MARRAKECH – ccNSO Members Meeting Day 1
Tuesday, March 08, 2016 – 09:00 to 18:00 WET
ICANN55 | Marrakech, Morocco

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: Today is March 8th. Marrakech. 2016. Oliveraie room, ccNSO member's meeting day one.

BYRON HOLLAND: Okay, if I could ask everybody to take their seats, we're going to get going in just a moment.

Okay. Good morning everybody, and welcome to the ccNSO meeting, the start of the ccNSO meetings for ICANN 55 in Marrakech. As usual, we have a very busy couple of days. And also very, I would say, particularly important couple of days for the ccNSO community, and certainly for the broader ICANN community as well.

Katrina, in a moment, is going to walk us through the overview of what the next two days look like, but I think it does bares mentioning that I would say that this meeting in particular has a certain gravitas or particular importance to it, that is even more pronounced than a standard ICANN meeting.

And of course, there is a change in leadership, both at the ICANN level. So there is an epoch or an importance to that transition in

the CEO leadership at ICANN. And to a much lesser degree, a leadership change within the ccNSO as this will be, of course, my last ccNSO meeting as chair. But I think most importantly, of course, is the discussion regarding the CCWG accountability, and of course, the related CWG stewardship.

Like previous meetings, we have significant time allocated to that. But this is a very, very important subject for our community and for all of the ICANN communities, depending of course, on the outcome of our conversations over the coming days. Should it be approved by this community?

We will see significant changes, I think, for the better in terms of our ability to determine our own fate regarding PDPs around, or a PDP around delegation, revocation, transfer, as carved out in the CCWG. Potentially SLEs, clearly defined where they haven't been in the past, etc.

So I mean, there are a number of very interesting topics for us to discuss, and significant time allocated to those topics. So please I would remain all of our counselors, it's always important for you to attend these meetings, but it's particularly important for us, as counselors, to be listening closely during the blocks of time allocated to the discussion around CCWG and CWG.

And as members of the ccNSO, it's absolutely critical for all of us to listen to the members we appointed to the CCWG and CWG, to

their opinions, to their inputs, to their take on the proposals. So, with that, I will turn it over to Katrina, to walk us through the next two days.

KATRINA SATAKI: Thank you very much Byron. Good morning everyone. I'm very happy to see so many of you already here in the room, ready for two days of packed agenda, intense discussions, and hopefully interesting presentations.

We've all got folders, in front of you, thanks to the secretariat for this initiative. They tried to compile together everything we might need in the coming days. You also will find an agenda printed there for your convenience, but if not, I'll try to walk you through, really quickly, not going to talk about each and every session, each and every presentation in details.

But again, as Byron already mentioned, we had a lot of time allocated to discussions around IANA stewardship transition process. And we'll start the day with block number one. This is going to be an introduction to the final, the proposal that we have at the moment. We'll have in the room, going to have Lisse, who joins us as our co-chair in the CWG.

We have time, we give time to each of our representatives, our members on the CCWG. They will give you their view on the

proposal, and of course we will have an overview of what proposal actually means at this particular moment. Tomorrow we'll continue discussions with IANA stewardship transition process.

Here we'll talk more about implementation, again as Byron already mentioned, we'll talk about SLEs, status quo, and what we will have to do during the implementation phase and what it means to the ccNSO.

And then at the end of second day, we'll have discussion around everything basically. We will want to hear your opinion. Of course, you're free to ask your questions during all of these discussions, during ccNSO cocktail, during breaks. People, you saw on the screen, they're here. They're ready and willing to share their views, their knowledge, and their expertise on the process.

And this is something, again, we need to do, PDP, for those who have forgotten. This is policy development process, we'll get an update from Becky and Bart on the, this process retirement of ccTLD and review mechanism.

Of course, we have many other interesting sessions, updates from working groups. Here I would like particularly stress update from guidelines review committee. This is, as you may remember, this committee is working on the guidelines of the

ccNSO. They try to update them and today represent our work on this issue.

Another interesting aspect, probably many ccTLDs would like to hear, a legal session. And all presentations are interesting, but this time we will kind of start discussions around intermediary liability around the world. So the plan is, in the next meetings, we will explore this issue in detail if there is an interest from the community, in ccTLDs.

Of course there are traditional sessions. Traditional ccTLD news, update from regional organizations, and so on. In the evening, of course we're all welcome to the ccNSO cocktail. It's another traditional session of ours. The cocktail will take place in… Not so far from here, actually.

Would have been walking… No, it is a walking distance. The problem is that it's too dark, so we would be walking in dark… Well, we're used to that, taking into account this whole transition thing, but [LAUGHTER]. But just to make it easier for you, we have buses. Shuttles will take us to the place and back.

And of course, thanks a lot to our sponsors, all the ccTLDs you see here on your screen. Special thanks to our colleagues at [K-NIC?] for helping to organize this. The cocktail would not be possible without you, so thank you very much.

And with that, I'd like to welcome you to the ccNSO session here in this room, remotely, via social media, plus follow us on Twitter and on Facebook, and simply talk about social media. We are launching a survey. So we want to know your opinion, how you would like the ccNSO to interact with you via social media.

We have already published the survey on the website, but [inaudible] will send information to the members later today. So please share your views on this issue. Plus, of course, after the meeting, we will ask you to fill in a satisfaction survey. So what you think about meetings? What you would like to see in the agenda in the coming meetings?

What you liked, what you did not like, and so on. Your opinion matters to us. Thank you very much and enjoy two days of ccNSO meetings.

And we'll start with updates from two working groups. TLD-OPS status update, Cristian, and SOP working group update, Giovanni.

CRISTIAN HESSELMAN: All right. Good morning everyone. I'm going to give you a brief update on the TLD-OPS incident response community. As a word of warning, I'm going to ask for a room temperature on a

certain challenge that we're facing, so please keep your cards ready.

How does that work?

Oh, okay, got it, thanks. So TLD-OPS is an incident response community for and by ccTLDs. And it basically brings together everyone who is responsible for the security and stability of their ccTLD. And the goal of the community is to, of course, further increase the security and stability of the Internet as a whole, and also of the services of the individual ccTLD operators.

We're trying to accomplish this in two ways. One is by increasing the reachability of ccTLDs for incident response situations. So we have a contact repository that I'll be talking about in a minute, that allows ccTLDs to quickly look up the contact information of their peers.

And in addition, we're also sharing information on security alerts, so that we raise the level of shared knowledge on security incidents. TLD-OPS is a community that's open for every ccTLD. So you don't need to be a member of the ccNSO, every ccTLD can join. The oversight is being done by the TLD ops standing committee, which consist of five representatives from the ccTLD community.

One from each region, plus liaisons to [inaudible] IANA and ICANN security team. The TLD-OPS community revolves around a mailing list, which serves two purposes. One is to be able to look up contact information of your peers. So in order to do that, the mailing list generates an email every month, which contains all of the contact information of your peers, consisting of first name and last name, phone numbers and email addresses.

And this information is packaged in one email. And the advantage of, let's say, doing it this way is that this information is also available in offline situations, because you only have to store the email in your inbox. And we know that this was important because there was a recent incident at dot TR, Turkey, and they were not able to communicate because their email systems didn't work, because DNS was gone.

So that illustrates that this offline support is important. And in addition, we used the TLD-OPS mailing list for sharing information on security alerts, such as DDOS attacks, phishing attacks, and thinks like software vulnerabilities.

The list, a little bit aside from traditional, you know, incident response facilities, is that we use a model of personal trust, as we call it, which means that the contact information consists of personal, of names and, first names and last names, personal

email address, and phone numbers. And that we do not use roll based accounts.

