engage the community as much as possible during the discussions, instead of waiting till we have discussed all the both two-letter and three-letter codes and long and short name. We work in the project in trying to get engagement from all the stakeholders why we are discussing so we can correct [way underway].

And so far, we have sent out a list to all of the SO/AC chairs and asked them to send this out to the community and to encourage

input from the community, so we have something more to work on before we can give our recommendation, if any.

PAUL SZYNDLER:

Good morning. What we're doing here is a relatively new model because we're legitimately doing the cross-community working group thing properly for the first time. So each step of our process, we take once step at a time, and we engage the community. We ask them, as Annebeth said, we send out a survey. The two-letter code issue was relatively easy because there's a history of it. There's a history of protection of two-letter codes under ISO 3166. We're all familiar with that.

When you then deal with three-letter codes, that's a whole different issue. There's possibly 17,000 combinations, permutations of three-letter codes, and there hasn't been any uniform policy for how they've been treated in the past. They are recognized on the ISO 3166 list, but you've already got, as you mentioned, .com, which is Comoros, and that's already a country code three-letter that's been used in the past.

So how do you retrospectively or do you wish to retrospectively apply some sort of policy advice that would narrow that?

ANNEBETH LANGE:

Yeah. So we're trying to find a framework that can be used by everyone. So to find out what to do, we sent out all these different questions, and the different options that we have ended up with, and it might be more, so if you have some good ideas, please come with them. Is that what should we do in future? Should three-character strings be eligible for use as gTLDs?

If they are not in conflict with the existing area, then here, this is something – sorry. This presentation is a mess. Should all three-character top-level domains be reserved as ccTLDs only and be ineligible for use as gTLDs? Should they be eligible for use as gTLDs, as long as they are not in conflict with the existing alpha-3 codes from the ISO 3166 list?

And that as the three-character version of the same ISO list, that is the basis for the current [ccTLD] allocation. And today, it's a few of them like [Jaap] mentioned yesterday that also is in use but they are not for countries, so it's a special use. Let's see if I can get the [right] up now. Yes. Good.

Or should three-character strings be eligible for use as gTLDs if they are not in conflict with existing alpha-3 three codes from the ISO 3166 list, and they have received documentation of support of nonobjection from the relevant government or public authority?

That's the system that we have today in the applicant guidebook for capitals and some cities. We know that there has been some conflicts about that to decide what is a government, what is the public authority? But in many ways, that would be up to the country to decide within their national region how they would treat it, if that should be in the solution.

In future, should there be [restricted] use of three-character strings as gTLDs if they are not in conflict with any applicable string similarity rules?

And then we come to another problem with the IDN that's even more complicated because we know that if you try to write country name in a script, it might have a lot of different lengths of letters. It could be two, it could be three, it could be four.

But should all IDN three-character strings be reserved exclusively as ccTLDs and be ineligible as IDN gTLDs? Should there be unrestricted use of IDN three-character strings if they are not in conflict with existing TLDs or any applicable string similarity rules?

So these are the options we have thought of, but we have also had input saying that you shouldn't touch it. Contain the solution we have discussed [us forward] to in the applicant guidebook today, don't touch it as yet, and then we'll see in the future if it's more use for it. Paul?

PAUL SZYNDLER:

Before Annebeth goes into the next details, I mean, the issue here is... The reason we briefed you on all of these questions is that we'll be circulating a survey and asking you all of these questions. That's our methodology. You'll note that in the seven questions, we swing from complete protectionism of three-letter numbers to complete openness. And that's the way our working group operates.

There's no predetermined outcome, there's no – these are not proposals. They're quite obviously just questions for the community. And they're interesting ones because it was easy, as I said before – easy in the two space, not so easy when it comes to three-letter codes. And it would be very valuable – I mean, that's our key message for everyone here – to take some time to look at the survey, think about it, and provide their input and their views.

The more we get, the better. We're starting to get some from the GAC and others, and it would be very useful for this room to provide some feedback, as well.

ANNEBETH LANGE:

Yeah. [inaudible] we have already got something, some input from some other GNSO communities and we haven't had a

discussion with ALAC yesterday. So we're starting to get engagement and we really hope that you can give us some valuable input, as well.

And what we experienced is that it's different working methods in the communities, and that's an interesting observation. They have different way forward to find how they can be able to give advice, and it take different time in the different communities.

So we are open to take the time it takes to get this through, think it through, and we won't press it forward. But we advise you to go home after this meeting to think about it. What we are trying to do is the framework, the principles, come forward to principles, and we must remember that this is not a regulation. This is a kind of private contract that ICANN establishes with the applicants for new gTLDs in the future. It's policy that we are making. It's not the way that if it's... As long as it's not forbidden, we are actually open to do whatever the community decides to do.

And we have the GAC, of course. We have sorted out, since we [talked late] last time, that the working group in GAC, they are working with all the other things. It's not two-letter codes, it's not three-letter codes, it's not country and territory names in the first level, but it's other geographical terms. And we both are working now with first level but remember also it's a hearing out

there for using two-letter codes in the second level for the existing TLDs, and these two discussions must not be mixed together. It's quite confusing.

So I think we have mentioned everything that's on the presentation, so we just want to really to encourage you and ask for your advice to go forward. And after this meeting, the questions will be sent out.

PAUL SZYNDLER:

Again, at the risk of repeating myself, but it's probably a prudent thing to do this early in the morning. We're seeking community input on a very important issue. Two-letter codes have been addressed. We're now on to three-letter codes. That requires a considerable amount more intellectual capital thought about what we'd like to see done with it. And what I would hate to see is a lack of response from the cc community because, as Annebeth said, we've already got the Registry Stakeholder Group on board. They've already provided their input. A couple of governments have already provided their input. And what would be very valuable is if we could get the same from this room. It doesn't matter whether everyone agrees or not, but we'll be sending a survey around soon and your input on those questions would be very welcome.

KATRINA SATAKI:

Thank you very much, Annebeth, Paul. Thank you for your updates. And we will any – sorry we had the technical glitch. Can we fix it now and change to... Next presentation is update from Guidelines Review Committee, and I will give that update.

So we already had short update in Buenos Aires, but I'll just try to – sorry again. Okay. Just to remind you, what do we do? We try to review all the guidelines we have. Guidelines, actually – all the documents we have at the ccNSO. We try to update them and ensure that our current practices are described correctly.

Plus, we also tried to translate it into plain English, just to make sure that even non-native English speakers can easily read and understand what do we mean in the guideline. I still cannot move forward. Okay.

Again, as you may remember in Buenos Aires, we asked for help, for more hands from the community and we're very happy that we got some new members and now – probably, we hoped that by Dublin, we'll have something substantial to present, but it turns out that the more we work on guidelines, the more work there is. So we have kind of snowball effect. It just keeps rolling.

But two of our guidelines are almost, almost ready, but still we're not ready to submit these guidelines to the Council because, for example, we have prepared guidelines, ccNSO work plan, but it has to be submitted together with a charter for

Triage Committee, which we are also reviewing. But when we reviewed the guideline on the ccNSO working groups, we realized that we need some more guidelines to describe different types of working groups.

We have, for example, standing committees or ad-hoc working groups, and so on. So the amount of work is growing and perhaps we don't have anything to report, to submit to the Council. But we certainly hope that we will be in good shape.

So here is a list of our new members of – not new – all members – all members of our working group. And I must say that's wonderful and very active working group. Yes. Okay. Here you can see an example of a kind of summary sheet, what we're doing with the guideline. We have the old guideline title. We tried to use unified form for titles so that you can immediately understand is it a guideline or charter or any other type of document, or this is going to be guidelines, ccNSO working groups.

Then we have subteams and each subteam works on its own different guideline. So we introduced structural changes and we change also content for the guideline. And then we pass guideline to our translators, Ben, David, and [Liliana] so that they make it easier to read and easier to understand.

That's another example. Okay, let's move forward. So currently, we're working on ccNSO response and statement procedure guideline and related timeline, as well as on Council meeting guideline and ccNSO meetings guideline.

Plus started working on assignment of roles and responsibilities, but perhaps we'll have to postpone it a little bit and when we see all the guidelines and every role defined in these guidelines, it will be easier for us to summarize and see what's included and what is not.

We have more guidelines on our list, but perhaps we'll have to... Initially we tried to set priorities, which guidelines should be reviewed first. We did not anticipate some developments, for example, with appointment of NomCom representatives, and perhaps we'll – at some point, we will need to review the priorities of our guidelines and perhaps work just – [ah]. We need these guidelines to be ready by next elections, next appointments.

This is important point. If there's something that bothers you regarding our guidelines and set of documents we had at the ccNSO, if you want, if you see that something is not clear, something is not covered, some issues not being described. So please talk to us. And here I'd like to ask members of GRC (Guidelines Review Committee) to raise your hands. I can see

Leslie, Alejandra, Margarita, Eduardo, Stephen, David. Please come to us, and if you have anything that bothers you, talk to us and we'll try to – okay, not to Eduardo. Eduardo is not – clearly is not willing to address your issues.

So if you have anything that bothers you, please come to us and we'll try to ensure that a particular issue is properly covered in our guidelines.

So with that, I'd like to conclude my presentation. If there are any questions, please don't ask them now, because in ten minutes, we have meeting with the ICANN Board. It's in auditorium one floor up.

After that, we have a coffee break and the meeting with GAC. Meeting with GAC starts at 11:00 in the room next to ours, and we reconvene here at 12:00. And as I already mentioned, we're going to talk about our strategy for future meetings, particularly about Meeting B. So to B or not to B.

So thank you very much and see you back here at 12:00. Okay. We have a question. Yes.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE:

Thank you, Katrina, for the update. What happens next with the guidelines? Are they approved by the Council or what's the next step?

KATRINA SATAKI: Yes, of course. When they are ready, we send them to the Council, and they must be approved by the Council. But one thing I'd like to mention, we're working on the wiki page for our committee. It's going to be perhaps the first experiment with wiki for our working groups and all the work of our committee will be publicly accessible. So you will be able to look at the current status of the work, all the drafts, all the final documents, and everything around the work of the GRC.

And, well, in now nine minutes perhaps we'll have to be at the meeting with the Board.

PAUL SZYNDLER: It's better not to leave your computers in the room, although there will be somebody from staff here. But I advise you to take it with you.

[break]

KATRINA SATAKI: Dear colleagues, please take your seats. We're ready to start. I see that some of my European colleagues are already – dear colleagues, now we're going to talk about the future, and the future is – well, it's not exactly here yet but it's coming.

Oh, we do know. At least – well we don't know how the future is going to look but we definitely know that there will be a future.

In front of you, you have one-pagers that we prepared for you with some essence of the presentation and the issues we must discuss and hopefully solve. And there's a presentation and Bart will going to walk us through the main idea. What is Meeting B and how it could look like? So Bart, the floor is yours.

BART BOSWINKEL:

Thank you, Katrina. So this is a follow-up from the initial introduction of the topic in the Buenos Aires meeting. And it's about change of the ICANN meeting structure, which is – how do this? Why does [inaudible]? It's about the change of the current meeting structure. And this is the result of a, I would say, a longstanding process that included the Meeting Strategy Working Group and finally the Board decision to change the structure.

Part of the Meeting Strategy Working Group members were Margarita and Keith. They've informed you on progress and they also conducted a survey at the time on what the ccTLD community would expect. And as a result, and now we're facing the new meeting structure, we thought it would be good to run through it because it will determine, in a way, how we will convene and move forward as a community.

So currently, the ICANN meeting structure is, yeah, reasonably simple from a 20,000-mile perspective. You have three meetings, which are almost – yeah, that supposed to be five days, and there is regional rotation, and we have them throughout the year.

Moving forward. And as a result of that Meeting Strategy Working Group work and the Board decision, there will be a new structure of meetings. There will be what is called A, B, and C meetings. The A meeting is more or less comparable with the current meetings we know. The B Meeting will be a reduced meeting. It will be four and a half days and it will be – or four days. And it will be in specific areas.

And then the C Meeting, which will include the annual general meeting, as this one will, will be a, I think, six-day – no, eight-day meeting. So that will be for an extended period.

Now the focus is specifically on the B Meeting because it's reduced in time and because the focus of the B Meeting in itself will be different. As I said, the A Meeting is similar to the current meeting, so there will be a lot of updates and discussions with the GDD and staff initiatives. There will a public forum and there will be a Board meeting.

The B Meeting will not include the public forum and the meeting with the Board or meeting by the Board, and it will be focused

on SOC policy development work. This is the way it's currently defined. And then the, as I said, the C Meeting will include the annual general meeting and it will be also focused on showcasing the ICANN work and, therefore, it's more extended.

So if you resume into the current meeting structure of the ccNSO, day one, that is Mondays and Sunday because it's Sundays more or less. Say we have Council Working Group workshop and cross-community events.

Day two is tech day, which has evolved into a cross-community event, outreach, working group meetings, and meeting with GNSO, also a cross-community event.

Day three and day four are full of the ccNSO meetings days, and day five of the current meetings is working group meetings, public forum, and the Board meeting in the afternoon. So that's the current structure.

Now taking a view on the Meeting B, how that would look like, so that would be – and this is from the Strategic Working Group final report. Day one will be an outreach effort, focused on outreach, that would include something like the joint ccNSO/GNSO meeting, and the tech day.

Day two would be what is called intracommunity work. So that's the way we work right now, where it has, in my view, a bit of a

GNSO connotation, its work on PDPs, working groups, etc. So that's the policy focus one.

Day three would be similar, also, intracommunity working group, so within the cc community, and maybe cross-community working group. And day four would be, again, intercommunity working group, so more focused on cross-community working groups and maybe joint meetings.

That is the layout as envisioned at the time by the Strategy Working Group. Now, as you can see, first of all, there will be reduced meeting time. And secondly, the way it's envisioned is a little bit different from how we conduct our meetings currently.

So as a result and say with the ccNSO Council asked The Program Working Group to have a look at the, say, what the implications would be. So there are a set of potential issues that we need to discuss moving forward in order to prepare for the first Meeting B, because the first Meeting B – new Meeting B – will be the next ICANN or the meeting in June of this year. So the meeting following the Marrakech meeting, that will be ICANN's first Meeting B.

So potential issues from a cc perspective is the duration will be reduced from four-and-a-half to four days. Focus of the meeting may change, and that depends a bit on you. Currently, you could qualify the work we do and how you meet A's information

sharing as a discussion platform, ccNSO-focused work like, and interaction with other groups.

If you would look at the ideas around the new Meeting B strategy, it would be ccNSO work, working groups, focus on PDP, Council meeting, and outreach. So there is a bit of a shift. The main question remains is –and one of the – so I’ll get into that point later.

One of the factors that has not been taken into account when the new strategy was developed is that, as a result of the announcement of the NTIA, there is a potential shift or added work – will be added work to the SO and AC structures as a result of the IANA transition work and as stewardship transition work, and as a result of the accountability work.

So, again, reducing the number of meetings may have an impact on how the mechanisms developed under these different proposals will effectively play out.

So with the Program Working Group, we discussed say – and the way it’s been treated right now. Effectively, you could have two different views on the Meeting B. Either you see it as a reduced meeting and therefore we need to cut everything and think on, and you perceive it as that the Meetings A and C, so the longer meetings, will become the standard, and therefore we’ll do a reduced work, or we start to see Meeting B as the standard,

which will create add-on work, and that's particularly relevant for the Program Working Group.

And one of the questions in there is – and I'll now go into the – oh yeah – that's, again, something we added in order to give you an understanding how the first Meeting B might look like and what will be on the agenda. It's the implementation of the CCWG and ICG proposals itself. So that's in June upcoming year.

So there will still be a fulsome discussion that was a view of the Program Working Group on topics related to the IANA stewardship process. It will be the first full meeting for the new CEO, so that might be of interest to some of you. And it's the meeting around that concludes the discussions around ICANN's fiscal year '17 ops plan and budget.

So although you would think the first Meeting B, okay, if we would go for a reduced format, there are still some very, I would say, topics which are very relevant to the ccTLD or the Program Working Group. Things are relevant for the full ccTLD community.

So now going into the core questions. And at the heart of it, and given, say, what I just showed you, at the heart of it is effectively the question that's particularly relevant for the Program Working Group. Should we continue with the ccNSO meeting days in its current format? Either in the two days that we

conduct them right now or effectively the one and a half day. And it's also, in my view or – not in my view, sorry. Because I'm presenting, I'm saying my view.

It's, say, what is related, although it's turning into a cross-community working group, and although it's getting more – its getting its own dynamics, is it may have impact on tech day itself. So I think a fulsome day of information sharing, both to tech day and the ccNSO meetings days, and then that makes ICANN meetings interesting. So the impact may be on and continue with the tech day in the long run. But the first question is the ccNSO meetings day.

And then, say, depending on where you're heading, it may change the ccNSO meetings days. It may have impact on progress and legitimacy of, say, of those processes which are longstanding. One of the topics that will be discussed this week is whether or not, say, when effectively the ccNSO will start launching a PDP on the retirement of ccTLDs, because that's one of the policy elements that still is missing.

And reducing the number of meetings from 223, that means effectively we can do working groups, but missing out on face-to-face meetings or just having them and not consulting with the boarder community may have an impact on the legitimacy and the duration of these processes.

And so at the end of the day, yeah, the bodies going back is to the question is how do you want to proceed with Meeting Bs? Katrina, yours.

KATRINA SATAKI: Thank you very much, Bart. So are there any questions from the audience? If so, here are two mics. Danko.

DANKO JEVTOVIC: I've got small question. I understand the Meeting B, it also might related to the regional question because usually in Europe, meetings are larger, and we are a small registry from Europe. In the long run, we are thinking about maybe trying to organize ICANN meeting, but is there any relations between size of the meeting and regional in your longer-term planning?

BART BOSWINKEL: Not my longer-term plan, ICANN's longer-term plan. There is, let me –probably Keith and Margarita can please confirm or smack me on the head. It's, in principle, as I understand it, the meeting B – that's another reason for doing it – will be organized in Africa and in Latin America. And the others will be rotating, as well, across Europe. Say, Meeting A and C will be rotating across North America, Europe, and Asia-Pacific. So B will be focused on Africa and Latin America.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: Actually, Bart, I'd like to understand a bit how the first day would be used, because I know when we organized these meetings over the two days, we get requests from ALAC, the ICANN board, the GAC to have joint meetings. Is it your expectation that we will receive requests for those meetings on the first day of the four-day meeting?

BART BOSWINKEL: If you look back and I think that's I've since, say, Katrina and I had some interactions with other groups on this topic. And they envision, say, these joint meetings on the first day in particular. So that means meeting day one. So the joint ccNSO/GNSO/Council meeting, for example, would take place on the first meeting day. Another element, which might be relevant and that's why we have the look of say that will be the standard format.

There will be no opening ceremony at Meeting Bs, so that will give you back half a day, as well. So that's the purpose of the effectively the outreach, but also the intercommunity work and the meetings between councils and/or communities.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: And as well, those meetings could be longer because there's more time.