And the rationale behind this is that we think that this contributes to, let's say, an increased level of trust within the ccTLD community. Also, what's a little bit different is that you can only join the TLD-OPS community if your IANA admin contact says that you are one of the persons that is responsible for the security and stability of your ccTLD.

This is different from how traditional incident response communities allow new members to join, because that's usually through a vouching model, where you need to know a certain number of people before you can join. And we think that this will not fit this community because it will increase the entrance barrier of joining.

So this is our current status. We have about 60% of all ccTLDs worldwide on the list, so still 40% missing. And in the ASCII space we have some work to do for the African region, the Asia Pacific, and also for the LAC regions. And we're doing okay in terms of the European Union, the European region and the North American region.

And in terms of IDN TLDs, we have 61% of ccTLDs on the list. Okay so progress since ICANN 54, briefly. We added six new ccTLDs. We updated the leaflet that we produced a while ago,

which contains all the information you need to subscribe, and also what the added value of the list is for you as a ccTLD.

So please check it out if you're not on the list yet. We extended the TLD-OPS standing committee with a new member, a ccTLD and three liaisons, and we're working with the ICANN regional vice presidents to onboard even more ccTLDs. So we're facing two challenges right now.

The first one is how to get the sharing of security alerts going on the list. That's basically a boot-strapping problem, and we have decided to work with ICANN to get this going. So our ultimate goal is that every ccTLD on the list also shares security alerts that they are aware of. But for now, we're starting with security alerts that we're going to receive from ICANN, and we're going to be forwarding those onto the mailing list.

And the second part of this challenge is that we also somehow need to end up in the operational processes of ccTLDs, so that when something happens, there is also an interaction on the list. To be honest, we don't really have an answer here so if you have any suggestions here, I would be glad to hear them.

Our second challenge is that we would like to open up this initiative for gTLDs. There are several advantages of doing that. Of course, it will strength the incident response facilities of not just the ccTLD community, but also of the gTLD community,

which will further increase the security and stability of the Internet, but of course, there is also downsides because there is going to be a large number of new gTLDs, including tens of back end operators, so that increases the complexity of the list and also the governance of the list.

So, this is actually the kind of thing that I wanted to get the room temperature on. So I was kind of wondering if you could use your cards to indicate if this is something you would be okay with?

I'm seeing mostly green, some yellow. I think that's, if we round it off, it's the green, I think. Okay, so thank you for that. So in this case, we will be continuing as described at the bottom of the slide. We propose to keep the current standing committee structure in place until ICANN 58, which is next year. And we're going to request ICANN to allocate time to administer the list, because there is going to be more gTLDs to join.

So that also means a bit more work. And we're going to request ICANN to actively promote this initiative among new gTLDs and also legacy TLDs. And we'll be starting the discussion on how to do this whole thing as of the next ICANN meeting. Okay? So thank you for that.

Just a brief update on the standing committee itself. We have a vacancy for someone from the Asia Pacific region, so if you think

this is a really cool initiative, which it is, then please let me know. We got, in terms of procedures, we have a mandate from the ccNSO Council until, actually until this ICANN meeting. So we took the liberty of proposing to extend that mandate until ICANN 58.

And also at ICANN 58, which is next year, we'll be assessing the perceived added value of the list by the community, for instance through a questionnaire or something like that. Our objectives until the next ICANN meeting is to further increase the number of subscribers on the list, and to really get this sharing of incidents information, of security alerts going, and also we need to develop a simple procedure to be able to update the contact information that we currently have, because there is 320 people on the list right now.

So there is bound to be some changes of people living the company or changing roles within the organization. And as I said, we need to find a new representative for the Asia Pacific region. Okay, so that was my presentation. These are the folks that are actually on the TLD-OPS standing committee. So please approach them if you have any questions, and of course, I'm also available. Thank you.

KATRINA SATAKI: Thank you very much Cristian.   Any questions from the audience?

So. There is none. Thank you very much. [APPLAUSE]

So with that, I give floor to Giovanni, he will give an update on the money.

GIOVANNI SEPPIA: Such an association. Thank you Katrina. Okay. My update, I do not have slides for my update.   It's going to be very short because ICANN has just released the fiscal year 17 in draft operating plan and budget. And the comment period opened a few days ago, and it goes until the end of April this year.

And this fiscal year 17 operating plan and budget, is expected to be approved by the ICANN Board before June of this year. We had a very interesting session with Xavier on Sunday, and also another very interesting session with the finance committee on the same day in [inaudible].

And a session for more than five hours on that day, so it's more than I want to see my wife at home. So it was a long time with Xavier, trying to understand, but above all, trying to absolutely acknowledging the great work which has been done by Xavier's department to make sure that the community is provided with

data, and especially with financial data, in a very transparent way.

And this is what Xavier and Cristian, they have been doing in the past two years. And if I look back at the work of the ccNSO SOP working group, and the data that we were provided five years ago, against the data we are provided now, there is a huge, huge gap. And it's in positive, because the data that we are given now are extremely detailed, well structured, and well presented.

And allow this working group to produce good comments. So I don't know if some of you had a chance to look at the fiscal year 17 draft operating plan and budget, which has been posted, as I said, a few days ago. It's a quite big document, and it shows not only the budget and the activities per project, but also it includes all the assumptions that are at the basis of the calculation of the revenue of ICANN, and we are talking about $132 for fiscal year 17 against expenses that are estimated as being between 125, $130 dollars.

And the progress that has been made by Xavier's group, is also to have, as I was saying, a better understanding of the revenue model, with much, let's say, closer to reality figures in terms of what they expect, for instance, renewals of new gTLDs, renewal of the historical TLDs, contributions from the ccTLD community.

So the budget, the fiscal year 17 budget and operating plan is a much more sound document than what we have seen in the previous years. So the work that this working group will be doing, in the coming weeks, is to divide ourselves in sub working groups like we have done in the past, and start contributing and coming up with input on the different sections of this operating plan and budget.

But, there is quite a new element that we have introduced in the last meeting. And it's quite a significant change because this working group is a strategy and operating plan working group. And what we have been doing, quite a lot during the past year, is to address to Xavier, Xavier's team, comments that were related to strategy.

And Xavier and his team, they are a repository of what are the needs at a financial level of the different departments, of the different units, within ICANN. So when it comes to strategy, when we were addressing comments with Xavier about why that strategy, well, we realized that we better ask these kind of questions to the head of the departments in charge of those strategies.

So this is going to be, and there was a general agreement that this was going to be the approach for the future meetings of the ccNSO SOP working group, meaning that we will not only deal

with Xavier and his team, but from time to time, we will try to invite those head of departments, head of units, at ICANN that are in charge of the different strategies that end up in expenses that go in the budget.

And I'm giving you an example, which was something that the ccNSO SOP has highlighted several times in the past couple of years. And it's to try to have an ICANN assessment of all of these engagement centers and [inaudible] that have been created around the world by ICANN, acknowledging that we wanted to see a cost benefit analysis of this plan, and we have been asking for that since a while.

So again, instead of, and we have addressed this during the meeting to Xavier, but we acknowledge that instead of asking this to Xavier, we better ask it to the person in charge of this strategy, so that we do not only base on our work figures, but when we have a better understanding of the strategy that is behind certain figures, we can present our input also in a more constructed and valuable way.

So as of next meeting, and we will have, we will invite one or more head of departments at ICANN who can explain to us what is the reasoning, and what is the assessment behind certain strategies. And that is going to be sort of preliminary before evaluating certain figures.

And again, this is going to be in place as of the next meeting of the ccNSO at Sophia. So in the meanwhile, we will produce our comments to the fiscal year 17 operating plan and budget, as we have done in the past, and I'll be happy to share with the whole community those comments at the next meeting of the ccNSO.

Happy to answer any questions.