BART BOSWINKEL: Yes, maybe. Depends on how full the rest of the schedule. But it could be made and turned into a more, say, until now, and you've seen it this – put it is – let me rephrase it. You've seen it this meeting. As a result of the fully packed program, we had, as Council, the Council had to cancel the joint meeting with the GNSO, which at this time, because it would overlay with the CCWG meeting on Monday afternoon.

And as that work needed to be continued and need all the support, unfortunately, we did not as the Council did not have the opportunity to have the same type of discussion as we just had with the GAC on the same kind of questions, which would have informed the broader community.

In the future, because there will be, say, a special Meeting B, it is easier to schedule that type of meetings on a fixed time and make it very clear there is no overlap either by staff initiative or other initiatives.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: Second separate question. Having read the report that led to this, there is supposed to be some form of outreach into the

community at the Meeting B, and how does that factor into our own thinking, if particularly because we in the cc community, it's something that I believe we value. So have you thought about how that would be integrated in?

Because I thought that was supposed to be on day one, as well.

BART BOSWINKEL:

Yeah. Going back... And this is and that's why you saw the reference to tech day, for example. I think, especially if you look at the locations of Meeting B, and the information sharing, and it is particularly for those regions, it is valuable we have tech day and it's valuable that we have the information sharing of the ccTLD community. And it's not just the outreach on day one, but it's the outreach enabling, showcasing what the ccs do to their peers in their region.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE:

So what you're saying, I think, is as well as tech day, which is an opportunity to outreach with the local community, there may be other issues and subjects that we would perhaps have an opportunity to, like marketing and administration, etc. Okay, thanks.

MARGARITA VALDES: Hello. Two things. This design, discovering this future design in terms of the meetings was thought without NTIA issues. So in normal times, we probably, when we were thinking about this new model, we were not these big issues over our heads. This is the first thing.

The second thing is that in terms of the Meeting B, it was thought in terms of give the opportunity to small countries, not necessarily regions, to have this kind of meetings because the capacity of hotels, conference rooms, and things like that are not able, there is not enough places in different countries for this. It's not only because we were thinking in regions. That's my.

BART BOSWINKEL: That's the way it turned out, and maybe also, say, that's not included if you would look to the ICANN staff slides or the meeting team's. Their expectations is that Meeting B will be with around 800-plus attendees, and the Meeting A and C around 2,000. And that shows your point, therefore, they could go to venues with smaller meeting places.

MARGARITA VALDES: Yeah.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: Hello, Bart. As you mentioned, the B meeting is meant to be smaller in number; just 800 people coming. So I'm looking for the principle that would help me decide to come to a B meeting and removing the public forum and the Board meeting is relevant. If there was a simple principle, am I in a working group? Yes or not. Then I can come. Am I in an SO council or something? Then I come. That would be a good principle. But as it is, I don't see any way to avoid coming to a B meeting. If there's going to be a tech – I mean, I may end up coming for one day now, or not come, and miss that day and undermine the tech day. Can you provide some clarity on how we choose whether to come to B Meetings?

BART BOSWINKEL: I think, and that's why, and that's maybe – that was, effectively, say, the purpose of that slide on your view on Meeting B. Will that be the standard meeting – and there will be add-ons on others – so that it effectively the underlying point is that we will continue having the ccNSO meetings and the interaction with other SOs, and full support of tech day, and therefore make it interesting for ccTLDs to come. Or we conceive it and we perceive it as a reduced meeting.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: Okay. So in the first option, then, the 1,200 people who are not going to come for meeting B are not cc people. There are other people because we're going to have to come to all [inaudible].

BART BOSWINKEL: Yes, because say what the expectation... At least it's my understanding, the expectation is they will be very much interested in, say, the add-ons like the GDD program or the new gTLD program, and that side. But again, I don't know the background of the 800-plus attendees and why they came up with that number.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: Okay, that's useful. Thank you.

KATRINA SATAKI: They think that 1,200 people come to ICANN meetings just for the excitement of the opening ceremony and public forum. That's the only reason I could see.

Yeah, so this is a very short intro into this issue. The Meetings Program Working Group wanted to run a survey to ask for your opinion. So we will prepare a survey and we will ask you to think the question through and just provide your view. Really very helpful and we will keep you updated.

With that, I'd like to conclude this session and now we have an hour for lunch. Sorry, lunch is not provided. And at 1:30, we meet back in this room, and we start our discussions around CCWG work with block one overview and introduction chaired by Byron Holland. Thank you.

[break]

BYRON HOLLAND:

Good afternoon, everybody. Welcome back for the afternoon of day one, ICANN 54. We are going to kick off the discussions about the work of the CCWG and CWG, ICG this afternoon with a bit of an opportunity to provide a status update and overview by leaders within all of those various groups, and to try to level set everybody's knowledge more or less in terms of where the process is at and how the pieces fit together.

As we talked about this morning, we have quite a robust program for you over the balance of the afternoon and tomorrow. And it will be very important that we all take an active role, ask questions, etc. Because it is a relatively fluid situation in terms of where the proposal of the CCWG is, what the next iteration may look like, and of course, the timing and logistics of anything that ensues.

So this may be our primary face-to-face opportunity to have the dialogue within our community about the accountability track of all of the work being done. I will also talk a little bit more about how that interacts with the work of the CWG and where the ICG is at right now.

So I think it would be, it's very important to acknowledge the very heavy lifting and amount of work that's been done by the folks in the CCWG. And as you can see on the slide above me, we have five nominated members. They are the community members that we have, as this community, appointed to be our representatives at the or within the CCWG.

And they have a very critical role. One is certainly doing the work within the CCWG, but also bringing back the information firsthand to this community and highlighting to us what some of the key challenges, issues, decision points, flavor of the discussions is, etc. And I look forward to those members providing this room with their insights.

And of course, equally important is those members listening, in this room, to the will of the folks in the ccNSO and accurately, to the best of their ability, reflecting it back into the discussions within the CCWG.

In addition to those members, however, there's an active list of participants, which has its own description, and you can see we

have quite good and broad coverage from a whole list of people in our community who are participants separate and distinct from the members themselves.

So I'd say we'd have very good coverage overall in the CCWG, and have certainly been taking a leadership role within the CCWG. So I thank all the members and participants and observers for all of that.

I wanted to just provide a frame of where we are today, at least as best as I can see it. So I'd ask that we go to the next slide. The next slide. I should also note on an administrative matter that ICANN has been experiencing challenges with the Adobe Connect application, which appears to be at the Adobe level, and I am told that ICANN has outstanding tickets with Adobe right now. But if you know anybody who's experiencing challenges or even here in the room, if you experience challenges with Adobe Connect, that is acknowledged by ICANN and they're working on it.

Part of what we wanted to get through today and tomorrow is to, as I said, provide as much opportunity to have discussion and debate as possible, to get a sense of where this community is at in terms of some of the big decisions. And we use the basic template that we had in Buenos Aires when we were discussing

the CWG issue as the template for building the program and decision making process for the outputs of the CCWG.

So in a sense, hopefully, there's a familiar feel to it, even though the content will be very, very different, because certainly everything I heard expressed and the Council heard expressed was quite positive in terms of the process we went through for the CWG work.

To give you a quick overview of all of the moving pieces here, again, you may recall this slide from Buenos Aires when I presented it in terms of the work of the CWG. You can see all of the different pieces of the puzzle itemized here, and I have put a yellow star that says you are here. That could be debated if that's the correct place. I put it there because there's likely another iteration and we're coming back around to create a final proposal.

One could argue the star could be a little further to the right under the gray box saying public consultation. But recognizing that, the point here is the CWG, CRISP, and IANA plan have all gone to the ICG. We'll hear about that later, and the focus now is on the work of the CCWG.

Both of those – the work of the ICG and the CCWG – will have to come together to the Board for overall approval, and then forwarding on to NTIA. So that is effectively where we are in the

process and, of course, those two tracks are intrinsically linked because our approval of the work of the CWG, as we will all remember, was contingent on some of the outputs of the CCWG. If we can go to the next slide.

And I think that's very important because I'm sure there are some in this room who would rightfully say, "Well I'm a country code manager or operator. What's happening with internal ICANN issues is interesting, but not necessarily my problem." In a sense, how the outputs of the CWG get implemented are directly impacted by the work of the CCWG, and that's how there's a very, very tight linkage and therefore the outputs of the CCWG are absolutely critical to us as a community.

Just to provide some sense of timing, because there have been a lot of discussions around timing. Are we in a rush? Are we time bound? How much time do we actually have to complete this issue? What are the various stages?

And at a very high level, I see there are three stages. One is the community phase here seen in the orange to the left, phase one, and that's where these two proposals, the ICG and the CCWG, come together.

The next phase, phase two, is an absolutely critical phase, and that's the NTIA review and the valuation phase. And these slides

will be made available to you on the website, so we're totally transparent about it.

And to the best of the NTIA's ability and to my own in trying to understand the U.S. legislative process, which is a relatively murky endeavor. But nonetheless, they will need four to five months to go through the processes that they require. And then, of course, there's the implementation and the transfer of stewardship itself.

Those are the major building blocks, and that middle one in blue, when it goes into the U.S. governance machine, there is little that we can do about it, and it does have a certain time requirement associated with it. If we can move to the next slide.

So those, I think, are the most fundamental big picture building blocks of the time required for each of the stages right now. And that will become more relevant as we move to the coming slide. Oh, the anticipation.

Each one of these lines represents a possible scenario. They all represent the three phases, effectively, that you just saw. The proposal generation stage to the left, phase two, is in the hands of the U.S. Government, and then phase three goes into the actual transition and implementation. Dates along the bottom highlighted with ICANN meetings. We are way over on the left at ICANN 54.

And effectively, what this is showing is the first two lines would theoretically allow us to make the proposed September 2016 date. Of course, the second one, if we push delivery of the proposals out to late December, is theoretically possible. But, of course, leaves little wiggle room based on the timelines that we've seen thus far. And anything beyond that starts to present additional challenges to actually effecting a transition by September 2016. Those are the big picture items.

And if we slide down one slide, just go down. This isn't meant to go through in any detail, but we will provide it on the Web. This just gives a sense of some of the more granular elements and the timelines associated with them. And we will, like I say, put this on the ccNSO website so you will be able to have access to it. But I also do want to highlight that there's a fair amount of work that's gone into the project planning side thus far.

So this is our opportunity in this community, regardless of what the timeline ends up being, to have a fulsome discussion about the issues of the CCWG in the construct of the timelines as we currently understand them. And I'm sure over the course of the next day and a half, we will start to get much more detail from all of the relevant leaders and members of the CCWG.

With that introduction, I would like to turn it over to Keith, who is going to walk us through the status of the ICG.

KEITH DAVIDSON:

Thanks, Byron. And I think Martin and I are probably equally surprised that we've had this leaving gift of doing each other's preservations rather than our own, and I think Martin later is talking on ICP-1. So I'm looking forward to hearing his expertise on that topic, and I'll try and struggle my way through what Martin knows much better than me in terms of the ICG.

Anyway, in terms of the overall progress of the ICG, we met in mid-September in Los Angeles intersessionally, and we met here late last week or – yeah, last week, I think it was. And we've got to a point where we've essentially finished as much of the work as we can do except for some tidying up of our documentation, which we've continued to do in working group sessions tomorrow and on Friday.

Just in terms of the process, we went out for our public consultation on the proposal as it stood. We received 157 comments in four different languages from a widely divergent view of stakeholders around the planet. We have analyzed that of those comments, 41% were supportive, 24% gave some form of qualified support, 11% were indifferent, I think you could say, and 9% were opposed.

So a very important item for us on ICG has been to measure whether the community supports the transition plan, and I think

we're on the brink of being able to say that we believe that the community does support the plan.

There are some key themes that came through that public consultation. The dependency on various outputs, such as the CCWG Accountability, were of quite considerable concern.

The form and shape of the post-transition IANA, the Board remit, the membership, and so on was a key set of questions. The lack of the existing agreement between the IANA functions operator and the root zone maintainer was noted and the issues that might arise around that, the overall jurisdiction of ICANN.

And then there were some specific ccTLD references including, you'll recall back in Buenos Aires, a number of ccTLDs gave their provisional support for the names proposal to go forward on the basis of various things, including accountability, being attended to. But also that the framework of interpretation be in place, and that the service level expectations be completed and implemented and so on. So those comments came through loud and clear from that consultation process.

Yeah. ICG has stated they believe the criteria has been met as per the NTIA's requirements on – but there are still those conditions remaining to be satisfied.

What happens from here is that after Friday, when the ICG has, I guess, completed draft five of the transition proposal, having taken into account and finished the minor editing issues that remain, the ICG will then go into what we've called hibernation. So we're going to climb into the cave and lay down and sleep. We'll still have an active mail list, but we'll have no scheduled meetings and we've set the alarm clock for 30 September, 2016, as the wakeup date for us. But the mailing list will remain active, and if we receive e-mail to the list, we will be triggered out of hibernation and back into action. So we'll be really awaiting those final inputs from CWG and CCWG relating to the accountability mechanisms and anything else on the inventory of unfinished contingency issues.

So I think that's pretty much it. But I'd invite Martin to potentially add, if I've missed anything obvious. Thank you. [inaudible] questions?

BYRON HOLLAND:

Yes. I was just going to say are there any relatively brief questions? Any questions at all? Or comments on the ICG?

You can continue to think about them and we will also take some questions at the end, if anything crosses your mind in the interim.

Now we're going to move on to Mathieu, who's going to provide an overview status of the CCWG proposal, potential next steps, and how all of that relates to Stream 1 and Work Stream 2. Mathieu?

MATHIEU WEILL:

Thank you very much, Byron, and hello, everyone. It's good to be in the ccNSO room for a change. There's more familiar faces, although a number of the CCWG faces are starting to get quite familiar with the extent of our work. And I see a number of the participants and members, as well, in the room. And I think what you said, Byron, was extremely important, that the leadership of the ccTLDs is something that is particularly striking in the CCWG Accountability.

It had been in the CWG naming, obviously, as we were a core customer of the IANA function, but it was probably less expected in the Accountability group. And beyond names that you have mentioned, Byron, I think it's worth mentioning that Becky Burr, who after all is also a ccNSO Councilor, is an official member of the group, as well, and she's leading one of the working parties. Jordan Carter is leading another of the working parties and Nigel is taking a leading role in yet another one on the human rights. So I think it's really important to note how our

community's leadership is being recognized through this process.

I assume that most of you were in the tech session yesterday most of the day, and especially when we had an engagement session around the CCWG Accountability, and that's fine. Because otherwise, you would see some repeat information.

I won't go much into detail now, but to give you an idea of where we stand, we have analyzed the 90-plus comments we've received in the second of our comment period, and most of them are supportive of the proposals. Actually, the support is stronger than it was at the first step. So I think we've got a lot of comments noting the improvements that have been provided between first proposal and second proposal.

And essentially, the key aspects of the proposals, which are about updating some of the bylaws to incorporate the Affirmation of Commitment that's currently in place between ICANN and the U.S. Government, so that those key principles and the review systems are in the bylaws.

The enhancements to the Independent Review Process, which is something that has been widely discussed, and it's still widely discussed, is the second block, and the empowerment of the community, which is the ability for this community to veto a budget, to veto a bylaw change, approve a fundamental bylaw

change, remove an individual director, or recall the whole Board. Those are their key powers.

So those are the key building blocks in terms of their existence. It's totally agreed. No one is challenging these aspects anymore. However, there are some areas of concerns – a small number, but with widely publicized debate given their importance to some of the stakeholders.

And basically, the concerns that we've heard were about the potential reallocation of power, the potential concentration of power in the new system, the fact that with a member-driven organization, even if it was a sole member, there would be some risk of capture, and that there might be some unintended consequences due to the membership rights, which are associated with the quality of member in the California code, basically. So that's the main reason of concern that we've heard.

We have had very intensive sessions since Friday. I'm starting to lose track of time. And these sessions were really focused on addressing the outstanding issues. We've made tremendous progress with breakthroughs that we will come back to in essentially tomorrow afternoon, but we think we're on the right track to find a way forward, that can reach consensus. The group very much works on the basis of consensus. It could be rough

consensus, but, [obviously], full consensus would be even better.

So we think we're on the right track. It's obviously taking time because there's been a lot of involvement into this, and we also, we're a large group, everyone needs to be heard, needs to be a thorough debate, well-documented decisions, but I'm cautiously optimistic and cautiously confident that we can come out of Dublin with something that is clarified in terms of the outstanding issues.

I won't go into much more details because tomorrow afternoon, we'll really get deep into this. I really encourage you to attend those sessions where we'll narrow this down around the items about the independent appeals to the IRP, around the community powers and how the decisions are made, what are the impacts for the ccNSO in terms of its own accountability and issues, as well as for the topics that will be addressed in Work Stream 2. So after the transition has taken place. And a special focus, as well, on human rights, which is something of high interest for many of us. And, of course, we'll also discuss timeline as well as the ccNSO decision-making process.

So really, stay tuned, be there, and engage. The idea is really that we can use the outcome of these discussion sessions as guidelines for us members in the CCWG.

Also, you've heard this morning that I think it was Erica Mann from the Board who was asking for the views of the ccTLDs around this. That's a good opportunity, as well, to channel our community's views to the CCWG, the Board, the other constituencies in our manner, so our manner being documented, fact-based, serious, and responsible, and not in a political manner.

So I think is something that many in the community are looking at and looking forward to, and that's what we'll get at tomorrow afternoon, and I think for introductory remark, I leave it at that. Byron.

BYRON HOLLAND:

Are there any comments for Mathieu, or questions? Maybe I'll just pick up on two points that he made. One is this is really going to be an opportunity to provide feedback and that's why we've given you all your voting cards. So throughout the day coming, we will be posing questions to you, so make sure they're available and at the ready.

And the other thing that I just wanted to really pick up on. Mathieu just listed a number of very specific topics. Without a doubt, this is a debate where the devil is in the details, and I would ask that if there are any details you're unclear on over the coming day and a half is really the time to ask the people who

are extremely involved in this process, and clarify for your own thinking any of those details.

And with that, we'll move on to the co-chair of the CWG, Lise.

LISE FUHR:

Thank you, Byron. Well I have the easy part this time. Well, as you know, we had our proposal signed off by the ccNSO at the meeting in Buenos Aires. So what am I doing here? Well our proposal was made conditional in relation to the Accountability proposal.

So we said we had a set of requirements that were to be met by the Accountability proposal before our proposal was totally finalized. We are to discuss these requirements at a later stage. I think it's tomorrow we have a session on this, so I'm not going to go into details with that, but I'll just say that I'm very pleased to hear that there's great progress in that group and I know Mathieu and his co-chairs are working their butts off in trying to reach consensus and find a model that will suit us all. Sorry for the very blunt language.

So actually, we are waiting for the Accountability group to actually have their proposal in order to assess if our requirements are met. But we're not finished in the CWG, even though I say we have the proposal decided and you all signed off

on it. So we have a face-to-face meeting tomorrow in our group from 9:30 to 11:00.

And what are going to discuss there? Well there is an implementation coming up and we, as a group, has not decided what our role as CWG is in relation to the actual implementation. So one of the issues that we are going to discuss tomorrow is the CWG's role in relation to the actual implementation of our own proposal.

We know that the other communities, the CRISP and IANA plan, has clearly stated that they find that they find the oversight and they will have the oversight of the actual implementation. The CWG is also in – we have meetings with Akram and Trang, who's the project manager for the actual implementation. So we have those discussions on how to coordinate the implementation because, as Byron says, the devil is in the detail, and you might have a proposal, but it's also how it's going to be implemented that's going to be important. So this is what we will focus on tomorrow.

Furthermore, we have Sidley, our legal advisors, drafting the bylaws that relates to the CWG proposal. And then we will hand these over when they have been discussed in the CWG. We'll hand it over to the Accountability group to have them collect and actually have a complete set of bylaws.

So that will also be ongoing the next couple of weeks. Furthermore, we have two outstanding issues that will also be discussed in this group, where one is the SLE implementation. There are some concerns about when and how the implementation of the SLEs is going to take place. The other issue is IPR, and that's in relation to IANA. That means how do we use the brand and the domain name IANA. We need to define in our group and the CWG a set of requirements of how to handle the actual IPR rights. So we need to establish these requirements.

The other communities, CRISP and IANA plan, are doing this and CRISP has already sent out a set of requirements and we need to coordinate these requirements.

There is a proposal of placing the IPR in the IETF trust, and we'll see if that's where we end or it's going to be another trust. So both of these issues are to be discussed tomorrow, too, and we will keep you updated on any development on this.

BYRON HOLLAND: Thank you, Lise. Any questions for her? Keith?

KEITH DAVIDSON: Thanks, Lise, for the update. That's most useful. Just actually not so much a question but an observation. The ICG also played

with the idea of what its role should be in terms of implementation. There was some suggestion that the ICG should be the implementation overseers or some such thing.

I think, perhaps, we need to take a leaf out of our own ccNSO book and think about how we've implemented before in terms of IDN fast track, in terms of the FOI, and so on. Having a committee of 30 overseeing implementation is just unwieldy and unworkable, so thinking about how to recruit a very small focused team but keeping the working groups available so that they can be called on to interact is probably a way to go.

So I'm not sure where you'll go with that, but we looked at it and we decided it probably was beyond our scope, but we recognize that both the CCWG and CWG will have a very strong interest in that implementation process.

LISE FUHR:

Thank you. I think that's a very helpful comment and I really agree that's something to think about in order to have a more flexible and fast working group. Thank you.

BYRON HOLLAND:

Any other comments for Lise? No? Then we'll move on to Giovanni, who's going to provide us with a perspective from one of the regions.

GIOVANNI SEPPIA:

Thank you, Byron. Thank you for the opportunity to provide an update with what the CENTR membership has been doing against the IANA transition and the accountability. I must say that [CENTR secretariat] has really worked hard and has done a tremendous job to keep the membership informed about the stewardship transition and the accountability.

One point that I'd like to highlight at this stage is that we had this week the regular meeting of the regional organization, ccTLD regional organizations' boards here in Dublin, and we touched based on these two topics, and we asked very openly to the other regional organizations what has been the status against their membership, how their membership is feeling against these two points. And like in the CENTR community, it is clear that there are some ccTLDs that have the sort of luxury to have time to dedicate to these topics while others, because of the size, and because, again, they are more into business operational matters, they're still very much involved into the day-to-day operation rather than spending and investing a lot of time into these two topics.

And that's because if you look at the amount of e-mails, if you look at the amount of documents, if you look at the technicalities and the legalese language of many of these

documents, it's really difficult to be up to date. And this is a point that we have in the first CENTR board comment to the first draft of the Accountability proposal. We have stressed that there should be an extra effort from the Accountability Working Group to make whatever document more accessible to a wider audience. And again, this is something that we have seen great progress during summertime with some infographics that were created to illustrate the second proposal.

And that indeed facilitates the access to concepts that if you go to the monumental 180 pages plus all the [inaudible] document, you may find yourself almost after the 20... after having gone through the first 20 pages.

The CENTR community is also quite lucky because we have many members, many of our members who are deeply involved, like Lise and Mathieu, in this process. And therefore, we are lucky that we can get fresh updates from them when we have our meetings.

At the same time, at the beginning of this month, October, we had a general assembly in [Brussels]. And we invited a high-level intimate group of the European Commission, and we had quite an interesting discussion with them about the IANA stewardship transition and the accountability enhancements at ICANN. And we came up with this what was called the Renaissance

Statement, which is quite a short –really short – almost a Post-It style document against the accountability full proposal, second proposal, that highlights that we will continue to support the process and we are very thankful to those involved in the process. And we highlighted that the outcome of the process will have its full legitimacy if it continues to be fully consensus driven and bottom up. And this is the essence of this Renaissance Statement.

At the same time, I'd like to also catch up with what Lise just said about [inaudible] and also Byron that the devil stays in the details, and that's because I was recently part of these breakout sessions regarding the veto of the membership model on the budget of ICANN and also I was participating in this working group that the ICANN finance department is having regularly every year to prepare the fiscal year, next fiscal year budgets or to collect the first input from the community about the next fiscal year budget.

And in both sessions, you can see there are a lot of implications about what's going to be the scenario in the future. A lot of implications that will impact the ICANN IANA structures. So it's really something that we are now very much involved into the planning process for this transition, but at some point, we should start looking, as it was said this morning and in past days, at the implementation phase, which is also very much

important. And where this community, the ccTLDs will have to play a leading role, as well.

So we are very much looking forward at CENTR to see the developments, especially the accountability level at this stage, and we are continuing to get engaged and do our best to inform our community about the developments in these areas. Thank you.

BYRON HOLLAND: Thank you, Giovanni. Any comments or questions for Giovanni? I have one. With all of the documents that CENTR has produced on this, are they available to the other regional organizations? They are all available.

GIOVANNI SEPPIA: Yep. We have a mailing list where these CENTR comments and the famous Renaissance Statement have been circulated. And they're also on the CENTR website. So everything is fully public and fully circulated.

BYRON HOLLAND: Any questions for any of the panelists at this point? Well then, I will provide a brief summary, and you can keep me honest to make sure that I've captured the essence of it. You're going to

have to come up to one of the mics in the middle if you want to make a comment. What's that? Sorry. I thought I saw a hand up. Okay.

MATHIEU WEILL: It was not a comment; it was a pizza.

BYRON HOLLAND: I thought it was cake for us, but. Okay. My mistake on that one. So thank you, everybody. I think that provides us a good sense of the state of play or where we're at right now in terms of the major pieces of the puzzle, as well as some of the work the regional organizations are doing to help add value to the whole process.

Certainly from the ICG's perspective, what I heard was quite positive, particularly in terms of the number of comments, the feedback, the diversity of feedback, the level of support in terms of the percentage breakdowns and how little feedback they received that was actually in opposition to the proposal. So that's certainly, I think, a positive outcome of the work of the ICG.

Though they recognized that there are still some key outstanding issues – the dependencies on the accountability track, the root zone manager and the IANA functions operator,

the lack of a direct contract after transition, and that there are still some outstanding issues, vis-a-vis the work of the FOI and some of the service level expectations. So while overall positive, there are certainly some very, very important details that still need to be worked out.

From the CCWG's perspective, our membership is doing a lot of heavy lifting. And when I say our membership, I mean as the ccTLD community. Then I did want to clarify because in some ways, I was remised, but it also required clarification.

Becky Burr is on the CCWG, but she is there as a member from the GNSO. So while I certainly expect that we infect her thinking, she is there on behalf of the GNSO and not the cc community. That said, we are well represented in doing a lot of the heavy lifting and from watching the lists, I know that our members are not shy to comment.

There was significant feedback and input into the last or the second proposal, mostly supportive, which is good, and more supportive than the previous one, so definitely on the right track. But still need to work through some of the key issues, particularly the detail level in terms of some of the issues about the allocation of power, potential for capture, etc. So some of that work still needs to be done.

But in the words of Mathieu, he’s cautiously optimistic that a breakthrough was near. I think that was pretty much a direct quote, so cautiously optimistic. But there are still many issues to address.

In terms of the CWG, there’s definitely work to be done still for that group going forward, even though the most work has already been accomplished. There’s still some of the outstanding issues, obviously –the dependency to the CCWG as well as some more operational details regarding service level expectations and implementation. And that leads to what will be the role of the CWG and the CCWG going forward during the implementation phases. So those are still some outstanding questions to be addressed.

And from a regional perspective, hearing from one region, and I know this to be the case because I’m a member of that region, there is a lot of discussion, a lot of material, and a lot of good work by the CENTR organization to try to provide as much material as possible at varying levels for those of us who have more and less time to dedicate to this subject.

I think the very good news there is the regional organizations are certainly very trusted organizations in their regions, and their ability to put forward that information in a very trustworthy way is certainly helpful to their communities and the communities at

large. And that's one of the issues that I've raised with ICANN in some of the leadership calls and discussions is making sure that ICANN puts forward a whole variety of levels of information to be able to appeal to the folks who want to read all 180-plus pages, the people who want an executive summary, an illustrated version, and everything in between that ICANN really needs to make an incredible effort to deliver the information in a manner that can be consumed by all of the individual participants.

And I think from CENTR's perspective, they're doing exactly that regionally and I'm very happy to hear they're sharing with all the other regions.

So that to me seems to be the state of play right now. And to reuse the phrase over the next sessions, we will start to drill down and look at the devil in the details and be able to have a lot more discussion about those details and potential implications. So that's how we see it today, and look forward to furthermore detailed discussions on all of these tracks in the coming day and a bit.

So with that, I will call this session to a close, give everybody five minutes to check their e-mails because I know nobody's been doing that while we've been talking. And other than the people sending them to me right now, but we will allow this panel to make their way off the stage except, I think, maybe Keith, and

the next panel can come on up and we'll get going with that one in about five minutes. So thank you very much, everybody.

[break]

PETER VAN ROSTE:

We'll be starting in one minute. Good afternoon, everyone and welcome back to part two. This session is covering the – well, I would say part of the work of the ICG and the CWG. And we're zooming in on three specific aspects that are of particular relevance to the ccTLDs. Some of those will be rather short updates but I think the key focus of the session, at least in terms of initial presentation, will be on the SLEs, on that session. That presentation will be given by Jay.

Martin will focus on ICP-1 and the status of that document under the ICG proposal, and Keith will discuss the need for future ccNSO work and what it requires, PDP processes. In addition to that, we hope to be able to use some of the time of this session to discuss how we, as a community, think we will need to get involved in the later and further stages of this process, in particular the implementation. And obviously, there will be a couple of conditions at the starter of that discussion, but we would like to start thinking on how many people are we going to need to do the work on the CSE and the other teams and

communities that the proposal creates. The proposal from the CWG and ICG as it stands now.

So the order on the agenda lists Jay first, but Martin, maybe since you have a very short update on ICP, it might be worth starting with that one. Thanks.

MARTIN BOYLE:

Okay. Thanks very much, Peter. I'd actually like to go a little bit wider than just ICP because in view of Peter's comments about where we, as a community, are going to need to start thinking about how we will contribute to the future model. It would be useful just to sort of cover some of the other parts of the proposal, which will imply ccTLD engagement. And I'm not going to dare look at him, in case he tells me no.

The ICP-1. ICP-1 was, for those who don't know, including me, a document that ICANN produced unilaterally in 1999, and that they claimed was the underpinning work for the ccTLD delegation and redelegation processes.

And that did not come from a bottom-up policy development process and never got accepted by the ccTLD community, was never even particularly accepted by the Governmental Advisory Committee, but at regular intervals got quoted by ICANN as being the source of their decisions.

It certainly was a source of considerable conflict between the cc community and ICANN, and has been – well, it was in full flight, when I first joined the GAC in 2003, and it now looks like we’ve managed to get it put to bed.

The CWG proposal came to the ICG. We went out for consultation and the ccNSO put in some comments on ICP-1 and rewording of text and on the Framework of Interpretation Working Group’s output.

Both of these we referred back to the CWG. The CWG gave the ICP some direct wording. This was accepted in its entirety and in the version four, which I believe is going to be the version that will go out onto our website towards the end of this meeting, and be seen as being the final document subject to the work of the CWG.

So that’s been a useful process, and as you heard in the meeting with the Board this morning, has had some fairly direct and immediate responses.

As I warned you, I’d like to just sort of catch a few other things that in that process from our consultation that we went back to the CWG on so that you’re aware of the issues that are happening and some of those are going to have direct implications for us as a community.

Firstly, there is the root zone maintainer function, which is an entirely separate process, and I understand that Larry Strickling has confirmed that this morning in his session, in the Board session with the Noncommercial Users Community, and the ICG has put into its text of its own bat that there needs to be a written agreement between the root zone maintainer and the IANA functions operator in place before separation. And that was agreed sort of by everybody in that discussion.

And then we get to the organizational bits for the CWG's work. There is the very operational part of the supervisory process called the Customer Standing Committee. The Customer Standing Committee is a small committee. It will have up to, if I remember correctly, five registries as members. It will meet once a month, almost certainly virtually, and it will take the input that Jay will be talking about in a moment. In other words, the way that the IANA functions operator, the PTI, is handling its job with relationship to the service level expectations.

And it will, if necessary, take up issues of performance with the PTI. And I'm flagging this one because this is a generally accepted part of the process, it's the operational end, making sure we ensure operational excellence. But that does mean that we've got to find, and continually find, two ccTLD IANA experts who can devote time to doing this and who can understand the information they're dealing with. And we also need to make sure

that these people can communicate through the ccNSO and to the wider ccTLD community so that everybody then knows and can see if there are issues, where they are.

The second one is to do with the regular review of the IANA functions operation, and that will have ccTLD members. And as I think Lise having been involved in the ATRT process, we'll be able to confirm to anybody who asks. This is going to use a massive proportion of three ccTLD people's time as they go through that process. Again, something we need to think about.

And then there is also the Separation Cross-Community Working Group that might be called should there be a serious problem and we decide that we need to identify a new operator. And that, again, is going to be a massive amount of work. And if we are going to be able to cope with that intelligently, we as a community need to understand the issues associated with that.

So those are the elements that I think I'd like you all to keep in your mind as we're going forward so that we can then start thinking about how, as a community, we can make sure that we are playing the role that we need to play to ensure that the IANA functions operation meets our requirements. Thank you.

PETER VAN ROSTE: All right. Thank you. Are there any questions for Martin at this stage?

STEPHEN DEERHAKE: For the record, Stephen Deerhake, .AS, American Samoa. Martin, you mentioned with respect to ICP-1 that it appears that it's finally been retired, retired, it's no longer present on the IANA website except in the archives section, where it should have been a long time ago. Do you have a commitment from ICANN that they will cease referencing it in external document? And do you have an as-of date if, in fact, you have such a commitment?

KEITH DAVIDSON: For the record, Keith Davidson providing a response. But I think no is answer to both of your questions. But at the joint session with the Board today, we asked that the Board confirm to us that it has archived ICP-1, and their response was they don't. They're still getting their heads around what the concept of archiving it might mean.

STEPHEN DEERHAKE: That's what I [got from] Chris.

KEITH DAVIDSON: But yeah, the purpose of this discussion was not to do with any external factors. That was purely that we wanted the referencing to actual policies and guidelines that actually exist as a clear way towards the transition and having achieved the deletion of those documents from the website.

Now, to have it verified that they are archived is about as far, I think, as the ccNSO should move on this.

PETER VAN ROSTE: All right. Thank you so much. [Jane]. One of the things that I think most ccTLDs things, the most tangible aspect of this whole transition is the service level that they can expect from the IANA function operator following that transition. And your group has put in an enormous amount of work over the last year, I guess, to get us to a point where you have a pretty detailed document to propose to this community. So the next 20 minutes are yours. Thanks.

JAY DALEY: Thank you, Peter. This will be the most boring presentation that you'll hear today. So could somebody please lock the doors to stop anybody escaping? There will be a short written test afterwards, as well, before you're allowed back out.

So service level expectations. This is IANA speak for service level agreement, which many of us will know and be very familiar with, reinterpreted for the modern age through the process of a very long working group and a very long time trying to understand it.

There were six people from the registries side. We have Paul Kane, Patricio and me from the cc side. And on the GNSO side, we had Elaine Pruis from Donuts, Jeffrey Eckhaus from Rightside, and Jeff Neuman, who was at Neustar or something, and then changed jobs halfway through, okay, but carried on. And we had help from somebody who works for Paul Kane to do some of the negotiations with us, so that made life a lot easier.

The six of us, all of us have extensive experience of writing SLAs, of reporting to SLAs, of running operations that meet SLAs. We eat SLAs for breakfast, we take SLAs with us when we go out with the children, we decorate our walls with SLAs. So we had a reasonably good idea what we were doing with SLAs and we were very, very tight as a group. We very much worked together about this.

However, we had a very strong difference of opinion with IANA about what is an SLA, what should go into an SLA, and how an SLA should be developed, and this was a very lengthy process of negotiation. And to be honest, some strong push from us for us

to get what we wanted through this. And we now have something that we are happy with on paper, but we still have to see how this will be implemented, and I will address that later.

So I'm going to walk through all 275 pages – oh, no – 27 pages of this. [Slightly]. I don't expect you to remember so much what I say; just remember the colors and the shapes so if you come to look at this later, you can remember what those colors and shapes mean in some way to give you an idea about things.

And I may not be able to show you everything on the screen, just the top half of the page each time, as well, due to our technology and I'm worried I'll break it. So we'll see how we go there.

[inaudible]. All right. I've talked about this before a bit. We have some basic principles in place, which are to ensure that the SLE is a proper SLE and doesn't try to do too much. We are not trying to change any process here at all, we are not trying to do anybody else's job. We just want to make sure that we measure what we should be measuring and that this is a fair document. So there are statements here about us that effectively mean let us ask something that is fair.

One of the big questions that we have is if you wish to measure IANA, and there are parts of IANA's processes where they're relying on a third party to do something, such as one of us, we need to be clear about that so that if a process is meant to take

60 days and we, as a ccTLD, take 58 days deciding something, then that's not the way it should be measured. So we've been quite clear about that in the way we state the principles.

And so we've also been very clear that when we have particular performance criteria that will appear later in the document, that those are based on real data that has been measured. That may not necessarily give us what we want yet, but we understand that the SLE will be a developing process over a number of years – and Joel is escaping – where we can look through to make sure that we change and update on a – as things develop.

Okay. We've documented the assumptions that we have based this on at the beginning, and this has been slightly difficult in some regards because we have – it took a long time for IANA to be given permission by the NTIA to release documents to us, telling us how they do things. And that's been vital for us to have those documents so that we can include those and explain how we think things should work. So there's a reasonably nice assumption section in there.