KATRINA SATAKI: Thank you very much Giovanni. Any questions? Peter?

The question was regarding numbers for 2017 budget.

GIOVANNI SEPPIA: So if you look at the fiscal year 17 budget which has been published, the baseline for the total support and revenue is expected to be $132.4 million, with an expected baseline for cash expenses of $126.5 million.

KATRINA SATAKI: Thank you. Any other questions?

If not, then thank you very much Giovanni. [APPLAUSE]

With that, we finish the first part of our meeting. Next, we'll have a meeting with the ICANN Board, it's in the Atlas room. Yeah, it's one level up. It shouldn't be…

And please, after coffee break, be back for block one of our discussion on IANA stewardship transition process. See you.

BYRON HOLLAND: Welcome back everybody. Could I get the panelists to come to the front please?

Hi. Could I get the panelists to come to the front, which would include Mathieu, Lise, Jordan, Eberhard, Roelof, Giovanni?

Please.

Is Lise in the room?

And Jordan. We need Lise and Jordan.

Jordan, come on up. Kim, could you send Lise an email?

Okay, welcome back everybody. We're going to get going again with the agenda. As I think you all know, this is the first of three significant blocks of time allocated to the discussion regarding CWG stewardship and CCWG accountability. We've purposely organized this so that the first session will be a little bit of a level set of where we're at, and we have the benefit of having two of the co-chairs, or a co-chair of each of the two working groups being ccNSO member or ccTLD manager and operator.

So they are going to give us the lay of the land from their perspectives at this time. And then each of our appointed

members to the CCWG will provide their feedback and input on the state of play for the CCWG. As you can see, there are a number of us up here.

So I'm going to ask all of our panelists to prove a full and frank review from their perspective, of the status of the CCWG and the substance. But to please be respectful of the fact that we do have to get through this session, and there are a number of us who all need to speak. And I will do my best to keep us moving.

From that perspective, just to level set where we're at. I'm going to provide an initial reminder of where we were when we left Dublin. But I did, before we get going, just want to remind everybody here that today is International Women's Day. And generally speaking, we have good diversity on the ccNSO community on that front, but I would remiss if I didn't notice, that…

Yeah, not right now, not for lack of trying, but I also know that Lise can more than hold her own with any number of us up front. So, I never have any fear that she can hold her own, absolutely. Anyway, just in terms of level setting where we're at, and providing a starting point for the discussion going forward, we do have a couple of slides and I will put the first slide up here.

And I'm just going to take five to 10 minutes to get us going and level set, and then pass it on to each of the co-chairs. You will

likely remember this slide, or hopefully you will remember this slide. We saw it in Dublin. And it is an attempt to show us where we are in the process and the different parts of the process.

Back in Dublin, we were a little further back in the process, but as you can see a couple of the elements have been completed. And you can see that on the slide. And we now are on the far right of the slide, where it's the time for the SO and ACs to review the final proposal, and decide or not, to submit it to the Board for their consideration.

I think it's worth noting, along the top of this diagram, the ICG proposal. It is essentially done, but they are waiting for the outcomes of the various SO AC reviews before they submit it. So it is not stamped completed, as the others are. However, it is effectively done and simply waiting to hear from the SO and ACs.

So that gives us a sense of all of the moving parts and where we are in the process with regards to all of the separate tracks. Now if we move on to the next slide, or spacebar. Would that do it? No, I don't have control of it. Two different decks, okay.

What we have provided here, essentially is… And I'm going to have to take a timeout to put my glasses on, I'm sorry. I can see really well as long as it's 24 inches in front of me.

Yeah, what we put together is essentially, where did we leave Dublin? And the document on the screen is a consolidation of the document that in fact, Jordan put together at the completion of the Dublin meeting. It has been provided to the community and has been published shortly after Dublin in fact. And it was just a compilation of where we were at the end of our Dublin meeting.

And I think that's important just to level set us going forward. It's not that we can't talk about the substance, but I think the full substance of the CCWG report, but I think it's important to note where we were when we left Dublin, and provide that as kind of a framework or a jumping off point, at least, for the discussion over the next couple of days.

And we've highlighted what I think were the key points of discussion, during Dublin. So for example, bullet point number one, changes to the fundamental bylaws. The key there is ccNSO PDPs really can't be blocked. Needless to say we were supportive of that. Changes to the standard bylaws. Again, same thing vis a vis any ccNSO PDPs.

There was recall, the potential for recall of the entire Board. We were supportive of that. There was rough consensus on incorporation of AOC reviews, and consensus on the

incorporation of AOC commitments and principles into the bylaws.

There was consensus on incorporating into the bylaws an article regarding human rights. And moving on to the other, I think, key points here. And again, this is based on the document that went out at the end of the Dublin meeting, that there was consensus that we as SO and ACs also had to be accountable in this process, and there will be some refinements there.

The fact that there would, the CWG requirements would be met was absolutely critical. Also the capability to remove individual Board members, there was consensus around that. There was rough, though certainly not unanimous, consensus about the single designator enforcement model.

And there was consensus around the right to veto the budget. As, hopefully many would recall, there was discussion around the GAC advice, and the general consensus there was that it wasn't a matter on which the ccTLD or the ccNSO rather, should be taking a view. So when we left Dublin, that was the basic understanding after all of the time and effort spent discussing this subject in Dublin, as it pertained to the third draft.

So that's where we left. And fundamentally the discussion over the next couple of days will be about, and where have we come since that timeframe. And I think we have come a long ways. I

mean, that was certainly going to, certainly my impression. And just, as an example, if we go back to the first slide, Kim or the previous slide.

You know, items number one and two, both of those have seen change since the third draft. And I think that that's absolutely critical an example of how the fourth draft, or the final proposal, has been modified to take into account the express concerns of this community and others.

But from my perspective, that's where we are in the process. That's where we left Dublin after considerable discussion and debate. And I think that this is a good jumping off point, as I've said, for the conversation over the next two days.

And with that, I'm going to pass it over first to Mathieu, to give us his update from the CCWG, wearing his CCWG co-chair hat, because we are also going to ask Mathieu to speak as a ccNSO member later, but right now he's going to put on his CCWG accountability co-chair hat, and give us an update from that perspective. Mathieu?

MATHIEU WEILL: Thank you very much Byron. And thank you for this setting, to see an introduction, which is perfectly, well reminding us where we left in Dublin. I'm going to speak to slide 14 straight, so I'm

not going to go through all of the presentation. I want to thank the secretariat for preparing the small documentation that has been provided on the tables, which is…

We probably don't have the same numbering. We'll fix it. So the idea was to provide you with the description of all of the recommendations, a high level summary, and a changes since the third report. And I will only focus on some of this in this discussion.

So can you go back a few slides? The other way around.

I'm looking for is, why does it matter?

Okay. Wrong set of slides, but that's good documentation. So, what does it matter? So just a reminder that what we are in need here is to approve or not, the work stream one recommendations from the CCWG accountability. It's a set of 12 recommendations that have been finalized with, in February 23rd and sent over to the chartering organizations.

It is work stream one, and work stream one is defined as those recommendations that need to be in place or committed to before the IANA stewardship transition can take place. The consequence, it's delivering the structure improvements to ICANN, that we are necessary because of the NTIA transition,

stewardship transition I should say, before my neighbor to the left hits me.

And it has been designed so that in the… Not only does it deliver those changes that are strictly needed, but also it secures the ability for further enhancements to take place, even if there was resistance from within the organization. And so that's the second part, which takes place in work stream two and that also needs to take place even beyond work stream two, as ICANN keeps enhancing its accountability, because obviously it's a journey and there is not an end game.

So I think we have left the components of the proposal intact. There are still four key building blocks, which are changes to the principles of ICANN, it's mission, changes to the independent appeals mechanisms by enhancing significantly the IRP, for instance. Some adjustment on the ICANN Board of Directors, which remains front and center in running the corporation, so that it's efficient.

And of course, you will remember if you were here in Dublin, all of the discussions around how to empower the community with a very limited set of powers. So, what changed since Dublin? Byron, you already introduced one key change, which was present in the, in the third report already. It's not a chance from the third and fourth report, but it's a change since Dublin, which

was that the request from the ccTLDs to have the outcome of a ccNSO PDP if a bylaw change is needed, cannot be vetoed by the other parts of the community, that had been taken into account already.

Since the third report, there have been significant work, and I think it's fair to say the month of January was absolutely crazy in terms of calls, and reviewing every comment. The changes that are significant to us are the fact that the IRP, or the independent appeals panel, will have the ability to… It will be possible to go in front of the IRP if after the escalation process with the IANA, IANA function, we as customers, or direct customers will be able to challenge actions or inactions from PTI in front of the IRP, after the escalation process as elaborated by the CWG.

That was an important point for the CWG. There were a number of discussion on the escalation around the community powers. So as we introduced in Dublin, there is always three phases: the engagement phase where the ICANN Board or ICANN staff engages with the community about a decision that has to be taken.

Once a decision is taken, if there is dissatisfaction in the community, there is an escalation phase where, with a number of occasions to discuss and find ways to solve the issue without going into a formal decision. And then there is a decision if only,

only if this all fails. And in this escalation process, there was some timeline issues and glitches.

It was very aggressive timelines that had been raised by several contributors, so we fixed that timeline issue in the final report. We've also discussed a lot about the GAC, the role of governments. I think this is very much at the core of many ICANN's discussions. It has been the case for as long as I've been there actually.

So it's no surprise. As discussed in Dublin, the outcome of the Dublin discussion was this was not practically a topic where as ccTLDs as a whole, we were, we felt we had consensus. We needed to make a statement, but in terms of reporting, I can tell you that number one, there was agreement to include as part of the ATRT reviews, a new item about the effectiveness of how the GAC interacts with the various parts of the community. So that includes the ccNSO. So that's an opportunity for us if we think the GAC is interacting with us to actually add this to the ATRT reviews and recommendations.

And as was intensive, intensive, intensive discussions about the compromise that was found around the stress 18 discussion, so how the GAC advice can be formulated, rules for that to be taken into, for the Board to be forced to try and find a mutually

agreeable solution with the GAC, before acting in a manner that's not consistent with its advice.

And this led also to a discussion about what is probably wrongly named, but the GAC carve out option, which is creating a lot of tension amongst governments because they feel they are being singled out, but is also following the positions from many in the GNSO essentially, saying that it would be, not be a good thing for the GAC to have two bites of the apple, I'm quoting, because they will be able to provide advice to the Board, and if the Board acting in consistent with this advice, they would still be able to participate in a community decision to challenge this decision by the Board.

Very political. If you want to elaborate on that later in the Q&A, I'm happy to. And we have Becky Burr who is much more of a specialist on that. I sometimes take liberties about it, but when trying to detail it because it's very technical, but basically this is the core discussion in the GAC right now, because this is a minority statement by a significant number of governments, and that's on the agenda. It has been on the agenda for the full week.

But probably not the center of our ccTLD concerns. A few of the staff have been added. The ICANN Board actually suggested that the community be empowered to have an investigation

right, so launch an investigation, sort of force the Board to appoint an external auditor to investigate an issue. It can be a security issue. It can be a, I don't know, corruption, fraud, accusations, or anything.

So that's a new thing that was actually introduced by the Board itself, so that is worth noting. There was some discussions on what happens if a Board director sues someone from the ccNSO leadership, for instance, because they introduced a request, a petition, to remove this particular Board director, and the Board director feels that it is actually causing a prejudice and so on.

So there has been some indemnification rules that have been added to the report. And we've also added an item of work for work stream two, which is around staff accountability. What are the roles and responsibility of staff when supporting working groups, or in terms of transparency with regards to the community, of course, being mindful of the employer employee relationship that exists for staff, which makes it quite different from what are engagement rules within ICANN are.

That's the list of changes. All the Board concerns have been addressed. I'm not speaking about CWG because Lise will do that later, but I think it's worth saying that we had a list of Board concerns, they've all been discussed, addressed. The ICANN

Board has there, okay with the outcome. That was an important point.

And in terms of attention for ccTLDs, I'd like to just add a couple of things. The delegation revocation, it's seen outside of the IRP until we have found our own process and policy for that. And we have worked a lot on the budget details. There have been a number of discussions with the CWG to make sure we fully address their requirements. I leave this to Lise, but there are two different processes to veto either the PTI budget or the ICANN budget, and we have expanded on the concept of the caretaker budget that would kick in if there is a veto on the one year budget, or one year plan.

And we are already seeing that ICANN is starting to incorporate this notion into the way that they're building the budget this year. So I think this has made good progress as well. And I know this was a concern that we had discussed.

So finally, just to thanks, a big, big thanks to the four other members of the ccNSO who were part of these efforts. It was tiring at times, certainly demanding, and also to a special thanks to Becky and Jordan who have been [inaudible] and carried, I mean they really did the heavy lifting in many of this discussions. So I think it's worth saying that after this work, the ccTLD contribution is, were recognized all across ICANN. And I

think that's also something that is worth taking for us.   And before turning to the question, I said, remember this work stream two coming.

This is not the end of the game.   This is just work stream one. This is the, this is a set of political agreements with very much details about it.   It still needs to be implemented, and it's going to be challenging, but challenging because of the amount of work and it's a technical challenge.   Not a political challenge, but it's still a challenge.

And work stream two is still coming.   And of course, we have prioritized work stream one, but work stream two is still coming, and work stream two has more, will be even more challenging because it's going to be about changing some aspects of the culture on staff accountability, diversity, AC/SO accountability. It's not going to be easy.   We need to remain committed on that, and that's an important point.

And I'll finish with a quote that was given to me by one of the GAC ambassadors in the high level.   The difficult is that which can be done immediately, the impossible which takes a little longer.   So work stream one, work stream two.   Thank you Byron.

BYRON HOLLAND: Thank you Mathieu. This session is an hour and a half, and we most definitely will have an opportunity for Q&A at the end, after we've heard from each of our members, as well as Lise, but are there any quick questions of clarification or understanding for Mathieu before we move on to Lise?

No? Okay. Lise.

LISE FUHR: Well, thank you Byron. I got the hint, the members and Lise. Not being with the ccNSO community anymore, but thank you.

BYRON HOLLAND: You're reading into that. You're always welcome.

LISE FUHR: That's good. Thank you. I did, I did. And actually you took my introduction by saying it's International Women's Day. You know, and even though I can manage myself, I would love to see much women up here. So, go get them girls.

Okay. As you know, the very long and hard work done by Mathieu and colleagues, were made dependent on actually fulfilling some requirements set by the CWG. Next slide. And why did we do that? Well, we were two working groups working

in parallel. We were trying to avoid overlapping work, and we wanted to ensure consistency what was actually been proposed.

So we actually made the IANA stewardship transition proposal, dependent on a set of requirements, so the CWG could actually draft out those in their proposal. And that created a lot of issues, of course, and actually like Patrik Fälström said yesterday, the ICG has not submitted their proposal yet, because of this dependency.

Next slide please. So what are the dependencies? Well the first one was in relation to the ICANN budget. We needed to ensure that the community had a right to actually decide over the budget, and we wanted to be a part of looking into the details, and also having a possibility to reject the budget in a way.