One of the things that we have defined in these assumptions that may have been missing before is the expectation that IANA's online systems operate 24 hours a day because it has customers all around the globe. Now that's been known before,

but through this process, these things have been defined a lot better, I suspect.

We have a flowchart, which has been provided by IANA as part of the assumptions, which is the one that took three months, I think, for IANA to have permission to share with us.

And we have had lengthy discussions about this end-to-end process bit, and about ensuring that there are no ways in which a request made to IANA can disappear, that either the request is something that IANA is responsible for or it is waiting for the customer, the registry, to do something. But there is no other state between those two.

Okay. Now this is one of the bits that took the longest time to agree, but this is one of the bits that we are most pleased about. This is fundamental to making this work. It is a very simple definition of the services that IANA provides split into four categories. And this is all, of course, on the domain name side.

We have routine updates that impact the root zone file, such as changing an NS record or a DS record or something. Routine updates that do not impact the root zone file, such as those that do with, say, changing a telephone number or an e-mail address or something. Creating or transferring a gTLD and creating or transferring a ccTLD.

This categorization is important because different standards will apply to those different categories later. And it seems so simple. It took several months to get that and that documented in that stage.

We then have a nice matrix, so this is one of the colors to remember. Well, you can't see it that well, but this is the light blue in the document. Okay? And this sets out, for these categories that we have at the top, different elements or steps that will be taken in that process, and then what form of measurement we expect, whether there will be full measurement or partial measurement, [inaudible] things there. It's just a little summary to help us ensure that we have everything covered properly.

Okay. Now the reporting mechanisms, this really is something new, but it has to be there as part of the SLE, so it has to be defined here. It's not a new element of the process that is undertaken by IANA, it's a new element of the way that IANA reports on that process.

And so we have this new thing, the real time dashboard, with visual performance indicators. And we have an SLE report that exists but will have more going into it and be explained better for us.

Okay. So when we looked at the particular measures that are required, particular metrics that we want IANA to track, there were two types of those. There are those that are for information, where we just need to know what is going on so that we understand these things, and then there are those that are used to determine IANA's performance. The second category, those are the ones that if IANA fails to deliver, there will be a problem that will be escalated.

These first ones, these informational measures, are things that we need to know to see the overall performance. But they're not going to be used to judge IANA; they're simply going to be used to help us understand the full scope of things.

And there are a few of these here for people to remember. And the ones that are in yellow on there but in green on the document, all of the new ones that are to be added. And so there's a lot of extra work that's gone in there.

Okay. So then we move on to the process performance stage. So these are processes within the categories we talked about previously that IANA must perform. And these are the ones that if it does not do it within certain times, there will be a problem.

There are no numbers in here yet. That is something that we need to do later through a process of capturing data, and then analyzing that data, and then putting that in place. And the

implications of that is something I'll talk about at the end of this talk.

This is a pretty straightforward way of managing an SLA, measuring an SLA. You have the metric, which is how soon something must be done, you have the threshold of how many must be done within that time, and you then have – you then talk about what happens is the breach and the period that you measure this over. Okay? We define those a bit earlier on over here. In this case, actually, the breach is the percentage.

Okay. So these are all set out. So this is category one. I'm just showing you here as an example. Routine updates impacting the root zone. And then within there are the various metrics of these so the time to results for subsequent performance of technical checks, for example. So this is a breakdown of that process into time stages that need to be timed.

Now again, this was a big part of the negotiation was to break down a fairly previously monolithic process of IANA into the individual stages and have those individual stages measured and understood. This is, if you deal with SLAs and you have a table made out of SLAs because you have so much paperwork, and you know this is very, very standard. This is the way something should be done. But there was a strong disagreement of views about this for what felt like about five years, I think.

Okay. So we have this right the way through, a very long set of explanations here. Now those of you that are not familiar with an SLA may look at this and think, “Well this looks very big. This looks like we’re asking a lot of them. There’s a lot going on here.”

For those of us who deal with SLAs, we were probably looking at this going, “Oh, this is nice and easy. This is not a very long one. This is a really straightforward one.” So we have not overdone this, we have not overcooked this, we have not pushed them to a level which is inappropriate.

We have to remember that the IANA function is Critical Internet infrastructure with a capital C. It is one of the most important functions there is because if things go wrong, then bits of the Internet stop working. And this is entirely proportionate to the importance, and that is the way an SLE should be developed, which is proportionate to the job that it is intending to measure.

Okay. Then we have talked about accuracy. Accuracy was a complicated subject for us to discuss, and I think this is the one element where those of us working from the registry side have learned the most from IANA about what we were asking for and how we understood it, and so this is a much simpler version, I think, than we started out with. And I think this is quite useful still. I’m still quite happy with this.

[Sort of] going back, we have some very small sets of things about accuracy. That's it. Basically, that it must have 100% accuracy, and if it is anything less than 100%, then the world falls apart. Okay? The simplest statement we could possibly find on accuracy.

Okay. So we understand... Many of us for many years were asking for IANA. I think that phrase was first developed at a CENTR meeting in Poland in 2004 or something, I think. And it is now within our grasp. It is something that IANA have been developing and is going to be there.

And so with agreement of IANA, we have gone through and set metrics for this, for this to be in place to understand how this works. And so these go through... These are all green, yellow on there, and these are the new things that are expected for that online availability tool.

Okay. So you don't need to read any more. I've finished taking notes. Well done. Thank you. I can talk you through the next steps. The big thing now is the data collection exercise. IANA, as you probably know – and correct me if I'm wrong on this, anybody – but I think has no dedicated development staff or dedicated IT staff that work on these things, which I was very surprised at when I heard.

It is fully part of ICANN, the organization, and needs to compete with other elements of ICANN for the resources to have its technical work delivered. So the IANA systems need work to be able to capture information, and then they need six months of time to capture that information. And as we understand it, the work will be ready, I think, sometime February of next year, and then they'll be able to start the six months capture.

Now if there's – David, have I got wrong that wrong?

DAVID CONRAD: David Conrad, ICANN CTO. I'm responsible for the development associated with the transition, including RZMS development. So let's see. There are dedicated resources for IANA development. We have rearranged the resources that we have available. We are.

PETER VAN ROSTE: So there are now? Yeah, great.

DAVID CONRAD: Yes. And it's FTE equivalents, there have always been one and a half FTE associated with IANA development. And depending on which projects need to be undertaken, we would add additional FTE as necessary to meet whatever the requirements were. The

issue with the resources available for this particular development is that you need to understand the code base given the extremely tight timelines in which the development needs to be done.

If you are throwing resources into a development project that do not have experience with that resource, you end up spending quite a bit of time in ramping people up on the code base. If you've read anything about software development, *The Mythical Man-Month* book by Frederick Brooks actually lays this out quite well, saying that nine women do not have the ability to have a baby in one month. Okay?

So with regards to the availability of the data for the testing for a collection of data for the SLAs eventually, we were never informed what the data collection period had to be or should be. We based our assumption that we would need to collect the data before the transition because we were informed that in order for the transition to move forward, we must implement all the SLEs and convert them to SLAs. Based on our assumptions of and scoping the amount of work that needs to be done when measured with the other work that needs to be done to the RZMS system to support NTIA-less operation.

We scoped the work to be completed at the beginning of second quarter of 2016. So that would provide for some number of months to collect data for the generation of the SLAs.

JAY DALEY:

Okay. Thank you, David. I think there may have been a breakdown in communications there about the length of time for collection, but we can discuss that later then.

So the big question, of course, for us is how important is IANA to ICANN? Personally speaking, having gone through this process, I am surprised at the answer that I feel I have received. Now I'm not – David's new in this regard and he's making changes on things they're doing there, but historically, it does not appear as though IANA has been as important as perhaps we would feel it is, being such direct customers of it.

The final thing to note is that a decision is going to have to be made as to whether or not transition can take place without the SLE in place or whether the SLE must be in place for transition. Those of us on the working group have been very clear that our view is that it must be in place for this, for the transition to take place, because it is a fundamental part of the process to do this.

Others have different views and that still needs to be set out and understood. But given the timetables we have talked about

earlier, there may well be some difficulties around that. And I think that's still to be resolved. So that's it unless there are any questions.

PETER VAN ROSTE: Thank you very much, Jay. Are there any questions? Yes. David, then Nigel.

DAVID CONRAD: Hey. Just probably a statement of the obvious, but ICANN has always – not always, but – maybe always – always been under a service level agreement to implement changes at the root. Currently that service level agreement is with NTIA. I think I don't want people to get the impression that ICANN or IANA are seeing these SLEs as anything new. These are enhancements and additional modifications and additional demands for information that were not previously collected, but ICANN has always operated under SLAs for the IANA functions.

JAY DALEY: Okay, David. Just to give a slightly different perspective on that. Yes, it has always operated under something labeled a service level agreement that has broad expectations of when things should be done by. But I think – I don't remember how many pages it was written on, but it was far fewer, and this was far

looser, than any of us would expect to be in place for such a critical function.

So yes, it was there, and as David as said, and it's been worked on and reported on, but it was in the most recent tender of the IANA function some years ago where that was strengthened to that point. So even before that, it was much looser still.

So personally speaking as a professional, I'm uncomfortable with describing what has been in place as a proper SLA because it is such a relaxed and low-specification document compared to what we really need for something this important.

NIGEL ROBERTS:

Thank you. I heard you say that we are almost on the cusp of acquiring the ability to have the [E] IANA and relatively trouble-free automatic updates to top-level domains. I'll continue to do what I've done at several meetings in the past and remind everybody that we had this ability before ICANN took over, the [Internet] system allowed us to make changes before it was split off and given to ICANN. So it really is *Back to the Future Day* tomorrow. We are going to be getting back something that we had in 1998.

PETER VAN ROSTE:

Lise, you're next.

LISE FUHR: You know, you've got a moderator. Thank you, Daley, and I think it's really... You did a great job. Jay Daley, sorry. But you did a great job with the SLE and I know Paul has really put a lot of time and effort in it. But regarding the implementation, we need to be aware that there is an SLE or SLA with NTIA today.

So we can't just change that before the transition. We can make it ready and we can make the data collection, as you talk about. And that's very important that we have that done as early as possible.

JAY DALEY: Oh, yes. All we're talking about is the work required to make it ready so that at transition, it can move to this new one. Yes.

JOERG SCHWEIGER: So this is Joerg Schweiger with the .de [inaudible]. I just wanted to mention that I don't feel that not having data about the current situation of the IANA or its performance. SLAs do not need to block, they do not need to be a showstopper. Because what I would do is if we do not know the current level of performance, what we could do is just make it very clear what our expectations need to be and are.

And if we could convince IANA or the IANA operator to just stick to those expectations, then it would not be such a harm to not have any measured data yet. And I feel that setting up those expectations at certain parts of those SLEs shouldn't be too hard because we do know at certain points, there has to be 100% performance; whereas on the other hand, there may be some issues or there's some points where 95% are just enough and we could just shift up the level that the service level expectations need to fulfill over the forthcoming future.

JAY DALEY:

To me, it's impossible to set the expectations without putting some figures down, and if we put figures down without data, then we're inventing figures. And I don't think that's fair on IANA for us to be inventing figures. We could put down how quickly we want things done, but that may not, if it doesn't reflect current practice within IANA, it may not at all be suitable.

And it would require a relatively lengthy discussion amongst us about how quickly we need things done. There are certain changes that if I ask IANA and it takes them a week, I have no issue with that. There are other changes preferred sooner. It's, I think, starting from data and using that data, and then assessing performance, then working through that over a period of a

number of years to refine that is a good approach, the better approach here.

The other point is that we have the only measurement that exists so far is for a very broad process that has now been cut into – or not cut – it always was in multiple stages. But we're now going to measure it at those different stages.

And so if we were to attempt expectations within those stages without knowing how much time is proportionally used within each stage, then I think we can make some big mistakes there, as well. So we did think about that. We did originally give some of these expectations in just terms of percentages, but some – IANA were able to make a very convincing argument that that would be unreasonable and problematic for us to do, and so that's why this has now been removed entirely, and we wait for proper data.

PETER VAN ROSTE:

All right. Thank you so much, Jay. I must say that talking for almost a year about expectations has made you a master at managing them, since compared to the start of your presentation, this is now standing room only, so well done.

Final intervention from – I'm going to take any remaining questions at the end because we're already running a bit late.

Final intervention from Keith, and then I'm going to give Mary the floor and I'm going to summarize it, and then we break for coffee.

KEITH DAVIDSON:

Thanks, Peter. My topic is the need for future ccNSO work PDP process on. And I guess there are a couple of issues that have arisen yet again during discussions in the CWG, the CCWG, and ICG in terms of ccNSO policies, or the lack thereof. And these are issues that have arisen during discussions on the Framework of Interpretation and on the earlier Delegation and Redelelegation Working Group.

So to cut a long conversation short, what I think I should be doing is recommending to the ccNSO Council that there needs to be a working group, or more than one working group, set up to do a PDP on a couple of topics. One topic being the retirement of ccTLDs for which there is currently no policy whatsoever, and leaving the ICANN Board to continue to make decisions based on no policy just seems totally inappropriate. So I think it is something that this community needs to take on board and deal with very rapidly.

The other is the appeals mechanism referred to in RFC 5091 where there's disagreement between a ccTLD operator who's being redelegated. RFC 5091 states there should be a natural

justice mechanism of an appeals authority. The CWG flirted with this topic and didn't get to a conclusion. But again, this is a property of the ccNSO and I would suggest that a policy development process be entered into to get that rolling.

I suggest that both of these topics are very urgent, both of them have impact on the overall accountability of ICANN and both of them are issues that pertain purely to this ccTLD community. So my recommendation is we think about this quickly, we can use the existing work of guidelines and policies of RFC 5091 [to get] principles 2005, the FOA itself, and the Delegations and Redelegations Working Group reports, and so on.

So just as a pre-warning to get your heads around some thinking of some future work, this is required and it needs to be attended to with no delay.

PETER VAN ROSTE: Thank you, Keith. Room for two questions. Mary first then Nigel.

MARY UDUMA: Thank you. My question is to the last presentation. Thank you very much for this elaborate work done. It was so challenging that you were able to get through to this point. Two things. The volume, considering the enhancement that is going to be done, do you think IANA has the capacity and resources to be able to

produce all these metrics? And secondly, did you consider the financial implication to the organization?

JAY DALEY:

So the metrics should be able to be collected by the software automatically. There should be very limited need for human work here, so the resource impact is the capital cost of developing the software; and then after that, there's no additional staffing side of things.

And no, we did not consider the finances of this at all. For many of us, IANA is the most important thing that ICANN does, and we just went in with that expectation that it should be given that priority.

PETER VAN ROSTE:

Thanks, Jay. Nigel, final question.

NIGEL ROBERTS:

Yeah, [as] bearing the scars of several of those working groups that Keith mentioned, just a quick comment. Yes, urgency is taken onboard. I would suggest that of those two topics, one of them is actually suitable for a fast track PDP, and one of them, perhaps, less so. But we can at least get one of them fast tracked.

JAY DALEY: I think that's a good idea. I think maybe one working group doing simultaneous PDPs – one on a fast track and one on a slower track – might be appropriate since the resource material is the same and the topics aren't that far apart.

PETER VAN ROSTE: All right. Thank you so much. Thanks to the panelists. Now I'm going to try and summarize the last 15 minutes in three. So Martin started off by telling us about a document that most of us had never heard of before that was never supported by anyone but ICANN, and that now has been archived, and we should all be very happy with that.

A very important piece of information was that the NTIA has today confirmed that the discussions on the root zone maintainer and the IST are two completely different processes. And referring to the ICG requirement, there will be a need for a contract to be in place between the IANA operator and the root zone maintainer.

Martin spent a significant portion of his allocated time, as well, to remind us that we will need skilled individuals and resources. Six, seven, eight, following the transition for the heavy lifting that this plan will require. We will need people to sit on the CSC

(the Customer Standing Committee), on a monthly basis, calls, probably a couple of in-person meetings. We will need people for the IANA Review Function, and if it ever comes to that, we will need people that will probably spend 20 hours a day discussing separation.

Jay told us that SLEs are basically SLAs in IANA speak, and that with a team of six experienced SLA writers, they have worked over the last year on how these SLAs for IANA should be developed. There was a strong push from the group needed to convince IANA that the level of detail that has been put into these SLAs was necessary.

Implementation is still an issue, though. We haven't really touched upon this at the end of the presentation, but maybe in some other future sessions, we can go a bit more in detail on that.

A couple of principles essential to make a distinction between the IANA part of the workflow and the external part. For instance, the time that it takes a ccTLD to respond to requests in that process. The group has started from a 24 365 principle. For the first time that is now put in writing.

Requests can no longer disappear, which personally I found what a shocking that hadn't been a principle before, but it's

good to see that it's in there now. And the SLE will be work in progress.

An essential part of the whole SLE discussion was that different types of services have been identified, depending on their impact and the fact whether they're CC or gTLD requests. And there is an "other" category. That is essential because it will form the basis of the expectations and the measurements and the benchmarks that will be applied to them. One thing that the group did not compromise on is accuracy. There will be a need for 100% accuracy, which again, given that we're talking about critical Internet functions, is rather reassuring.

The next steps include major data gathering exercise, and we learned that timing how that exercise might be slightly problematic. And it is really rather reassuring to hear from David that there is now a dedicated resource in place for the IANA development since the proposals of the SLE team will require a lot of work from [inaudible].

A couple of open questions, and probably the most important one is if the transition even can take place without the SLE ready to go. As we learned from Lise, it cannot be implemented given the fact that it would be competing with the NTIA current SLEs.

David and Jay remind us, as well, that SLEs have been in place for a long time, but this proposal provides the necessary details

for an SLA for such an important function. It's very good news that the IANA will be operational, and depending on your age, you might have a Deja vu.

And Keith, in the last part of this discussion, explained to us that there is a need for a policy development process following the work of the ICG. And he recommends to set up at least two drafting groups, one on the retirement of ccTLDs and one on appeals mechanisms that should be put in place, as this essential element was omitted in the final version of the CWG report.

What I take from this is that, contrary to popular belief, the end of this process will not make our lives easier. It might make Lise's and Mathieu's and Martin's and Keith's and Jay's life easier for a bit, but that there is not only a lot of work needed to prepare for the transition following the finalization of their proposals, but following the transition, we will need to rely – well first of all, identify and then rely on highly skilled individuals to make this whole thing actually work.

I give the floor to David for last comment.

DAVID CONRAD:

Just one clarification. In the 13 years that I'm aware of, that I know staff that have been involved in IANA, no request has ever

been lost. I think what Jay was referencing was time of a request process being misplaced where a request will go through and a certain number of days or minutes or hours were not accounted for within the system, but a request itself has never been lost.

JAY DALEY:

To be clear, I wasn't suggesting that time has ever been misplaced previously. We just want to make sure that in new SLE that all time is accounted for in one or other of the two buckets. That's all.

PETER VAN ROSTE:

I happily stand corrected on this one, but I'm still equally relieved. Thank you so much, everyone, for their contribution, and thank you so much for the questions from the floor. Thank you.