Furthermore, we thought that the ICANN Board, it was very important for us also that whatever was done with the PTI or IANA was connected to the community rights in order to appoint or remove members, or recall the entire Board.

Number three, is that actually we wanted to have an IANA functions review, and we wanted this to be incorporated in the bylaws. It's important that you take a review of IANA, we proposed, first after two years, and then every four years. But this needed to be in the bylaws, and we thought the bylaws were part of the accountability group's work.

So this was a dependency. Next slide please. Then in the proposal, there is a customer standing committee. And that's actually, what I find, is very important with a new setup, and the proposal for IANA. This customer standing committee is actually the different communities that has a possibility to follow and have an oversight of IANA. And this needed to be incorporated into the bylaws, so we ensured this group for the future.

We had a request for an appeal mechanism, and that should also, how to actually incorporate this in the proposal was not set in stone. So this was more, we needed a possibility to actually react on PTI or IANA's actions or inactions, just as important. And we wanted some of these requirements to be in the fundamental bylaws, that was the last dependency.

Next slide please. And as many of you know, in December, we had an opportunity to review third draft from the accountability group. But the CWG found that the draft didn't meet all of the requirements. So we actually had to highlight in specific two issues, and those were the IANA functions budget, and the other one was the appeal mechanism.

Next slide please. And well, the draft had the following issues. One was that the IANA budget lacked the details we wanted. We actually specified a lot of the details that needed to be in the IANA budget, in order to be able to follow how the money was

used on different projects. Was money used for developing IANA, or was it used for salaries?

Where was it…? Where will the money be going? Also, since this was not a finalized process, we wanted to have within the draft, that the CWG is actually going to develop a process for this budget review. And last but not least, the appeal mechanism seems to have disappeared. It's been in a prior draft, but it was missing in this third draft. Next slide please.

Well, so the CWG worked very closely with the CCWG. We have a lot of overlapping persons. I think it's, I don't know the number, but it's more than 10 people are overlapping in both groups. And those can actually ensure the consistency, but we also had the design team leads. We had formed design teams for every subject.

Those leads were working very closely with the accountability group in order to solve these issues. So now we actually could send a letter to the accountability group. Next slide please. With a happy message that we found that all of our requirements have been met. So I put in a little sunrise here to see, this is the start of a very nice and good time for ICANN.

For us, I must say, we confirmed. I've been really impressed by the work, and the corporation between the two groups. It has been great to actually work on the actual wording, because in

the end, as they all say, the devil is in the detail, and that's what we found when we reviewed the third draft.

But now, in the revision, everything has been met and we're very confident that the proposal meets all of the requirements. Thank you.

BYRON HOLLAND: Thanks Lise. And thank you for all of the work of the CWG. Are there any questions of clarification or understanding for Lise before we move on to the individual opinions of our members?

Okay, with that, we have a little over 45 minutes available to us in this session. We have five members. I'm going to ask them to provide their thoughts and feedback on the work of the CCWG, in as close to five minutes as they can, respecting that part of what we want is an interactive session.

It's one thing for members to deliver their opinions and thoughts, but it's equally important to hear from the room, and to ask questions to gain clarity on anything that you don't understand, that you're concerned about, or that you support any of those three things.

So as best as possible, I'm going to ask the ccNSO appointed members of this CCWG to give us their thoughts and feelings in five minutes. And I'm going to start from the left. Jordan.

JORDAN CARTER: Thanks Byron. Hi everyone. Thoughts and feelings for a moment, someone came to mind that I should try to do this through an interpreter of dance, but I won't because I'm not very good at that kind of thing.

I just, before I work through, I think, the reasons that we should approve this proposal, which I do strongly think that we should do, there is just a prior comment that I want to make that the working methods of this group have been really interesting, and the interactions with the ICANN Board have been really interesting.

And I think a lesson for future CCWG on cross ICANN issues like this, we need to encourage the Board either to be involved from the beginning, or to wait and see what the outcome of the CCWG is. We were probably about five months behind where we would have been, if the ICANN Board has chosen one of those approaches, but instead they were not involved at the start, and then became heavily involved in the middle and towards the end.

So I think it's a good reflection and learning process from this about the way that CCWGs can operate, and the way the Board can interact with them in a constructive way. And that, along with the interactions across the community that Byron

EN

mentioned in his comments in the public forum yesterday, I think, are two really good outcomes of this as a learning process.

So I think we should support this, and not just because I've spent too many hours on it to be able to cope with us not doing so. I'll start at the bottom of the slide. We've delivered the requests from this group in terms of protecting PDPs from the ccNSO. And in terms of us setting the policy around delegation, revocation, and retirements that we talked about, and also the appeals process. So we'll set the rules for how appeals are done on those topics, that hasn't been done by the CCWG.

Overall, I think that as ccTLD managers, it's in our interests that ICANN be unable to expand its scope, and unable to disobey its own rules, which restrain its ability to make policy for us, as ccTLD managers. And that's what this package delivers. There are new powers to hold the Board to account.

There is a new IRP process that I'm sure Becky can talk about in detail, that means that if ICANN steps outside its bylaws, it can be held to account, and those decisions can be challenged and reversed. The mission is more clearly specified, and the bylaws can no longer be changed by the ICANN Board on a whim.

The fundamental framework of ICANN will become subject to community agreement before any changes are made, and that's a really significant thing when we're talking about a framework

that has to be able to survive the end of the IANA functions contract with NTIA.

There is some limits on the GAC's ability to influence ICANN, and I don't want to go through all of the details there. There is a slightly higher threshold for the Board to reject GAC advice, but there is also a carve out that says if the Board acts on GAC advice, and the community has got a problem with the Board decided, the GAC can't simultaneously be part of deciding to exercise, or not exercise, the community powers.

So that's a really important angle to just be clear about. And so whether we were dealing with a stewardship transition or not, I think this would be a set of accountability improvements that are probably quite overdue, and the impact of them is not necessarily seeing them used often, because we don't want to see them used often, I don't think.

It's the changed incentives that this creates for ICANN Board and staff in following the company's mission, in serving the ICANN community, and in not, you know, deviating from that responsibility and that mission. It isn't a perfect proposal, we had arguably a better model in October with a membership structure to deliver this, for their own reasons the Board pushed back hard against that.

And as all part of this negotiation process, is you know, that's what the multistakeholder model does. We've got a model that can do the job, it's just a bit more complicated as a result. So I would urge you to support the proposal when it comes to the decision tomorrow.

And I just want to say in closing that this is our one shot at this. If we don't approve it, if we don't get this off onto the runway tomorrow, the delays mean that this administration will not approve the transition in the United States. And as you can all see from news feeds from the United States, if you're paying any attention, God knows what is going to happen after that.

So if we want this to happen, I think we have to be aware of that timing reality, which is an external constraint that we can't do anything about. Thanks.

BYRON HOLLAND: Thank you Jordan. And if you have any questions for Jordan, I'm just going to ask that we wait until the end and we'll do all of the Q&A for the individual members at the end of their comments. Now carrying on, in alphabetical order, is Eberhard.

EBERHARD LISSE: I'm just waiting for my slide. Next slide. The next one. Thank you. I will also try to do it in under five minutes and 11 seconds.

This is, I'm not impressed with the quality of work, 17,000 man hours, eight trips or three individual trips and three ICANN meetings, plus a few others. 11.4 million US dollars, seven million dollars when to US lawyers.

They did proofreading for 600 bucks an hour and overlooked most errors. I'm just carrying this around to be able to bash somebody's head in with over it. I challenge anybody to tell me that he has read every page of this. It was then done into multiple languages, and only given to us last week, over the weekend, so I don't really know how somebody who doesn't speak good English can actually even say he has looked at it properly.

Process in an accountability session in particular matters. So if the charter is violated repeatedly, if the working method gets changed as it moves along, if the co-chairs will have to process over consensus, whatever, that's not really the way it should be.

Two members of the ccNSO, appointed ccNSO members had a conflict of interest because they run gTLDs, dot Amsterdam and dot Paris. The ccNSO, the GNSO appointed member is a ccNSO counselor, or the other way around, so that, in my view, is a clear conflict of interest, and I spoke to her yesterday about it so she knows it's coming.

And if I could have the next slide please. It does redesign ICANN's dynamics. That's a nice phrase that I got from an Indian block that I saw the other day. We should have actually restructured this properly. The government influence will increase. We don't really know whether they want to be part of the decision, whether they want to be a decision and participant, and if they don't, the numbers that we have put in the project really start becoming very complicated, because you need a certain number to participate in these things.

The transparency of the ICANN deliberations, as far as the GAC is concerned, have been given very choice names by an independent review panel. The special consideration, a minority report by 15 countries says they still want the 66%. We bartered them down to 60%, but still, they should have not any special consideration. I personally do not think that the ALAC should be a SO, or any advisory committee should be a SO.

The ICANN is funded on the [inaudible] the protocols and the DNSO which is split into two specifically three supporting organizations. To say that we can sit down and everything is fine and the government, it's not the case. The influence of the governments do increase, and if that is the case, we should have basically restructured.

This is something that I have been saying since last year since Singapore. And now the last slide. How does this really effect? To be really honest, I don't care. Accountability, all together and sing Kumbaya, it doesn't affect the ccTLD really. The only thing that affects a ccTLD is hostile, revocation, and transfer.

The large ccTLDs, they have got contracts or understanding with the governments, they're not affected. It's the medium or smaller ones, in particular, in developing countries that have no protection whatsoever. The accountability measures for ccTLDs are not in the stress test if it accommodates, if the government tries to force a re-delegation.

We have no accountability measure to do this. We have heard, I wasn't there, but we have heard a Board member reappointed to the Board, made a really, not understandable comment about re-delegations. Now if I wanted to remove this Board member under this, we don't really know how to do this, because the book says the majority of the AC or SO for us is that, does that mean council? Does that mean the members?

And then, once that's done, we need to get another SO or AC to help us to form a community, and so it's designed so that nothing really will happen. I must say the ATLAS, one last thing of the ATLAS organization worked very nicely that they achieved

their accountability soon agreement. We do not achieve the accountability.

This report is actually not even back on consensus. There is minority statements from one member of each chartering organization, the government minority opinion by Argentina is supported by 50 countries, roughly. And there is a big story going on whether they're going to agree, not agree, no objection, or whatever.

It's not as clear as it is. I cannot in good conscious remember, recommend that we accept it. I'm not saying we must vote against it, just saying I cannot recommend it to accept it as is. Also, our bylaws clearly state what the roles of council is. I'm not sure the council can vote on this. I think it must go to the membership, preferably it should go to all ccTLDs that we can reach.

BYRON HOLLAND: Thank you Eberhard. Moving on, again in alphabetical order, to our next member, Roelof.

ROELOF MEIJER: Thank you Byron. Can I have my slide please? Okay. While it's coming up, maybe just to take us back a little bit. I think effective we have two working groups, the CWG and the CCWG, is

in fact, a kind of a design flaw or a glitch. Because in the end, we are from different perspectives, addressing the same issue. I think some of you still recollected on, I think, two or three different occasions during different ICANN meetings, I talked about this big stick.

The US oversight over ICANN through the IANA function and through the affirmation of commitments, is this big stick. A stick which is so big and ugly that it kills, it hits, it kills when it hits you. It has never been used to hit ICANN, but it has been whacked in ICANN's face a few times.

So I took our assignment, together with the CWG and the CCWG as redesigning that stick. Making sure that we had something very deadly that we could wag in ICANN's face, should things tend to go wrong.

And that's also how I tried to do my work in the working group. Well, you've seen all of the numbers, that was, let's say, the capacity challenge, I think there is also, at least to me, there was also a quality challenge, because as a member of the CCWG, how do I judge if I think this is a good proposal? Or this agreement of the proposal is good or not. I did my utmost to judge that on what I probably should call professional assessment over those in front of me, trying not to use my personal preferences, and my personal visions, over what I thought that maybe was best for

the cc, but probably detrimental to other parts of the community.

I judge this plan from the perspective, does it provide us with the stake that we need? Is it the proper replacement with the role that the US has played? As such, I think it has strengths, it has weaknesses, it gives an opportunity, but there are also a few threats.

Most of the strength from, especially I think from Jordan's presentation, we've already dealt with, so I won't pay too much attention to that, but my assessment is yes, it's a big, ugly, powerful… With that comes a few weaknesses, and one of the most important, I think, is that it's partly based on distrust.

But there is also… If you're in the process of designing a big ugly stake that can kill, I think the group, or the person, that stake is for, is not going to feel very comfortable. And I think that is what we've witnessed a few times in this whole process. We were being aggressive towards the Board, and the Board was being aggressive back to us.

And I think it was said this morning also in the Board meeting, that you would hope that such a process is that we've gone through this last year, would bring the community closer together. And also, bring the Board and the community closer

together, because we're trying to solve a mutual problem, for the good of the Internet.

And I regret to say that that has not been the case. I hope that now that we have something that we all share, and that we can all agree to, let me call it, work on rebuilding our relationships, but there has been some, more than collateral damage on the way, I think.

So it widened the gap. I'm a bit worried about the role and the position of the GAC, but opposite to most people that worry about the role in the position of the GAC. But that's a personal opinion. I think we are a bit too scared of governments, and we try to keep them too far away from us, and in the end, that makes governments very pushy.

Not [inaudible], pushy. And it doesn't help. What is the opportunity? And that's where I completely disagree with Eberhard. We do have something at stake here, also for our community. And it is that I am convinced that if we don't do this now, like Jordan also has said, we won't have a second chance, any time soon. But the fact that the US government is overseeing something that is so crucial to the stability of the Internet, is not something that the international community is going to accept much longer.

And in the end, that can lead, and it will if we don't solve it, to the crumbling down of the Internet as we know it, this one single interoperable medium. So that's, I think, where the objective for all of us is.

Now what are the threats? Short-term, US Congress, so there is still a political way to solve [inaudible]… Medium-term, workshop two, work stream two, I think there is some interesting subjects there to solve, SO, AC accountability for instance, but there are also some subjects that it can focus down for I don't know how long, and as an example I can mention, a framework of interpretation for human rights. Okay.

Medium and long-term threats, it's not my phrase, but it's the prophets that always turn into pariahs. This weird process that we send our best people to the Board, and then as soon as they get there, we don't trust them any longer, and we have to solve that problem because we have to work even closer with the Board after the transition, than what we're doing so far.

BYRON HOLLAND: Thank you Roelof.

ROELOF MEIJER: I think my recommendation is clear, but I cannot push the button, but if you, yes.

BYRON HOLLAND: Thank you Roelof. Okay. Almost five minutes, a little bit over but thank you. Moving on to Giovani.

GIOVANI SEPPIA: Hi. Good morning, thank you Byron. I would like to take you back to the time of the high school. I like to speak about Plato. Plato. Yes. Okay?

BYRON HOLLAND: You know you only have five minutes, right?

GIOVANI SEPPIA: Five minutes. I promise, I'm committed to five minutes. He was a philosopher. He was a philosopher, don't kill my minutes. So at the heart of his philosophy is the theory of forms, or theory of ideas. Everything that he had done, psychology, political state, all these arts he was into, they're all linked to this theory.

According to Plato, reality consists of two realms. First, there is the physical world. The world that we can observe with our five senses. And second, there is world made of eternal perfect forms or ideas.