KATRINA SATAKI:

Dear colleagues, unfortunately, our next session starts now. So we don't have time for a coffee break. Otherwise, sorry, we were running into troubles with our external visitors. So marketing session now, sorry.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: Well good evening. We're going to start with the marketing session. We have three very good presentations from our colleagues. We are going to start with Danko with ask.rs, an educational [event], then challenges of the current market for ccTLDs, the .nl experience with Michiel, and in the end, responding to changing marketplace in .uk with Russell.

DANKO JEVTOVIC: Okay. This is my presentation. So hello everybody. I hope that this marketing salad among this IANA transition sandwich will be a bit waking up event during all this, but we'll try to keep it short and instead of the break, just to change the topic a bit.

So I'll be talking about the event we have organized, and to tell you first just... Okay, ah, this works. So just a few words about the registry. The Serbian .rs registry we got like 90,000 domain names in management so we are small registry. We're actually the European youngest registry, and we are a foundation that has four goals.

We are developing the registry and domain name market in Serbia. We are striving to get our office to do business excellence and to do it in an efficient way. We are foundation so one of our goals is also the organization and development of our foundation, meaning the structure, our board, conference of co-

founders, and the whole structure that is holding the registry together.

And because we are foundation, we are not not-for-profit, so we are spending the funds we are getting by registries and domain names in a usual fashion by improving Internet in Serbia and rising up the e-commerce and the quality content in Serbian language.

So we are having multi-stakeholder model in our registry, which is quite unusual for Serbia being a country that has experience with significantly different kind of social model earlier. As I said, we are a foundation, not-for-profit. We have around 70 co-founders that are Serbian legal entities, companies that are electing our board. The board has seven members and the board is [picking up] CEO, that's my duty.

We have about 40 registrars and currently they are only Serbian legal entities, Serbian registrars. We are in process of changing the new registration system, including new registration software, that is written as we speak in the final stages, and we hope that next year move to standard EPP protocol that will hopefully help us expand.

So our challenge was to improve the community goodwill because we are a rather young registry. Our domain .rs is rather young, it was Yugoslav .co.yu, Yugoslav domain name earlier,

and we have a lot of people who are longer time with Internet in Serbia, and they're used to using also gTLDs because in that moment when they started to be on Internet, .rs was not available, not existing.

So we are also striving to include our registry recognition to also to help our community and educate about [inaudible] the entity in a way for our domains and other things. And to support Internet entrepreneurship, this is one of the goals of our foundation. And in order to do all that, we are also trying to promote usage and revenue – our revenue from .rs and .serb registrations.

As I mentioned in the previous slide, .serb is IDN with a Cyrillic name we are also using, but it's not that strong in a marketing sense because it's a rather new thing and, of course, IDN has a lot less registrations.

So the opportunity presented itself, there was in Serbia Internet conference called New Energy that was some people from the communities started this conference on the Copernic Mountain Resort, and we were expecting a lot of participants. It turned out to be more than 600 of them, and that presented, they came to us with an idea for us to support the conference and to be a sponsor.

But we decided not to just spend money to sponsoring something, but to use this opportunity in a more creative way. So we had an idea to make this ask.rs event, it's in Serbian language [inaudible].rs. And to bring experts from the community to answer the questions from the community. So in order to facilitate this dialog and to help those experts bring for to the goals we are seeking for our communication with community.

So the topics we selected were these four: how to start your Internet business, how to create online content, how to build your brand online, and how to advertise on Internet.

Then we had this structure – I think, yeah, this is [inaudible] event. Then we had this structure that for every topic, we had a presenter like a host from the registry or people who are involved in the registry, maybe not directly employed, who's introducing the topic and speaking something about them. And then we had two additional people who presented their experience and their lessons from this topic, so we had 12 lectures in total.

At the end, the event was very successful because we had more than 100 visitors, we expected half of that number, so people are the whole day standing in this rather small room. But it was very good because it brought also visibility for social media.

So people were really asking the questions and the subjects they were interested in and we were able to be answered by the people from the community from our expert, and it was really seen as a contribution from [inaudible].rs registry.

So the effects were [inaudible].rs website was especially made for this event and now the videos from the event are on the website, had during this pre-event and during the event itself 6,200 visits, which is good number for our size. Facebook reach was 370,000. Our hashtag on [inaudible].rs (meaning ask.rs) had 620 tweets by more than 100 authors, and the tweet reach was, it's not fully seen on this slide, but 185,000 people.

We had [inaudible] media mentions and we were also able to place, because of the interest in this event, people from the registry in the national TV and national TV news, so it was a very good opportunity for our visibility.

So not to take too much of your time, we are thinking about what's next and what's our takeaways from this event and that way of doing things. And we are actually very happy because everybody recognized this as a good way for our foundation to communicate with the community and to bring the message that we are really doing something for everybody, and really helping our goals of promoting e-commerce, Internet usage, and

better usage of cyberidentity, which leads, of course, to registering our domain names.

So we will be repeating this experience two weeks from now on [inaudible] conference, smaller conference in Serbia, just to try to see by repeating that if this event is really going to work with the community again. And if we do this successfully, we are planning about extending this idea into next year.

We are thinking about [inaudible].rs caravan for Serbia that will go through smaller places and bring people, experts from the community from these local parts of Serbia to answer the questions about Internet and about cyberidentity, about e-entrepreneurship, and then to make maybe some central event in Belgrade.

The idea is maybe to make ask.rs as a central educational team for the registry in the next year, and in that way, to make it use this educational tool as a way to promote not only the registry itself but also our domain name and our brand. So that will be it in short. Thank you for your interest. If there are any questions, I will be more than happy to answer.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: Thank you, Danko. We have a couple of minutes for some questions, if there are any. Well, I just have one question – quick

question. Is there, in the people invited, someone who will be advise in entrepreneur funding, as in financially?

DANKO JEVTOVIC:

Funding is interesting subject and there are some possibilities and there are ideas by the government also to provide this sort of information. By talking about entrepreneurship in general, we see two kinds of people. There are Internet entrepreneurs, so people who know much about Internet but are not really moving into business yet, and I think this subject is more interesting to them.

But I also recognized and we through this also tried to communicated people who are already entrepreneur in an, how to say, offline world, and doing some business, but to try to move them into online world and to help them take the benefits of cheaper communication, better reach, and so on.

So the idea was... Well this particular event more to talk about this people and to help them move into online. And this is also the way for us to rise the number of registrations.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE:

Thank you very much. Any other questions? Then we move to our next panelist. Thank you, Danko.

MICHIEL HENNEKE:

Thank you very much. Alejandro, I see that my sheet was still being uploaded. I've been asked to give a little presentation here about a subject that I've been working on for a while now, and that is how we, as a ccTLD registry, should cope with the changing market conditions that we see all around us right now.

Now this is a subject I could be talking about for a very long time, but you've all had a very long day, so I decided to go about it another way, if my sheets would show up.

I would like to share with you some insights that we gained, and that we used, in shaping our marketing policy, based on research that we did. And I'm then going to ask you all to participate and answer a number of questions that I'm going to ask you or statements with true or false.

And for those of you who do that best, I have actually brought some nice edible prizes with me, which I think you'll all really like after a long day like this. So if the sheets work, then we can get started. I don't know where that came from. You see that Irish chocolate is even popular across the lake.

Ah, very good. Right. Here's the quiz. Now before I start, what I did for this quiz is that we hired an existing panel of 10,000 Internet users and we monitored their entire behavior on PC,

laptop, tablet, and smartphone. And to give you an idea, we're talking about 160,000 domain names per month and 10,000 apps, which meant that in order to analyze these results for power computers, as they're called, had to run 24/7 for 261 hours straight. And it's about results that I would like to ask you some questions or put some thesis to you.

Now the first question is this. From our findings we found, did we or did we not find that Dutch Internet users visit more domains on PCs and laptops than on smartphones or tablets? Raise your hand if you think it's true. Don't raise your hand if you think it's false. Don't raise your hands if you think it's false. Raise your hand if you think it's true. Everybody. More domains on PCs and laptops. One, two, three, four, five, six, seven. True. The majority says it's false, and the correct answer is it is true.

Though by a small margin because, as you can see, the average tablet user is actually pretty close in terms of number of unique domains to PCs or laptops these days. So everybody who raised their hands is now going to the next round. This is really cleaning up here.

Okay. This one then. This should be easy. Young Internet users are more likely to consider registering a domain – and young, I mean 18 to 29 – than Internet users in general. What do you think? Young people. Who thinks that it's true? Raise your hand.

One, two, three. Only three left. And it's true. Once again. I'm sorry, [Eric], really.

And why is that? Because this is interesting. Their motives are distinctly different. Young people in the Netherlands predominantly want to register because they consider it useful for business purposes in the near future. And by business purposes, I mean, starting your own company, becoming a freelancer, or simply applying for a job.

Personal sites, personal [meals] domaining, that's not interesting. Aob personal [meal], one respondent said, "Yes, that's what I use if I have to reset my Facebook password." Okay. So we're only at three now, I think.

Then the third question. The importance of mobile apps for businesses is increasing. True or false. Raise your hand if true, don't if it's false. Totally false. In 2012, three years ago, almost half of Dutch businesses were working on apps, working with apps, planning on apps, saying they were important or even strategically important, and an awful lot of businesses have now come to realize that the number of apps somebody can have on a smartphone is too limited for every company in the country to have a viable app. So it is shifting to responsive websites more and more. Again, a very valuable insight.

Now who had all questions good so far? Oh, my God. Who really likes chocolate? One, two, three, four, five, six. Okay. Report afterwards and we'll be fine. I didn't realize I've made it this difficult. But I still have a last question, and I'd amended the shifting question because I expected at least 20 people to be still in the race here.

We also measured, in the same panel, how many people out of those 10,000 visited a new gTLD. .club was the most visited new gTLD in Netherlands in the first six months of this year. How many percent of Dutch Internet users actually viewed a .club website in that period? Anybody an estimate? 1%, 0%, better? 5%. Okay. Great.

The gentleman out back is actually closest. It's 6.64%, which means it's just ahead of .xyz, and then you see a very long [till] and in total, 79 new gTLDs were recorded has having been visited by members of the panel. This is over a six-month period.

Okay. So I do expect six chocolate lovers here afterwards and thank you, everybody, but now back to some serious business because why am I asking you these questions? It is to introduce the insights that we are using to cope with the changing market. How does customer behavior change? What does mobile mean for our business? And what does that mean for our deposition of our ccTLD?

But to start, the reason we're doing this is that we... As many of you are looking at growth declining, this is growth chart for .nl since SIDN became responsible for it. And the trend is obvious and we're not the only ones as this chart from centrstats.org, the new CENTR statistical website, clearly shows. Growth is slowing down across the board.

Now the question that was put to me, or by somebody is, "Hey, where has the growth gone and what can we do about it?" And I do think –and this is my personal opinion here – that your options are limited. You have existing competitors as a ccTLD, you have a lot of new entries, and you have substitutes coming up. And if you look at the way ccTLDs are coping, what you see is that those ccTLDs that are relatively successful at generating more creations tend to have a higher deletion rate or lower attention rate, and the other way around.

In other words, the more you invest in new registrations, the more it leads to deletions, eventually, so it doesn't really pay off. And the reason is that there is an element – and this differs from market to market, but in general, there is some saturation.

If you look at the Netherlands right now, almost half of the population has a domain name. This is overstating it a bit and sometimes difficult to guess if a gTLD is registered in the Netherlands, but it's not far off with 8 million.

And a lot of those are not used, and this is a pie chart that we use a lot, and that's IDN, which is very important. It's a scan performed for us by a data provider showing the entire .nl zone by use or non-use.

And as you can see, from the 5.6 million .nl domain names that are active today, a lot are not really visibly used. So how realistically is it to expect more growth or growth taken up if there is so much not used within the existing zone?

Also, a lot of what you see here, a lot of these pages that are unused tend to be deleted relatively fast. So if you can't influence the growth of your market as a whole, well, what can you do as a ccTLD? Well, to go to it quickly, three things I think are of big significance: registrar loyalty, investing in use, and investing in your brand.

And to start with the first two, this is one initiative that we've launched a couple of months back. It's our registrar scorecard. It's a dashboard on our registrar Exonet with a loyalty program attached to it, and it rewards registrars who invest in more active use of their portfolio. They can see how they score. They can see what incentive they're entitled to. This, by the way, is a mockup account. And they can get a detailed breakdown and report of that use.

And the letter is very important because this is something that you, as a ccTLD, are uniquely set to use in a relationship with your registrars. For example, this is how we use the data with the registrar. And before we went to him, he said, “Okay, it’s great, I like .nl, but I have to divide my attention between you, other gTLDs, the new TLDs, and my hosting products. And the latter are the most profitable.”

So this is how you can use your own data or zone data to strengthen relations to your mutual benefit. What we did is we made an analysis where we identified Web shops that had, what you see on the right, a high search engine score (84% in this case), but did not, as you can see at the bottom, have an SSL certificate or an up-to-date SSL certificate. And for those of you who are not aware of that, since this year, Google rewards Web shops that have a proper SSL certificate, so really gain as an owner if you have one.

This is used, well, first of all in the interaction between us and the registrar, but it’s in use by the registrar to go to the client, reach out to him, and say, “Hey, you could do more with your website. And by the way, one of the things you could do is get an SSL certificate.”

The client gets a better search engine result, registrar has an upsell opportunity, and we have more active use of the .nl zone.

We're also investing in branding, and this is one of the things that I think will seem logical to you if you look at the quiz. What we focus on right now is what we call young starters or online starters. Young people willing to register domain names for business or future business purposes.

We're not just basing it on the data I showed you. We have more research in that founding it, but basically it comes down to this. We feel that young people with business interests are the most interesting group of potential registrants out there right now in the Dutch market, and we feel it's important that they should retain their preference for .nl as the domain of primary choice in years to come.

So how do we do that? Well, we mainly focus on awareness because we do believe that registrars are better poised to do the sales part. We sponsor Chamber of Commerce events. We invest in a national knowledge base for small and medium enterprises. That's the one you see here on the right. Every question or every piece of content there, which is about online entrepreneurship, shows our logo, or is in some way sponsored by us.

We're also providing a database of available .nl domains through registrars and advanced search query that even with 5.6 million domains registered, lets you find a domain that fits your business. And we participate in the new wiki of the e-commerce

branch organization in the Netherlands exactly for the same reason.

These are activities that we undertake to reach that group of young business users and we feel that this is the way that we should better position our domain in years to come.

So I leave you here, and basically with the conclusion you can't really influence the world market for domain names, but you can make sure that within that market, your domain holds best possible position for the future. Thank you.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: Thank you very much, Michiel. We have a couple of minutes for questions. Any questions? Yes, please?

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: I saw that the website you are sponsoring is .org, or not the one, the previous slide. Aha. So what's your policy, are you?

MICHIEL HENNEKE: No, I'm sorry. That's not the... The website is .nl but the branch organization of Dutch e-commerce, Dutch Web shops is actually called [inaudible].org. It's the name of the organization but the actual wiki and the site you see here ends in .nl. But you are right, I totally didn't realize that.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: Usually have a challenge because sometimes, we have sites on .com that want to be sponsored by us.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: One more question.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: Thank you for presentation. What do you mean by saying providing available domain name lists for registrars?

MICHIEL HENNEKE: Well, the usual way to find an available domain name is you go to the site of registrar, type in a domain name, and it will say, “No, this is already taken. And then you try again and again and again. And below the .nl and .com, the customer is offered all kinds of alternatives, .info, .biz, the new gTLDs. So what we saw is that that method, people needed more and more attempts to find one that was available, and were more and more tempted to choose an alternative.

But if you have a search query like we do, you can say, “Okay. I want to start a pizzeria in Arnhem,” you type in words, and we can give you 50 good combinations that more or less match

what you want. And then [inaudible] .nl so you won't have to look for any alternatives.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: So it's related to some other lists like for registered .com domain names or registered other TLDs, or it's just...

MICHIEL HENNEKE: The primary source are .nl domain names that were once registered but then deleted. But we're also looking into other sources like DNS traffic or third-party sources. But the main feature for the customer is just the database and the search query.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: Thank you.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: Thank you very much. I'm so sorry, but we need to go to our next presenter.

MICHIEL HENNEKE: Are you sure? Because he already felt so bad about...

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: That can be after our presentation. Thank you. Please, can we move to our next presenter?

RUSSELL HAWORTH: Just before we begin, I don't have any gimmicks like chocolates, but I do have a Guinness stand at 5:00 on the Nominet stand downstairs. So there's questions later on, then, you get a Guinness.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: Good move.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: Let's see who gets the most ladies, then.

RUSSELL HAWORTH: Yes. Oh, that's big. There you go. Okay. So first of all, a very good afternoon, everybody. I wanted to start with a little bit of a short story, which is yesterday evening I was on my way home in an Uber taxi, and I got back to the hotel. But while I was on the way back to the hotel, I was using a messaging platform to my wife called WhatsApp.

It kind of reminded me of the fact that we can never be complacent in a mature market, where we can see two startups disrupt very mature businesses. And so that's a thesis, if you will,

for today's discussion as to what I'm going to briefly run through, which is how the domain market needs to look forward and respond to changing market conditions, and I want to briefly enumerate how we've managed or are managing this process in Nominet.

So today, I just want to cover three things. One, our impetus for change, what's really driven the driver for change in our markets by going and looking at what's happening in the UK market. The second is what I'm calling the new strategy for the new era, and looking at what we're doing from a strategy perspective looking forward. And then thirdly, I just want to touch on what benefits that has to the overall industry, but moving very slowly to the next slide.

So when I look at the domain market in the UK, we see, as been shown on the prior slide growth rates, which have substantially reduced over the last four years. If we look in 2011 in Q4, there was around 4% growth rate. And we're now seeing that fall down to around 0.4% in terms of growth rate.

So it's very easy to kind of look at the numbers and kind of draw what I think is an obvious conclusion that the domain market looking forward is in a mature and saturated market. And for us as a key cc in the UK, that's a significant trend for us, and we really need to understand what we are going to do about it.

But let me just build on some of the dynamics that continue in the UK market. We are, and have been, holding market share, around 54% market share at the moment, with .com remaining the next alternative in terms of market size. But we've not seen this tremendous growth from gTLDs that many were expecting.

We think that's partially to do with the fact that .uk is a very trusted domain, and the geographic .uk resonates with people in the UK, and therefore people looking for domains continue to look for the .uk brand. Having said that as a company, we have moved into .wales and .[inaudible] in the gTLD space.

Now in terms of dynamics in the market, we have also seen renewal rates, and we launched .uk in June 2014 and that's had about an 80-odd percent renewal rate. When you combine the overall portfolio, we're around 75%, sorry, 72% renewal rate.

So really what that says to us is the market is a very mature market, it can increasingly reflecting in the renewal rates as the market growth rate slow down, but happily, we are at 10.6 million domains on the management, which has the largest we've been in the history of Nominet.

So I think that's good news on the one hand. Bad news is the market is where people know in this room, is slowing. And therefore, the question is what do you do about it? Well just reminders of what can happen very quickly. And this chart is

from *The Economist* but it's one of my favorites because you've got the telecoms industry happily ticking along with revenue from SMS revenues, and all of a sudden, this small startup comes along and starts to really diminish the SMS revenues in the telecoms industry.

And going back to my earlier point, I think that's the sort of complacency that we need to evolve from in the domain industry, really need to look what more we can do to tap into untapped areas of opportunity, and also look at expanding our products and capabilities.

And at Nominet, what we've really been focusing on over the last couple of years is what we can do beyond the domain space, but equally remain a key leading player in the registry market.

So I want to come onto what we've done about this changing domain market landscape. And our strategy is in some ways strikingly simple, which is we're really looking at the core registry business and what more we can do about that. We're bringing in more people from the commercial business, so we've hired people from the channel that really understand the channel and can help us traverse the understanding between the registry and registrar.

We're increasing partnerships, which I'll come onto shortly. We're also running promotions, which is the first time we've ever

run promotions with the channel. And so there's a real focus on becoming a lot more commercial and a lot more engaged with the channel opportunities, but a key part of that is segmentation, and I'll come back that shortly.

The next concentric ring to our strategy is around new opportunities, new markets, new products. And what we've looked at there is Turing, which is a network analytics tool, and we're moving into network analytics and security in a way in which we've not done before.

As I say, registry at the heart of our business but expanding to counterbalance some of the headwinds we're seeing in the domain market. And over the last three or four years, we've invested quite heavily and will continue to do so in innovation, and so we've got a very gifted team of people who are looking at innovation, what more we can do in the Internet the things, and particularly around IOT security. But we're also looking at dynamic spectrum management.

So the strategy is to build on a really strong base of being the market leader for domains in the UK, but equally building our portfolio of opportunities that go beyond that.

We've also, as you may have seen, looked at what we're doing in terms of our overall approach to the market. We're selling into new markets, we really need to start branding our organization

to be something beyond the domains and so we're positioning Nominet as both an Internet company, not just a domain registration company, and that's important as we're looking beyond the domain registration market. Please visit our website, www.nominet.uk.

The next element I wanted to come onto is around marketing. In some ways, this really comes to some of the points that were raised in the prior presentation. We see, as a cc, our role in really facilitating growth in the channel, and helping the channel identify areas and pockets of opportunities.

No longer can we look at the market and think, "Well, let's look at the market for an inch deep, mile wide approach." We've really got to start thinking about segmentation of the market. So we've been looking at SMEs, we've been looking at the consumer segments, and we feel our role is around both adding insight and then helping translate that insight into activity.

So I'll come onto some of the approaches we've been taking on the SMEs, and so we've been doing some research into the SME market, particularly in the UK getting below the surface of some of the kind of broad strokes, dynamics of what's happening in the SME market. And for anybody that's not got binoculars, then I'll just point out the fact that what this chart is in broad stroke showing is the fact that we are getting deep into segmentation

on the SME market, so what we've highlighted here in yellow are the financial markets, accommodation, wholesale, retail, construction, and real estate areas that we think there's real opportunities for under-penetration of the domain markets.

And we're using data to get a lot more insight and primary research to get more insight, and then we share that with the channel. The idea is that we have a more engaging conversation around what we can do to penetrate some of these markets.

Now the slide here, slide 14, is just trying to give you some idea of scale. And when we look at the overall scale of the opportunities, if you just took the top four, there's a potential market size, and you also have to qualify those numbers. But there's a potential market size of about over a million domains that we think are potentially underpenetrated. And then pivoting to the consumer sector, when we see age groups that we think are, again, underpenetrated.

So this is all about segmentation is about better data, and it's about equipping the channel with that data so we can mutually start to target sectors that we think are under-penetrated.

Just very quickly before I get hooked off the stage, I want to talk about two things. One is around partnerships. We don't want to do this alone. We are working with government organizations and government agencies, Go ON UK which has got terrific

network of countrywide SME contacts and the local enterprise partnerships. We're working with the public sector, the Department of Business and Skills, Companies House.

So there's lots of people in the ecosystem that can help and I think we've got to start thinking beyond just cc working by itself, partnerships is absolutely, we believe, the way in which we can start to broaden the scope of the overall potential market opportunity, which includes, by the way, the academic sector.

And finally, I wanted to come on to the promotional strategy, which would be in running. We've gone from the sublime to the ridiculous. We've never run promotions before. Now we're running three in six months. But what we're trying to do is do accelerated learning by looking at what we can offer so that the one pound promotion that we did earlier on in the year, we saw 100% uptick in our domains.

The buy one, get one free campaign that we're running at the moment, again, very strong uptake. And that's by working with our channel and trying to understand what they want to do and being very responsive but very proactive in what we can do on campaigns.

And then the final point is around providing marketing collateral and working with the channel both on the digital marketing side as well as above the line. I'm personally not a fan of the above

the line advertising, but I think there's a place for it, and so what we're trying to do more of is educating the market on why people should have a domain. My final leaving gesture is, as a community, we've not done enough to make the availability, use, and adoption of domains easy.

So I think there's a lot of work for us to do as a community to help educate these areas of untapped opportunity. So with that, I will wrap up and hand it back to the floor.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: Thank you very much, Russell, please. I'm sorry, we have to hurry a little bit because we are right on time for our next session. I please ask everyone, if you have any questions, that you find them later and ask them directly. Thank you very much, and another applause for our three panelists. Now back to Katrina.

KATRINA SATAKI: So please, all Council nominees, join us here at the stage, and Nigel will help us question them. So sharpen your knives and get ready. Where are the Councilors? Council nominees, candidates.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: Ladies and gentlemen, while we actually find the successful candidates, because there's only one contested election at this point, but while we actually find all the successful candidates, we have the two contested election candidates. One represented as he can't be here himself amiably chatting right now. So if you can take your seats, please, gentlemen. Let me see.

Can we... They are now. [inaudible] just ask if these are my chocolates. I said, "They are now." Have we got everybody? Katrina, can you help me out here. Debbi. Oh, yeah? She's coming. Okay. The way I'd like to do this before we actually start with the – I hesitate to call it hustings because, as I said, the election results are known in most cases.

But what I'd like to do is to start with Debbie right at the end, and if you could just say a few words about who you are, where you're from, and what possessed you to run to Council.

DEBBIE MONAHAN: All right. Hi. I'm Debbie Monahan. I'm the .nz Domain Name Commissioner, so I'm the CE of one of the three groups associated with .nz, the other two being Jay Daley and Jordan Carter, of course.

What possessed me to put my head in the ring was the old retiring fart at the back of the room, Keith. I mean, I think I've got a lot of respect for Keith, and Keith's done a lot of fantastic work over the years. And .nz's got a proud tradition of actually trying to do our bit to contribute to this space. We have a lot of belief in it and I was keen to continue the good work done by New Zealand to date by Keith, and I just hope I can do half of what he's done; I'll do a great job.

DEMI GETSCHKO:

My name is Demi Getschko, I am not a newcomer in this area, I suppose. And we are running .br since '89, and I am trying... I think we will have strive to keep the success in their original way, in their original concepts, but it's very important for us to keep a clear line between what are the Gs and what are the Cs. This is one of the resources that for us IANA function is vital, it's very important, and it's also a way to integrate with the Framework of Interpretation to keep our stronger against eventual menaces or threats.

And I'm just finishing my term as Councilor, and was in doubt if [inaudible] or not, but my name was put forward and I accepted. Then I [will put] with all the candidates in the Latin America. And as I say, we are in times not much easy times in this transition.

And so we are worried by the size that this transition of IANA took. There was a Latin saying that [foreign language]. It's very big job for something that is, in my opinion, quite straightforward. But, of course, there aren't a lot of side things around it, I'm not [inaudible] that, but anyway, I suppose my mission is to try to keep the ccs in the original way. Thank you.

ALEJANDRA REYNOSO: Hello. Good evening. My name is Alejandra Reynoso. I am from .gt, Guatemala. And the reason for me to be in the Council is because throughout the years, I've been in the .gt since 2011, and over the years, I've been getting more involved in the activities of LACTLD, and I am curious, and I want to learn more about how the ccNSO works from the inside, and I hope to learn more so I can help my region.

PETER VERGOTE: Thank you. Good afternoon. I'm Peter Vergote. I'm coming from a small, beautiful country called Belgium. I'm working for DNS Belgium, which is the ccTLD operator for .be, and more recently, who has also evolved into the g space because we're also a registry operator for two geographic gTLDs linked with the territory of Belgium.

My background is legal, although my function is not limited to legal. I have been busy doing regulatory and corporate affairs for the last ten or more years. Before I joined DNS Belgium, I worked for the government, and I used to be GAC representative from 1998 to 2001 if my memory doesn't fail me.

And more recently, I served four years on the board of CENTR, of which three years being chair. And recently, about six months ago, this term came to an end. I think that with being on the board of CENTR, it was the first time that our organization felt that we had both the experience and the resources to put to the disposal of the community. Now that this term within CENTR has ended, we would like to recommit and we thought that proposing me as candidate for the ccNSO Council provided an excellent opportunity to serve or experience both as a ccTLD operator and as a new gTLD operator to put it, well, to the benefits of this community. Thank you.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: All right. This is a little bit unusual, but Giovanni Seppia from .it is also running for or has been nominated, and running for position as a European Councilor. Unfortunately, due to a conflict, he could not be here today, even though he tried to have the schedule rearranged. So you will have to picture me as Giovanni. [Dear Ola]. It is with... No.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: I'm not sure who has the better suits.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: Anyway, I will read the statement on behalf of Giovanni:

“Dear All,

It is with great pleasure that I have accepted the nomination for the ccNSO Council. I started being involved in the ccNSO Council during its infancy back in 2004 when the ccTLD community was familiarizing, and arguing a bit, with the new ccTLD constituency at ICANN. Together with the CENTR community in 2005, as CENTR General Manager, I contributed to draft the changes of the ICANN bylaws relating to the ccNSO. Those changes allowed the ccNSO to take off and achieve today's broad membership.

I've been following the ccNSO since then and have been proactively engaged in some of its working groups like the IDN, PDP 1 and 2, which completed their work a few years ago to refine the ccTLD IDN fast track procedure.

And since 2011, in the ccNSO Strategy and Operating Plan Working Group, of which I was appointed chair earlier this year, the ccNSO SOP achieved great results by substantially contributing to designing and improve the ICANN five-year

strategy and operating plan processes, and then the yearly operating plan and budget.

The persistent ccNSO SOP recommendations to introduce precise KPIs and timelines in the plans have pushed ICANN to enhance its original project management culture.” Sorry, it’s organizational project management culture.

“We are living crucial months for the DNS community. The IANA transition, the enhancement of ICANN’s accountability, the WSIS+10 process, the discussions of the renewal of the IGF mandate. Compared to ten years ago, the Internet landscape has changed considerably, mostly for the better. What has not changed is the capacity of the ccTLDs to play a leading role at local and international levels.

The IANA stewardship transition process is at the heart of the ccTLD community because we would like its services to be performed at the highest standard possible. It will not be an easy transition. What we’re going through now is just the beginning of a new era in ICANN/IANA management.

The ccTLD will have to continue to be engaged in the future new IANA/ICANN environment. Through the ccNSO Council, we will must make sure our voices are adequately heard. I will be delighted to listen to your thoughts and ideas, and work with and for the European and worldwide ccTLD communities so that

they are subsequently well represented at the IANA and ICANN level.

I regret not being able to attend the Q&A session, but remain available to answer any questions you may have via e-mail.

Giovanni Seppia.”

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: Thank you, Giovanni.

ABIBU RASHID NTAHIGYE: My name is Abibu Rashid Ntahigye. I work with the .tz registry since 2008, and I’ve been very active in the FTLD region as .tz registry as a member, but also as a board member up to that. And in 2013, I was appointed to represent the African region of the ccNSO Council, so my term will end during ICANN 55 in Marrakech, but fortunately, my colleagues nominated me once again for the second time. It has been a learning period during the first time and I hope I continue to work for the African community and the cc community at large.

Apart from that, in June this year, I was appointed as board member of AFRINIC and I hope to continue working with my colleagues in AFRINIC [inaudible] FTLD and ccNSO. So I hope to work with the cc community for the second term.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: Thank you very much. So we'll now move to questions to the candidates. Giovanni is excused from having to answer questions as he's here by proxy. You may ask a question of the panel in total, altogether, or ask a specific question of a specific Councilor. Do please bear in mind that if you ask all Councilors, it will take five times as long to answer.

But with that, and within the time constraints, please feel free to ask whatever you'd like, and I can see we have one questioner chomping at the bit.

KATRINA SATAKI: Sorry, I'm not going to ask the question, I just...

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: Oh, you can sit down, then.

KATRINA SATAKI: Yeah, I just have a short announcement as I had just received an official, how to say, complaint, perhaps, from our elections manager. The thing is that nomination period for LAC region is still open, so we still might have some new candidates from that region. Therefore, please bear in mind that perhaps [Demi] in

this case is in a better position than any upcoming nominee that we might have, just for the sake of the process of transparency.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: Thank you for that helpful intervention. So we must have some questions, particularly of the European candidate.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: Which one? Giovanni.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: Particularly with the contested election, it would be nice to see some—

KATRINA SATAKI: Somebody's asking questions, so maybe shortly, what are the three top things on your list that you would like to complete when/if elected?

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: You all want to answer that? Let's start from the left.

ABIBU RASHID NTAHIGYE: Yeah. I guess what my region is about capacity building and basically technical capacity of managing the ccns in the region.

That is my priority and that has been so since I joined the cc community in the Africa region. So I can say capacity building, second one is capacity building, and third could be capacity building, but in other areas like marketing. Thank you.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE:

I'm going to be a frank in my reply. I actually don't have a top three of topics because I think that it's up to the members to be far more close connected with their cc Councilors and to actually transmit what their expectations are and what the area and topics are that they want to see addressed by their cc Councilor of their region. So I think that would be my short answer.

Now if there's one thing that personally comes close at heart to me, if you look at this whole IANA stewardship transition, ICANN accountability case, what you see is that gradually we more and more start working cross-community.

Now this is a change. Before the IANA stewardship transition, I got a bit of the feeling that every supporting organization was more working inside its own silo. So I think if there is one thing that had brought dynamics to this community, it's that ability to work more cross-community.

So the question is what if the whole IANA stewardship transition is behind this and we can return to a normal business focus? What are we going to do? Are we going to get back into our silos or are we going to try to keep some of that dynamics of working cross-community? And that I find a very attractive challenge to work around. So if entrusted by the members, I would like to do some reflection on that and potentially get some action points coming from that. Thank you.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: Well, I don't have also three points that I want to accomplish but I do wish to help my LAC community, inform them of the proceedings in ICANN with the IANA transition as with the LAC strategies that are already taking place in Latin America. Most of our members in LACTLD that are not members are not able to come to all the ICANN meetings and I wish to help them have some other means of information and maybe in their own language so that they are able to participate either through the regional organizations or through me. That's my point.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: I don't have also three points but I'll say something in this area. I suppose one of the things we have to try is to diminish the gap we have between several country code domain names and use the best practices we have heard. We have two or three excellent

examples in the previous presentation about how you can, in some way, make our cc stronger and how we can face the new demands of a growing market and a growing competition in that area.

Just to remind that old practices, we use it to exchange DNS servers between us without any kind of cost. We have one server in Germany, .de has one server and .br, the same with Korea and the same with other countries. I suppose it's good to have this kind of interlacing of practices and good things in the old Internet spirit without trying to make any kind of balance on costs or so.

And another point I think is important in our area is to keep our domains clean, in good shape, because security is a very important issue these days, and there are ways to do it in some better fashion. For example, DNSSEC is a good way. We understand that it seems to be a good way. And there are other ways improving semantics and then improving safe havens in domain area.

But this is in the area of good practices that we can use this community to spread and to discuss between us and to learn from other experience.

In the more general area, I suppose, we are facing other important process of transition of the IANA. As I said, I'm a little

bit worried of the size of this transition, not to mention that the things will be – it seems to be straightforward just to finish the oversight. But of course, there are other issues around, and the idea is to try to keep it simple and safe and safe for us, the ccns, because, as I said, I think we have a strong dependency between what we’re doing and the services we get from IANA.

If you remember, the ‘98 NTIA paper, it was the provision that until 2003, the transition was [inaudible] and we are in 2015 and are in the same [inaudible]. Okay. Thank you.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: Thank you, [inaudible].

DEBBIE MONAHAN: I suppose I want to get to the end of my term and be able to look back with a sense of achievement of actually helping to continue to develop a strong ccNSO that delivers for its members. What that will mean in the future years, I don’t know. I mean, in the short term, it’s going to be helping to support the transition and the accountability work, and also given all the work that Keith’s done and others, including yourself, Nigel, on the FOA, to see those PDPs through to their successful solution so that I feel like the whole cc and the redelegation and everything gets ticked on

and that's all done and dusted. And I think that will be a thing of achievement when the ccNSO achieves it.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: Thank you, Debbie. And I smell a volunteer in some of that. Alan.

[ALAN]: Hello. I interpret Katrina's question as the "what" – what would you do? So my question is, how would you do it? So how would you make us more effective as an organization, as a community in the meetings? But one thing. Okay. And I actually think that Peter has already answered this already, so I think I'm going to exempt him from this in the interest of time because I think he was talking about working more cross-community, not losing that what we've learned. I think that Alejandra has also answered it by saying we need to be more effective in reaching out to the other regions and then look at languages and making what we do more accessible, but I'll ask the other candidates and I'll exempt, of course, the other candidate from Europe from this question, but I'll ask you. How could we do better? The one thing we could do better.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: Thank you, Alan. And we'll start with Debbie, going backwards.

DEBBIE MONAHAN: I don't even really know how it all works on this Council thing yet. Look, to me, the idea, I'd like us to see the utilize that Meeting B. And if we make it smaller and we make more places be able to actually have a meeting, I would love to see more in the Pacific, a greater focus on the Pacific. The Asia-Pacific is a huge region, but we don't see many Pacific Islanders and other such things here. So pretty similar to what Alejandra said, as well, is actually enhancing and picking up the contribution, those small [inaudible] ccTLDs in the Pacific can do.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: I'll go on the same line because if you see this room full, all ICANN meetings we see the ccNSO room full and sometimes even without space for the people. People stand and it fills the room during the whole meeting. Then I suppose we have a very vibrant community here and the best way to make the ccNSO stronger is to keep this way in the exact same direction that make this meeting stronger is to keep this way in the exact same direction that is make this meeting stronger.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: I'm not sure but I think everybody else to my right has been excused already. Is that right?