What are the forms? Plato says they are perfect templates that exist somewhere in another dimension, but he doesn't tell us

where. He was very clever. The forms are the ultimate reference points for anything we observe in the physical world. They are more real than the physical objects you see in the world.

So for example, a chair in your house will be always an inferior copy of a perfect chair that exists somewhere in another dimension. A horse you see in the stable will be always an imperfect representation of some ideal horse that exists somewhere else.

However, in both cases, the chair in your house, and the horse in the stable, are just imperfect representations of the perfect chair and horse that exists somewhere else. According to Plato, whenever you evaluate one thing as better than another, you assume that there is an absolute good from which two elements can be compared.

The outcome of the CCWG work stream one might not be as perfect as the outcome of the CCWG work stream one that exists in another dimension. We have to live with that.

Not yet. But it is an outcome that contains new structures, procedures, and actions that deserve to be tested in the long term before being fully accessed. And if we keep assuming that there is an absolute good from which two elements can be compared, we should continue to believe that what we have

reached today is something that can be further refined and improved.

Jeff, myself, do you believe that the CCWG has delivered the perfect recommendations? Well, I would say, not really. But I firmly believe that the work we have all done as community, is a great work. And it's a step further towards the perfect template, a step further that will allow us to explore new dimensions of the multistakeholder model, which we have all been working in the past years.

And I like to end by referring to the work that this community, because history counts a lot, and we should always remember history. The work that this community has done to amend the ccNSO bylaws of ICANN in 2004, 2006. Because when ICANN presented the bylaws, and they were written to the ccNSO, this community, let's say reacted in a not so positive way.

But then, after we all calm down, we sat together with ICANN and we worked out new ICANN bylaws for the ccNSO, that allowed the ccNSO to become what it is today. So it's my firm yes to this proposal, and a firm thank you to all of those who contributed to this process. Thank you. [APPLAUSE]

BYRON HOLLAND: Thank you very much Giovani. In my 35 plus meetings at ICANN, I have never heard Plato invoked. Although more than once I've heard about alternate realities in this community. Thank you for that. And moving on to our final ccNSO appointed member of the CCWG, Mathieu.

MATHIEU WEILL: Thank you Byron. I don't know how you follow-up, coming after Plato is quite challenging. And yeah, speaking with my ccTLD manager hat, as the chief executive of a multistakeholder organization very [inaudible] in France. What I'm seeing here is basically the outcome of what we've been discussing in France with a number of stakeholders around these proposals, because our vision has always been that a ccTLD is the trustee of its local internal community and that's really basis that we've had in engaging in this process.

Although considering the fact that I was a co-chair, I've certainly not been able to voice all of the opinions that I will have, if I hadn't been, at some point. But it's… We've made a good distinction between the co-chair role and the fact that as a ccTLD manager, we need to make contributions, and we did in the public comments, as well as engage with our community.

So our view is that, number one, and it's not on the slide but I think it's worth mentioning, these proposals confirm, and keep

intact, a number of key principles for our community. Number one, it is confirming that ccTLDs, ICANN has no powers over ccTLDs, beyond the existing ccNSO bylaws that which, we know, are very limited.

Number two, the narrow mission of ICANN is being much more clearly defined, and there are more effective appeals mechanisms should ICANN every come to try and mission creep. I think that's been a constant focus of our work, and I mean for all of the ccTLD members, that these principles remain. Secondly, I think coming into this work, it became obvious very quickly, that most of what is going to affect us in the transition package, is in the CWG.

We want SLEs, we want escalation process when we have a complaint. We want the CFC. And this proposal, as Lise just said, is the one piece of the puzzle that we need for that to become effective. And I think that's a very important aspect of the proposal, that it's also a, the only way we have to get this over…

This request that we've had for years and years and years, and that are finally about to happen. We also, it also addresses a number of the current issues we have with ICANN, the lack of due process. The lack… The ability to interpret the mission and

a number of things quite, take liberties with the interpretation of the bylaws has been, I think, a constant history within ICANN.

And that's providing some effective tools to ensure that is not the case. And finally, and to me that's a very important aspect, and for our community at AfriNIC, it's a very important aspect, it secures the ability for what's still ahead of us, and especially in terms of changing ICANN's culture, making it more diverse.

We are quite a diverse community within ICANN. The ccTLDs, because our motto has always been that there is no one size fits all, so that's a good basis for that. But all the parts of ICANN are absolutely utterly captured by certain sub-groups and we need to work on that. We need to work on that because as [inaudible] was saying, we are part of a global community that makes the Internet work, and also we need subsidiary principle, we need to be committed into the global system because for our respective communities, they do not care that there is a difference between ccTLDs and non ccTLDs.

They want the Internet to work everywhere. All of the time. And that's an expectation from them. That's why we are committed to that aspect as well. With that being said, obviously I strongly encourage every member of the ccNSO, every ccTLD manager, to review everything, to ask any question, and make an informed decision in favor of approving this report. Thank you.

BYRON HOLLAND: Thank you Mathieu. Thank you all of our members for all of the work that was done on the CCWG. As we've seen in the statistics, and as we've heard in the commentary, it was an incredible amount of work. So thank you on behalf of the ccNSO.

Now, you've heard the various opinions, you've heard the updates. Any questions? Nigel.

NIGEL ROBERTS: Thank you. That's good, I'll be quick. Nigel Roberts from dot GG. I've got two things, one about the technicality that was mentioned by Mathieu, and one a comment on the overall context and the political situation that which we find ourselves.

I think that the ICANN staff and Board, and to some extent, the CCWG have served us poorly. And I think we've all been co-responsible for this. We have been in the process for many years of creating a private sector led, open, multistakeholder organization.

For myself, I took part in the international forum on the white paper. That's the equivalent process to what you're going through now, that led to the formation of ICANN, before ICANN. I've been to nearly every meeting since. This is the third time I have seen this process running.

IFWP then again, the ccNSO creation 2002 through three, and then again today. I'm not speaking to the resources that have been expended. You can see from the slides that we've seen how much money and time and effort has been spent, and I commend every single member of the CCWG and the CWG, including to those which I disagree, for all of their dedication and the hard work they've put in.

My own political position is kind of neither here nor there, I'm slightly left of center, but what I'm really concerned about is that what ICANN done is to hitch our wagon, our collective wagon, to one United States parties and political side, the Democrats. ICANN, all of us, and we're co-responsible for this, has very clearly sent the message, we must get this transition done now, actual costs, because we don't trust the Republicans.

I think that's very wrong. ICANN must be able to deal with all governments of all political hues going forward. Despite the fact that the special nature of the US government's role, whatever that it is, and however legal that is, and whatever, might be going away with transition, ICANN remains and will remain incorporated in California, and a US organization.

We will always have a special relationship with the US government, whichever color it is. We've seen the increased attention of Senator Cruz in ICANN, and it may be that when he

either fails to become president, or even may be when he succeeds to become president, he'll lose interest in ICANN. May be.

But the Republicans will not forget that we, ICANN, have given clearly the impression of being their antagonists, and I think that's seriously wrong and dangerous for our future. Nothing we can do about it now, but I think we've made a mistake in the road that we've gone on.

We should have taken the time necessary to get this done right, because there are failings in it. And I would say in one particular case, now I'm coming specifically to the thing I want to talk to Mathieu about, I think this is a… In one particular case, this is a pattern, it's an appearance of accountability.

I ask somebody about 10 minutes ago how, if the accountability process was in place right now, I would proceed to initiate the recall of one of the ccNSO Board members, because if the reported remarks are true of what was said earlier this morning, that would be something I would consider right now.