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: I think the key issue is engagement of the members apart from engagement. Because basically, the performance of the Councilor depends on the activeness of the members. So basically, what we're promising... Basically what I say it is based on what I know about my region, but it will also depend on the feedback or the information I get from the members.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: Okay. Any other questions? Individuals, perhaps, you want to pick on? I think that brings it to a natural conclusion, then. Thank you all very much for your questions and your input. And where it's contested, there will be a ballot going out at some point. Where is our election manager? She's not here, is she? Oh, Bart then.

BART BOSWINKEL: Okay. The next steps. The extended election period for the Latin America will close on the 30 of October. The election will run from 5 November [10:01] UTC until Thursday, 19 November. In case there is a conclusion of that election, then the election report will be submitted, at the latest, by the 1 of December. But by, say, mid-November or 19th November, it will be clear.

If there is a need for a runoff election, that will start on the 1st of December at 0:01 UTC, and will run until 8 December. And then the election report will be submitted to the Council at the latest by 11th of December. So hopefully before Christmas, there is clarity.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: Thank you, Bart. Just one point of clarification, if you could let the room know what might cause a runoff election.

BART BOSWINKEL: The runoff election is what I just said, is if there is no winner and it's just by a majority. So if there is, what's it called, a draw in voting. So both candidates receive just as many votes. Same amount of votes.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: I think that's it. We can [inaudible].

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: And now we will move straight into our session with our Board representatives. So think up your questions for Chris and Mike.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: Okay. We are back to right on schedule, perhaps even a minute early. Program Working Group, they're doing an excellent job. So we are now on to our discussion and meeting with our Board representatives, Chris and Mike, well-known to us all, and we have the opportunity to have a dialogue with them, ask any questions that we want of them, and make sure that it just generally we're getting good value for money.

Yeah, we just had a marketing session, so we're looking for a return on investment here.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: I'm happy to live up to the amount that you pay me.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: So with that, I would like to ask are there any questions or comments for either or both of our Board members? Mary, you have the mic.

[MARY]: Yes. I have the mic. Sincerely, Mike and Chris. I would like to know whether you've been representing the whole community or you've been representing ccNSO issues at the Board level. It will help us to be able to make up our mind in the question of recalling and [spilling] the Board. Please.

CHRIS DISSPAIN: That's a really, really good question. Shall I just recall myself now?

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: Sorry, can I? Before you get into that.

CHRIS DISSPAIN: Go ahead.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: Are we having an open agenda today? Because I was under the impression that we were kind of pushing some of the CCWG issues till tomorrow. Now I've got no problem answering the question, I just don't want to use up the time if there are other issues.

CHRIS DISSPAIN: From the Board perspective, I think, tomorrow it's all about the actual stuff. Today I think it's about the Board perspective, and I think that's fine.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: This will be one of the topics tomorrow.

CHRIS DISSPAIN:

Yeah. So Mary, I think there's a lot of nonsense talked about... A lot of legalese talked about what it means to go onto the Board. So what the actual position is this. You get elected by your constituency, by your SO or your AC, and when you become a Board member, you have a number of responsibilities. And the one that you hear the most about is the one that is called fiduciary responsibility, and it's the duty to act in the best interests of the corporation, which in ICANN's case is defined as acting in the global public interest. And the Board is obliged to act in the global public interest.

However, it would be ridiculous to suggest that Board members who come from the ccTLD community can do anything other than look at things from a general ccTLD point of view, and bring the flavor, understanding of being a ccTLD onto the Board, and bring opinions that come from the ccTLDs onto the Board. Now there are a huge number of decisions that the Board makes, which have completely nothing to do with ccTLDs at all, they're simply... A lot of the stuff is very boring and corporate and stuff like that.

And in those sorts of areas, you exercise your judgment as a Board person. If I can take an example of the Framework of Interpretation paper that came up to the Board, I would have –

there is no way I would have voted against that under any circumstances. There is no way that I would have done anything other than to push as hard as it was possible to do to get that past. And frankly, if it hadn't been passed, I probably would have resigned.

So I can't really say it any other way than that. There is a legal requirement to act in the best interest of the corporation. What people tend to forget, what I hear a lot around here is the best interest of the corporation is John Jeffrey in the legal department. That isn't true. The best interest of the corporation is to act in the global public interest in respect to the management of the DNS.

And that's it in a nutshell, that's it. I hope that's about as close as I can get. Tomorrow, we can get into the detail of what we should do about Board [spilling] and so on. Mike, did you want to add anything?

MIKE SILBER:

Yeah. Let me be a little bit more [inaudible] than Chris. My view is as somebody selected by the ccNSO, my obligation is to inform my colleagues of the views of the ccNSO. If they have shared a specific instruction with me or if having followed the lists, I'm aware of a specific view or approach within the ccNSO, then it's my obligation to bring that forward. Even if I don't agree

with it, it's my obligation to say the cc community is coalescing around this view or, guys, there a couple of views within the cc community, these are they.

I can also express my opinion as on those issues, and even if the community hasn't coalesced, I can make people aware that this particular course of action is likely to cause offense, affront, will be received positively. Have these issues been considered?

However, when it comes to voting, then I take my cc hat off. And when it comes to actually voting on a resolution, then I take my hat off. I'm no longer an advocate, I no longer express a view, but I make decision based on what I think is in the best interest of the corporation.

Up until now, I've never been in a situation where I felt that the views from the ccNSO or those expressed by my colleagues in this room are different from the best interest of the corporation. But there may come a time, and if that's the case, then I would vote my conscience and what I think is in the best interest of the corporation.

Now, I'm somewhat unusual and I keep hearing people – yes, I know I'm very unusual, Chris. I keep hearing people say, “No, the Board objects to individual Board member removal.” I have a different view. That is, if I lose the trust of my community, I don't deserve to carry their seat forward.

I would like to know what it is that I did, and it would be nice to have an opportunity to find out what it is and if there's a way of restoring trust. But if I've lost the trust of my community, I don't deserve to be here and somebody else should be there. And whether that's a recall or me choosing to resign, or whatever the case is. It's very different and I think that, to me, is the critical issue is that there needs to be a link between a Board member appointed by an SO and that SO, but that link doesn't mean that you control my vote, other than to say, "You've gone totally off the rails and we need to do something to bring you back on."

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: Thank you. Mary, did you get the answer you were looking for?

CHRIS DISSPAIN: We'll do the detail tomorrow. Okay?

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: Yeah. So just to be clear, the idea wasn't to walk through CCWG detail today. This is a more broad, general discussion, and we will have more than enough time tomorrow to drill deep. Nigel?

NIGEL ROBERTS: I don't want to disappoint Chris by not asking a question, so I'll ask a question I've asked a couple of these previously. Are you both still having fun yet?

CHRIS DISSPAIN: "Still having fun yet." Depends on how you define fun, I suppose. Look, it's a huge commitment in time and effort, and I wouldn't be doing anything else given the choice. I'm having a great time doing it, but it's hard. Especially stuff like this, this is hard. I mean, some of you were around when we did the ccNSO and when we did ICANN 2.0, and this is just as difficult but there are so many more people that it actually just makes it harder to keep up on the mailing list, harder to do. In those days, there were so few of us, it was pretty easy. Mike, you having fun yet still?

MIKE SILBER: Well, I'm having a lot of fun seeing as I am about to end my second term and on Thursday – sorry, on Friday – Yeah, Thursday I'll commence my third term as the Chairman of the Board. So now, I can actually speak my mind. So I don't need to hold back any longer.

This is a really interesting, challenging environment. The one thing, though, that is going to be obsessing me for the next three

years is succession planning because the one thing that I don't want to do is coming into this room in two years' time begging somebody, please, who's going to take the Board seat?

I really think that we need to start giving some careful consideration to who takes my seat once I leave, because I would really like to be able to mentor somebody who takes the seat because I suspect it may not be one of the grayhead persons, and preferably somebody young and energetic and even better if it wasn't another man, which would allow me to actually spend time with that person and allowing the transition to be a lot smoother and easier, and that's an undertaking I'm taking on, but I'd also really appreciate any thoughts or comments from the community as to where that's going because I'm not saying that I'm indispensable, but rather, let me help train somebody who will be better than I am.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: Thank you, Mike.

MATHIEU WEILL: I'm not going to ask any question related to accountability, no worries. But, I think, the Board duty number one is to get the right CEO in place. And actually, even more, to get the right leadership team in place through the CEO. Can you give us an

update of how it's taking place and whether you're confident that it will be the timeline and the profile that kind of thing?

CHRIS DISSPAIN:

Yeah. I'm on the Search Committee, so yeah, I can do that. So we had a large number of applications. We have held a series of interviews, telephone interviews, and we're moving to the next stage now. There are no guarantees that we will find someone in this pool, and there are no guarantees that we will, therefore, be able to meet a timeline.

The truth of the matter is even if we did find somebody in this pool, there's no guarantee we'll meet the timeline because it depends on what that person may or may not be doing.

But I'm reasonably comfortable and confident that we will. It's a little early to say, but I'm reasonably comfortable that we will. We're doing our best to do it. We're working extremely hard on it. Something else to add to the list of things that we – and you're right. It's incredibly important, right?

I was talking to some people the other day, and though somebody was talking to me about we've got to do something to improve the Board's transparency, something we've all been talking about for a very long time. And I said, "Yeah. You know what? The Board knows that, too. And in truth, if we weren't so

busy with the transition, we would be working on that.” Not that I’m blaming the transition, Mathieu. I’m not blaming the transition. I wouldn’t dream of doing such a thing.

So, I mean, yeah, it is hard. It’s a hard time to be doing a CEO search and it would be ridiculous to suggest that where ICANN is in its current – where ICANN currently is in the middle of this transition does not have an effect on those who would apply and those who may not, but I’m reasonably comfortable and confident.

MATHIEU WEILL: Well I’m sure many in the community would help the Board thinking about transparency and lower your workload. But one part of the question you haven’t answered about the profile, how the Search Committee is looking, what kind of priorities have been set in terms of the skillsets...

CHRIS DISSPAIN: Okay. I thought that was included in the job description and the...

MATHIEU WEILL: Well I’m sorry. I haven’t reviewed that.

CHRIS DISSPAIN:

It is. It is there. It's all there, so I mean I don't want to repeat it now, but it is all in the document. Can I just suggest very, very briefly just tell you one quick story about transparency? So I don't know whether you know, but the Board, every ICANN meeting, the Board has a lunch with all Board members, alumni board members that used to be on the Board.

So people like Peter and Dennis and various other people, if they're around, they come have lunch with the Board. And yet today, we found ourselves having lunch in the foyer of the fourth floor. So we're right literally in the middle of the public area with having to use microphones because it was set up for the African Strategy Group and we've got food and we're sitting down talking to each other, and our friend Milton Mueller came along and sat down, and then went back to the NCSG and said that we had a secret Board meeting in which we were discussing how bad everything was in the CCWG. It's extraordinary.

MIKE SILBER:

But if I can add to that because, Mathieu, I think it's a useful question but just linking on from that, not about the CEO, but about this question of transparency, and you're right.

I just think, at the moment, there have been so many cycles that are being used within our processing capability, all of us focused on these time-critical comments that we're sometimes losing

sight of the small improvements that actually could work to rebuilding the trust. And to me, it's a trust discussion.

Because I think that some people might argue in some circumstances trust is never existent. Others may argue that trust is gone like a wave and, at the moment, we're in the trough and we need to rebuild to the crest, and then somebody will do something that depletes it again.

But right now, we're not in a great trust environment and going through this transition in a not-ideal trust environment has its challenges. Let me repeat a question that George Sadowsky has been asking all week, but let me ask it here, which is how do we improve communications? In particular, at meetings, but then beyond meetings.

Because I'm sensing that the interaction that we have at these meetings with each other, with the staff, with the Board, then carries through into a feeling of us versus them decisions being made behind our backs. How do we improve?

Because the suggestion has been made in particular by the GNSO to try and grab Board members and lobby them hard about their particular issues. The ccNSO is different. Generally, the ccNSO moves in [great or] builds harmony amongst itself before it goes outside, so they don't look to the Board as the arbiter of their own dispute that they can't resolve themselves.

But the suggestion has been made that there seems to be a secret tunnel that's put in for the Board so that they can go from their boardroom to meeting rooms to their hotel rooms so that people don't have to see them at all. How do we improve or change that? I'd really appreciate input on that.

CHRIS DISSPAIN: There is no tunnel, just in case anyone's wondering.

MIKE SILBER: No. I said the suggestion had been made, and now my question is how do we address that and how do we reframe some of that so that we can start working towards rebuilding the trust? So let me throw that at the audience when you're standing at the microphone before you ask your question of us. Maybe you want to suggest an answer to that question.

Even if it's get drunk with us more often or whatever it may be.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: Go ahead, Stephen.

STEPHEN DEERHAKE: Question to both of you, and actually it's a broader question to the Board, and it's kind of a follow-on to Mathieu's question, which is when an organization brings in a new CEO, more often

than not, they like to not necessarily clean house but bring in people they're comfortable working with. And my question is how concerned is the Board that with the installation of a new CEO, we will have significant turnover at the senior management level as we're trying to run to the finish line from the transition.

CHRIS DISSPAIN: We are concerned. However, no offense intended, Stephen, but the CEO coming in and cleaning house is very much an American view of the world. It's far, far less common in other countries than it is in the States. However, ICANN is an American company, so yeah. But that doesn't mean that the CEO will necessarily be American.

MIKE SILBER: So that being said...

STEPHEN DEERHAKE: I hope not.

MIKE SILBER: That being said, there is no doubt that there will be some staff who came in with the current CEO who will not feel the same ties, and either they may choose to leave or the new CEO may choose to replace them. But we have a core set of staff. We've

spoken with many of the senior staff, and I'm not aware of anybody that I would consider critical to the operations of the organization who has indicated in any way that they would be leaving. And I think the instructions to a new CEO is that you don't have carte blanche.

This is not an environment. I think that Fadi has built a very good team. Like him personally or not, he's built a really good team, and I think that any changes in the senior management would need to be taken very carefully, and that's something that I would put through personally once we've chosen a new CEO, whereas previously, the CEO was given carte blanche to assess, move, rearrange.

And that's not the Board interfering, but rather simply urging caution before there's any wholesale changes. And I'm quite sure that whoever we select will listen to that very carefully.

BYRON HOLLAND: Jordan?

JORDAN CARTER: Thanks, Byron. Jordan Carter, .nz. Mike, a kind of response to your question off the top of my head, one way to increase trust would be for all of the formal meetings of the Board to be open so we could see the discussion in real time, hear the

deliberations, and that kind of thing. That's something that's worked well in my organization.

But my question is to both of you. You've both been on the Board for a while. I'm very impressed by the level of commitment that you both managed to show – or perhaps, sometimes endure – given the intense nature of these roles. It seems to me the ICANN Board is a strange mix that sometimes looks from the outside more like a working group than a classical governing board of a company, and there are all sorts of representational reasons and so on. The size of it sure doesn't help in terms of quick decision making.

But do you think that the ICANN model would work? That the ICANN model, not what the Board does, but the actual bottoms-up community-driven policy process? If the ICANN Board stepped away and had six two-hour meetings a year to govern corporation, told the CEO to account, or is that just not possible?

Because you've both been deeply in it as it is, so just wondering what your perspective is or if you've thought about the alternative of a more conventional type governing body.

CHRIS DISSPAIN:

That's a really good question. Let me ask you a question. My answer is no, it wouldn't at the moment. And as an example of

that is how do you think the new gTLD process would have worked? We spent a lot of time filling in gaps. Now I would argue – and I wasn't on the Board at the time the decision was made so I can argue, that what should have happened with that was it should have been sent back, and they should have been told, "Sorry, you're not ready yet, and until you are ready, we're not doing it." But that didn't happen, and because that didn't happen, there was a lot of time and effort being made.

Part of the issue is that we're not just a corporate board. If we were just a corporate board, then we would just be a corporate board and you would be right. We could meet six times a year for two hours, and that's all there is to it. But then you would have to build other structures. And I was interested in listening to Peter talk about the cross-community working groups. Right?

So then you've got cross-community working groups that you've got to put in place, and then there needs to be facilitation of those and management of those. The more complicated the environment becomes, the more – what would replace the Board? I suppose, is my question. What would you elect to? Would it just be your council leaders that would be talking to each other? There's got to be something.

So if the ICANN Board just went corporate, what would replace what it does? Because something would have to replace it. So What would that be?

MIKE SILBER:

Well you see, I've been – you may not say a fan, but certainly an interested observer of, for example, the German corporate governance model where you separate out the supervisory board and the operational board. But I think what Chris is saying is that as a board, some of the confusion stems from the fact that we have both a corporate governance responsibility as well as a policy audit role. Ideally, that should be the role in my view, which is auditing the policy development process to ensure that the process has been followed, the outcome is sane and implementable, and that we act as a first line structure to ensure that staff does proceed with the implementation.

But too often, we're dragged in as an arbiter of decisions that are half baked, and yes, while Chris wasn't in the Board at the time, I was, and I voted against the start of the new gTLD program because I was of the view that it was half baked at the time.

So I think what Chris is saying is absolutely right. Is right now, the Board cannot function that way, and if it were to function that way, then we would need to split out the function of the

current functions undertaken by the Board, and either it would need to be the Board in two or more guises or there would need to be two or more structures that fulfill that role. But right now in the current environment with all that people are asking us to do, I can't see us moving to that environment.

The other thing – sorry, I'm carrying on a bit here – the other thing is that I'm concerned that simply having six two-hour meetings and getting financial reporting from staff doesn't tie in to some of the fuzzy areas.

So for example, when the CEO launches a new initiative midway through, and it's within his or her budget. There's no new budget required but starts an initiative. Then as a corporate board, we would see it when we next get a set of financials or at the next quarterly report. And we'd say, "Tell us a bit more about it," and we would hear about it. But if it's budgeted, we would have no input.

You may argue that we haven't covered ourselves in glory in how we've dealt with some of the new initiatives that have come along, but we are far better informed than if we were just a corporate board meeting four or six times a year. And I sense that the community is asking us to test things like that against the core mission of the organization before we allow it to

proceed, and I'm not sure if that can be done without some sort of structure in place.

BYRON HOLLAND: Thanks, Mike and Chris. I just want to remind everybody that we have about five minutes left before the IANA session, which I'm sure we're all interested in. So another couple of questions, and then final wrap-up of. Paulos?

PAULOS NYIRENDA: Thank you. Paulos Nyirenda from Malawi. I just wanted to find out or hear the view of the Board on the Independent Review Panel on .africa. And in the light of that, the situation on accountability.

MIKE SILBER: Let me take that one before Chris does. It's an independent process and we had to respect it. I understand why the panel came to the decision it did. It doesn't mean that I disagree with it. Sorry, it doesn't mean that I agree with it, but I can understand why they came to that conclusion.

I think there was some really interesting lessons to ICANN in terms of issues like holding constituent parts of this community

to account, not just the Board to account. And I hope we learn from those lessons.

That being said, the panel has not obliged us to do anything other than to restart the process, which had been suspended. So the process is restarted and the rules will be followed, and I've no doubt that based on those rules, we'll come up with a just and equitable answer. But yeah, it seems that there were some shortcuts taken in process and we deserve to have some of those inadequacies pointed out, and it creates some interesting discussion as to the role of the GAC.

CHRIS DISSPAIN:

What would the alternative be, Paulos? The alternative would be for us to – you asked about it in the context of accountability. The alternative would be for us to actually not follow decision of the IPN. I thought pretty much everybody agreed that we should be following the decision of the IPN.

The problem with that is – and I agree it should be binding – the problem is if it's binding, then you have to follow the decision. And it doesn't matter whether you like the decision or not, you have to follow it. So that level of accountability means that we follow that decision, which we have. And we will continue—

MIKE SILBER: Except, Chris, that the latest IRP panel made a very interesting finding, which is that they can make a finding but they're not going to discuss implementation. It's up to ICANN to then deal with the implementation.

CHRIS DISSPAIN: That's a much deeper discussion.

MIKE SILBER: I know, but to me it's interesting when it comes to binding or nonbinding. Because if a panel only says, "You did something wrong, go and fix it," but doesn't tell you how to do that, then I'm far more comfortable with a binding process.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: Dotty, last question to you.

DOTTY SPARKS DE BLANC: Of the most... I don't know if it's two or more, proposals that are in the works for presentation, what do you think is the most dangerous element in any of them, and what do you think is the most positive element?

CHRIS DISSPAIN:

Can we do that tomorrow when we're actually discussing the detail of the CCWG? Because it's pretty hard to pluck things out of midair, but it has given me an opportunity to say the one thing that I wanted to say, so thank you, which is this.

I'm actually – anyone who thinks that... A couple of people have come up to me in this meeting and said, "You are still looking after the ccs, aren't you? You haven't been captured by the Board." So the first thing I want to say is, "Yes, absolutely. We're looking after the ccs."

Secondly, I'm optimistic that the progress that's been made in the last few days gives us an answer of actually pulling this off, that will need to be compromised as all around, but I think we can do it.

There's one thing I wanted to say to the ccs to think about overnight before... And I'll happily chat with you at drinks about this if you like, is to think about this.

There are many, many, many areas that the ccs, not even remotely affected by in CCWG proposal. But there's one thing that I think we need to be clear about, and it comes to that thing that Peter was talking about, working cross-community working groups and the changes and whether when we get back to normal, is that what we're going to do?

I have a question for everyone to consider. The one thing we can do is... If the one thing we do is if we need to set a global policy for any reason, doesn't happen very often, but if we do need to set a global policy for some reason, we have the power to do that following our process and our bylaws. And the question for us to consider is do we want to ensure that that process is, in effect, final? Because unless the policy bylaws are excised from the community review mechanism, then you can follow the ccNSO bylaw, involve the GAC, involve the ALAC, involve everybody in coming up with your policy.

Come up with your policy, have that approved by the Board, and then have that spin back into a set of community processes where if a bylaw change is necessary because of the policy that we make, that bylaw change can be resisted.

Now I'm speaking very much as a ccTLD manager [inaudible] as anybody else, we need to think about that. The solution is very simple. The solution is you simply take the SO policy decisions out of the process. So a bylaw change that follows from a supporting organization policy wouldn't actually be included.

Now I'm not saying that's how it should be; I'm asking everybody to think about it. And that's the level of depth I think we need in our discussions as ccTLD managers because it's not just about should you spill the Board. It's actually about making sure that

the ccNSO can do the fundamental things it's supposed to do, small though they are, in a global policy function. Thanks.

MIKE SILBER:

If I can add to that. I think that may apply to the ccNSO and the ASO, but I don't know if the GNSO is going to be willing to give up their ability to re-litigate issues.

Dotty, the other thing that I wanted to just say is to acknowledge your contribution in the ccNSO in running your individual cc.

And I think one of the downsides of this whole process is failing to acknowledge the effort that everybody in this room puts in in their local community, whether it's individually or based on their own multi-stakeholder model depending on what their particular model is to actually make the local Internet work, to actually provide options and opportunities for their local community.

And I think in this very academic debate that's going on, the efforts of all the people in this room are being ignored, and I'm sorry that I'm singling you out, but you came to the microphone so it gives me an opportunity to point to you individually and say, "All of us are indebted to you and to people like you."

BYRON HOLLAND: Thank you, Mike. Thank you, Chris. And with that, I'll wrap up this section of the agenda. Thank you, gentlemen, and welcome up the IANA team.

Hi, everybody. Please don't leave. We just have one final session, and it is with Elise from IANA, and I know even just today, we've had quite a few conversations about IANA. I want to update the schedule. There will be no NomCom update. The NomCom representative has canceled for some reason, so it is just IANA and FOI implementation in this session, and then that's it, you're free to go, we're free to go until the ccNSO cocktail party, which is at 7:00 PM about two blocks away, and I believe Bart will be handing out, or somebody will be handing out a card. But Bart, I suggest you only hand out the card once Elise is done. It's called incentive.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: Otherwise, I might go, too.

BYRON HOLLAND: Yeah, so all we have is this final presentation on a subject that is clearly near and dear to our hearts and then we are free for the balance of the afternoon until 7:00, at which time, there's a ccNSO cocktail party.

So with that, I will turn it over to Elise.

ELISE GERICH:

Thanks, Byron. Can you hear me if I stand up when I talk? Because when I sit down, I can't see those of you who are towards the back of the room. Hi back there.

Anyway, I'm Elise Gerich, and thanks again for inviting me to come to the ccNSO and to give the IANA update. And I'd like to recognize my colleague, Naela Sarras, who's in the back row. She actually manages the team of four people that handle all the requests. So she knows really all the nitty gritty operational details, but I wanted to make sure if you haven't met Naela, please introduce yourself.

So here's the agenda for the IANA update today. I'm going to talk a little bit about performance, measurements, and reporting, what we do. Some of the Framework of Interpretation recommendations, what the status is of that. And I know that Keith's spoken to that earlier today or is going to talk tomorrow. I don't know which.

Talk about our customer survey and a couple of announcements as well as to give you an update on the 24 by 7 emergency service that we have out there for TLD operators. I think that sometimes people forget about that and so we thought we'd do a little refresher.

Moving right along, this slide is obviously over several years, 2013 through now. And what I'm trying to display here for you all is the trend of total number of root zone requests per month over the years that are new, and those that are closed, so that you can see there's been an anomaly in one month that was in June 2015, and that was we received a huge number of DS record changes from one operator, who had a lot of TLDs. So we don't expect to see those kinds of spikes.

But the whole point of this graph is to show that even though we're seeing a slight upward trend in new requests, number of new requests per month, we're closing them at a steady rate, also, so that we're not getting a backlog. I thought that it might be of interest because I know at one time when we were here at the ccNSO people asked if, well, now will all those new gTLDs really change the volume of your work and how you're able to keep up with it?

And so even though we are seeing a slight upward trend, we are keeping up with the work. This slide represents the key performance metrics, the key performance indicators that the IANA department has measured itself against for the last two years. We did a public consultation with community about what things were important for measurements and what data we should report on, and overwhelmingly, everyone said it should be accuracy and timeliness.

So what I've done is taken or actually Naela did this for me, took a little snapshot from online, if you go to IANA.org/performance, you'll find the monthly performance reports. And these are the descriptions of what some of those key performance indicators are.

So for all the root zone file and database changes, we have a target of completing any request within 21 days, and 80% of the requests should be closed within 21 days. And then we report on that on a monthly basis so that you can see which requests might have taken longer, which might have taken less, etc. And then the delegation and redelegation of ccTLDs, the metric is 120 days for a delegation or redelegation, and again, that's only 50%.

We had been a little more aggressive when we put out the public consultation. We said, "Well we could close them in 90 days and maybe 70%." I really thank you all for coming back and saying, "No, 90 days is not right. 120 might be more reasonable, and 50% because, there is a really big variety how long it takes to open and close – not open and close – to do a delegation and a redelegation of a ccTLD."

But I just wanted to remind you that these are reports we publish monthly, they're on the IANA website, and these were

the key performance indicators that, through the public consultation, we put in place about two years ago.

One of the other performance reports that we have on a monthly basis takes a look at the root processing times for the different kinds of requests we get. So you have name server change requests, you have administrative contact change requests, etc. And so this monthly report shows the total number that was within that month, and then the average processing time for that kind of request.

So this report is for August, mid-August through mid-September, and as you can see, delegations and redelegations take the longest amount of time on average, and the other one that takes a long time is the admin contact change. Again, we report on this monthly and it's published on the IANA.org/performance website if you're interested in seeing. And we do trend over the months to see if things are going up or down, or if they're just sort of steady.

There's a third report we put out there, it's called the monthly audit report. And what this really means is it's a list of delegations and root zone change request and database change requests that have been done during the month. And so there's a huge, long list, if you go to the same website, you'll see this report.

The reason I'm mentioning it is we have been working on expanding this report to include pending requests. So what the report has done for the last couple of years, it shows what's been completed each month, which requests were completed. We're planning, and this is just a prototype shot, and I'm interested in your feedback on adding this to that audit report to show what requests are pending for a delegation, what requests are pending during the month for redelegation.

Now in some cases, especially with gTLDs for delegations, something may not show up on this list ever because they typically close less than ten days. So if it opened on the tenth day of the month and it closed on the 20th day of the month, it would never show up as pending. It would be in that other part of the report, which says closed.

But say it opened on the 31st of the month and didn't close until the 10th of the next month, it would show up on the pending month, the month previous for pending. And then the following month, it would show up as closed. So if you have any comments, I'd be happy to take them at the mic afterwards about the kind of prototype and this type of addition to the report we currently have, or you could grab Naela or me and give us your private comments. We'd certainly appreciate those.

The other issue, of course, that has to do with performance and reporting and metrics is the service level expectations that the CWG has been working on. What I've done here, and I won't read them, is that they've come up with a set of principles and these principles are going to be applied to measurements that we're going to instrument within the root zone management system, at which point we're going to collect a bunch of data. Then we'll come back to the community and say, "All right, this is what the baseline looks like, the trending data, what should the metrics be that we're measuring ourselves against."

So that would be the process and the CWG is, of course, already finalized these principles and submitted it as part of their proposal.

Framework of Interpretation recommendations. I think I've been asked more questions in the last 24 hours about this, and unfortunately, I was on a plane 12 of them, so if I didn't answer your question online, I can take them at the mic, of course.

But you all know that the Board adopted the Framework of Interpretation recommendations last June. Becky Burr and Keith Davidson were nominated to assist the IANA staff to look at an implementation plan and how to come up with one. We sent to Becky and Keith in August a bunch of questions asking

for clarifications of some issues within and recommendations within the Framework of Interpretation recommendations.

Keith met with us in California in September. We all went away with a bunch of homework that we were supposed to follow up on, and he's looking at me like, "Oh, yeah. You had one, too, Keith."

Anyway, and so we're hoping that we'll be able to meet during the rest of this week to follow up on some of our homework and finish up on that. So for the execution of the next steps, this is not a timeline, but it's a graphic of the steps that we'd be going through as we do this.

So we already had the consultation with our advisors, Becky and Keith. We're really now in the part of trying to do the development of an implementation plan, and then, of course, there'd be public comment, then we'd incorporate the feedback, at which point we'd know what the plan should be and start looking at a timeline to put that in place, and then they'd be incorporated into our day-to-day processes.

I did want to put an example, and this is one of the things we had homework on, was one of the changes, for example, that we asked for clarifying questions, was okay, so we're not supposed to use the admin contact and the technical contact for

authorization of certain changes. We're supposed to use the sponsoring organization

So does that mean anyone in the sponsoring organization? What is the definition of the sponsoring organization? Because right now, is it the CEO of the company? Is it someone they designate? How do you want us to track that? Once we have a clarification of exactly what that definition should be of sponsoring organization, I mean, is it a letterhead?

Anyway, then we have to do the change in our workflow because right now our workflow has us asking the administrative contact and the technical contact. We have to make those changes in the root zone management system, that automatic RZMS system that we use. And, of course, then there's the revision to the documentation and the website, etc.

Just making the documentation changes, it's a lot simpler than the other preceding steps. So that's why it's sort of towards the end. But these are the kinds of things we're working with Becky and Keith on, and hopefully we'll get a chance in the next couple of days to sit down and work out some of the open questions that we still have.

Customer survey. So annually, our department sends out a customer survey to anyone who has sent in a change request within the last 12 months. Hopefully, you all have gotten one.

Can I see a show of hands? Anybody out there get one? Tada. Hopefully you've answered them. Yay.

As you can see here, we got about 11% response rate. This goes out to TLD operators, goes out to the protocol parameters folks, and it goes out to the numbers folks, so it's a customer survey that is categorized, so you self-select when you respond. And we will be – actually, it's a third party that does the survey for us. They will correlate all the data so you're anonymous, we don't really know who said what.

They'll correlate the data, we'll get the data back in December, and then we're publishing the report so that everyone can see how we did compared to the last three years, and hopefully, we do as well, if not better. So I hope we got some good marks.

Finally, these are just basically informational announcements. So I know everybody's aware of what a root server is. Well the H root server has announced that they're going to do an IP address change, both the IPv4 and the IPv6 address. That means we're going to have publish a new hints file and you all might want to monitor it if you're operating your own TLDs.

So this is just so you know, this is targeted to happen on December 1. We've sent out several announcements, Naela's team has notified people via e-mail, and I wanted to make sure that as – I didn't touch a thing, it just jumped. Anyway, I wanted

to make sure that people realized that there will be a change in the IP addresses for the H root server.

Another announcement is that I'm sure you've probably heard about the KSK rollover planning and that that would be basically we do the ceremonies four times a year where we sign the KSK, the key signing key, for the root zone. And this would be something unusual, it's not really been done to the root. Many TLD operators have rolled their own keys for their TLDs, and so a design team was put together from the community. We put out a call for volunteers.

This group has been meeting for six months now, and they are meeting here at the ICANN meeting this week, they're reviewing the public comments they got for the proposal they had published back in August, and then they will be coming up with the final plan and making a proposal of how to go forward or not. It depends on what the review and the analysis of the comments are.

So I wanted to let you know this is happening, the team that's doing this within ICANN is under the CTO's office, David Conrad and Ed Lewis are leading that team, and if you see them in the halls, I'm sure they'd be happy to talk to you about this.

Finally, just one last thing, and that's maybe if you have an emergency, please, this number is only for emergencies because

it's 7 by 24. We do have a 7 by 24 phone service, if you have an emergency. We have had a couple in the last six months. Not often do we have an urgent situation where someone needs something done in the root zone right away. One example is somebody's name servers weren't available all of a sudden and they called us and said, "I need to get these other name servers put in the root zone. Can you do this ASAP?" That was over the weekend, and yes, indeed, it happened.

So this is the process. And basically when you call, the phone service will call one of the IANA staff. The IANA staff will then call you back, at which point, you'll discuss what needs to be done. We'll get in touch with both Verisign and NTIA because, obviously, they need to be engaged. At this point in time, who knows? At some point in the future they at least NTIA won't be involved, hopefully.

But today, this is the way it happens. We contact them, and as a group, we correspond quite well with NTIA and Verisign and make this happen as best and as fast as possible. So that's the emergency service in case you didn't know about it or had lost the phone number. And I want to thank you for your attention, I know I'm keeping you from cocktails and other good things, but if you have any questions, I'm happy to field them.

Whoa, somebody's up. Whoa, three people are up. This might be a banner day. I may call on Naela, too, so yes.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: [inaudible] I can attest that the emergency number does work once you get hold of the right people. Your slide set's incomplete. You don't have a picture of Kim and his kid.

ELISE GERICH: That's because he only sent me one of the dog and the kid. Yeah, for those of you who may be missing Kim Davies and didn't realize it, Kim's now a dad. He has a little girl named Mika, and he's quite happy taking some time to be with his newborn and his wife, of course.

NIGEL ROBERTS: I'd just like to make a comment that for about 14 t 15 years, the ccTLD community has been objecting the term sponsoring organization. We don't know what it means. We're not selling soap, I'm going to say this for the 15th or 500th time. We had a commitment from Kim that this was going to be removed from references to ccTLDs. And I believe it started somewhere, it still appears on the webpage, and it's obviously, as I can hear from you, very easy for the IANA staff to fall into error here.

Can we please make an effort? Thank you.

ELISE GERICH:

Hi, Nigel. So that is one of the Framework of Interpretation recommendations. And a little like changing the who authorizes a change, it does take changes to the workflow not because it changes what happens with this “sponsoring organization” or now manager in Framework of Interpretation. But that it’s all through the workflow and so we have to make changes within the root zone management system where you’ll still get messages that say sponsoring organization.

So that’s all part of the implementation plan. And I only joined ICANN five years ago, so I really don’t predate that term, and I’ll have to retrain myself, but I’ll try.

KEITH DAVIDSON:

Elise, I’ve got a couple of questions on FOI, which might not surprise you overly.

ELISE GERICH:

You probably even know the answers.

KEITH DAVIDSON:

No, I don’t. But one is I think has arisen through the few days of this meeting. But it’s around the status of ICP-1 and those items,

and thank you very, very much for expediently removing the reference to those documents from your website. But what we ask the Board today was could we have some confirmation that they have been archived? But the Board has said they need to understand what is meant by archive, as well.

So it may not be a proper question for you, but just for you to note that we asking so that we can formally close off on that. There were ccTLDs who gave their approval for the names proposal on the basis of some work having been done and completed and part of that was getting rid of ICP-1 from any references being a current policy. The other question I have, too, is around how long do you think the implementation of FOI is going to take. Because again, there's a lot of people or ccTLDs who have an expectation of implementation will be complete prior to the transition.

So without wanting to pin you to a date now or even an answer now, if you could consider a timeframe that I reasonable to get it done.

ELISE GERICH:

So to the question about the archive for ICP-1, ICANN.org does have an archive site, and so it's been put on that archive site. It was a document that was written and has history, and that's what moves to archive sites. So that's where it's archived. And it

was considered one of those low-hanging fruit things where it doesn't impact the workflow, it didn't take any changes into RZMS, didn't take any changes into rewriting documentation and instructions on how to do things. So it was quite low-hanging fruit.

And I think for your second question about implementation timeframe, I think that's part of the work, Becky, you and I need to discuss with Naela. Because there are some things that probably are low-hanging fruit and there are others that could be impact the stability of RZMS because there's significant changes.

So I don't have a timeline for you, but that's part of the reason you were nominated to work with us to look at implementation and potentially identify low-hanging fruit.

Do we have any more questions? Otherwise, I want to thank you for your attention and look forward to seeing you at the next ICANN meeting or somewhere else, at the cocktail party. Yay.

KATRINA SATAKI:

Thank you very much. The first meeting day is over. Meeting day is over, yes, but we still meet for cocktail. Please grab your invitation, but you're still welcome without an invitation. Invitation is just for your reference so you can find the place. See

you tonight and, of course, tomorrow morning we start at 9:00.
So party wisely.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]