I was told, well we'll have to get 50% of all of the ccNSO members, so that's maybe 75 ccTLDs voting in favor, and then we don't get to recall, we simply get to start discussing it with other parts of ICANN in some kind of community forum. I'm

sorry, you need reasonably serious threshold to start the process, maybe 10%, and then a majority vote to remove.

I think it's designed in a way that these accountability proceedings will never work effectively.

MATHIEU WEILL: Nigel, just on your technicality, this is an incorrect reading. The process for that lays in the hands of each SO or AC. So it's up to the ccNSO to decide what are the relevant thresholds that regulate this process in the case of a Board removal.

NIGEL ROBERTS: I appreciate that, as I said, now I've been a participant of this. There has been so much paperwork, so many changes, I've done my best to follow it. [CROSSTALK] I have to say, if I can't follow it after spending the time that I've spent following it as a participant, I pity anybody else in following this. [CROSSTALK]

MATHIEU WEILL: …reach out to us.

NIGEL ROBERTS: I was only reporting… I asked the question of, about 10 minutes ago, and that was the… So what you're saying is, we get to

decide this, but we haven't been able to decide it yet. It's not in the document.

MATHIEU WEILL: It's not the CCWG decision how to operate.

BYRON HOLLAND: I have one a question from… Is it on this specific point? Okay, and then we have Becky.

EBERHARD LISSE: Can we all open our documents on annex two, page 12, number 55? It clearly says, majority within nominating SO. This is all very nice, what's good for us, but the document says different. I don't care now what's right or wrong, we are going to vote on something we haven't ready anyway, escalation of community powers.

It you want to remove an individual Board member, you have to go through a step process. How the internal this process is done, but it says clearly a majority, and that's an indication of the quality of the work product in my view.

Threshold not to convene a community forum. You need a majority within the AC to do that. And then you need to have a second SO to do that.

EN

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: No you don't.

MATHIEU WEILL: Okay, let's not get into technicalities, but Jordan has been the lead rapporteur on that, I think he's a good person to answer.

BYRON HOLLAND: Thank you. Becky?

Jordan, did you want to take that please?

JORDAN CARTER: So if you look at the reference that Eberhard gave us, yes it does say a majority within the nominating SO or AC to petition to remove a director, then it says a three-quarter majority to actually enact that removal. One of the things that we've been careful about is not to dictate to SOs or ACs their internal processes.

So if it's up to the ccNSO, I think, to decide whether that is a majority of the council, or a majority of all of the members. And the reason, as I said, that's part of the implementation discussion that I hope will be on the agenda for the ccNSO meeting in Helsinki in June, because we do need to consider our options and how to organize that, and how to actually do it.

But I just want to correct one thing. I think when Eberhard had said that there needs to be another SO or AC agreeing with this power, that's completely wrong. The removal of the directors appointed by us is only down to our decision in every respect.

BYRON HOLLAND: So just to be clear, there is a broad audience here and I don't want to spend our entire time with two people talking about one subject. I recognize the importance of it, and I respect it, but let's also go to the rest of the room. So please, very brief, and then we're moving on.

NIGEL ROBERTS: Removal of Board directors goes right to the heart of accountability. I just want to make a final comment, and some respects, I don't care what Eberhard is about to say, but you didn't want to dictate to the SOs the internal process. So we are having imposed on us a 75% threshold for removal, but it's left open to us whether that 75% of council, 75% of all the electorate, or 75% of the members attending a particular meeting.

There is a kind of a contradiction there, but I kind of, I now understand that we need 75% of something to remove a Board member. Okay.

BYRON HOLLAND: Okay, moving on. Becky?

BECK BURR: So first of all, I want to take issue with Nigel who, on many, many things, I agree with but the analysis of antagonizing the Republican Party is just way off base. You could not antagonize Senator Cruz, the junior senator from Alberta, or Donald Trump on this issue, more or less, one way or the other.

They will use this for political fodder. Let's just put that aside. If there… There is an election on November 8th. It doesn't matter who is elected, if Hilary Clinton is elected, as I hope, we will have exactly the same outcome. If we are not done by November 8th, we will wait a year, at least, at a minimum.

Because what happened is, all departments in the United States will be instructed not to do anything implementing any major change. No matter who. Hilary Clinton will have [inaudible] by her side, he will be interested and supportive of this.

This will not be her first priority. It will not be her second priority. At best, we will wait a year and it will probably be two years before anybody thinks about this issue again. So the deadline has nothing to do with Republicans or Democrats. It has to do with the moment in time of a political process in the

United States, where everybody's attention is going to be on things not ICANN.

And so, if you want this to happen in the reasonably near future, we need to have it happen in this timeframe. Second, I just want to really take issue with, you know, everybody here has been an incredibly helpful participant, and I value the diversity of opinions and all of that.

But it is not true that there is nothing for the ccTLDs in this proposal. It's just not true. The mission statement, the revised mission statement basically limits ICANN's in the, as a matter in the bylaws, to the development of bottom up policies in a very specific and limited area, through the bottom up policy development process.

That locks into the ICANN bylaws. What we have, and what we think we enjoy, in a very particular way, and there are processes including the independent review for ensuring that ICANN stays within its mission. Now yes, we have said collectively as a group, we don't want the IRP to be available for delegation, revocation, and transfer at this moment.

But if ICANN steps outside of its mission, we as a group, have the ability to use the rule of, the tools of the rule of law that are available through this revised proposal to ensure that ICANN

sticks to its mission. That is a huge deal for us, and so this is not perfect.

I totally agree with that. There are lots of things I would of liked to have gotten that we didn't. But you know, there is, the rule of law is being delivered here in an important way, and we should not miss this opportunity.

BYRON HOLLAND: Thank you Becky. Jay and then we're going to come back to Roelof. And then to Lise, if we don't have any other questions. I'm going to give priority to the floor first, though.

JAY: Thank you. This is a question for Mathieu. You very helpfully explained to us, the point just strengthened by Becky there, that this prevents mission creep for ICANN, or at least gives us some very strong tools, to deal with mission creep for ICANN.

I'm one of those people that feels we've had significant mission creep over the last few years. And I would be interested to understand how this proposal gives us any ability to roll back some of that mission creep that has happened over the last few years.

MATHIEU WEILL: That's a good question. Honestly, the only discussion we've had on continuity of previous actions, was related mostly to the GNSO issues related to picks, if you're familiar with picks and the gTLD process.   And there was agreement that previous agreements, commitments, could be maintained, without actually investigating whether they or within or without, I think the term grandfathering was used.

I'll turn to Beck because she has been following this more closely. There is no provision in the report specifically to say, in any way, that we will look back at previous actions. And be able to dismantle, cancel them. So which is, I mean, a good principle in the rule of law that you don't change the rule at some point, and then it applies retroactively. But I don't know if Becky wants to follow up on that.

BYRON HOLLAND: Okay. Becky? And anybody else from the room? Okay, Eduardo and then Patricio.

BECKY BURR: I'll just be very quick. Just in terms of roll back, it is true that we have grandfathered the provisions of the current registration agreement and registrar accreditation and agreement, which may indeed account for some scope creep. They have been only

grandfathered, however, until a new registry agreement or registrar accreditation agreement is negotiated. So there is a provision for a review based on the clarified standards going forward.

But we are not, you know, sort of upending the contracts and opening the door to millions of claims in the IRP right now.

BYRON HOLLAND: Thanks. First we had Roelof, and then we're going to go to Eduardo.

ROELOF MEIJER: Yeah, my remark is triggered by the remark that we heard Nigel would like to use the power, or starting using the power to remove a Board director just for the reason of a single remark of that director. I'm not responding it to directly, but what you will see in the document that those seven powers together formed this big stake that can kill if we use it.

There seems… There are sincere thresholds to use those powers, and I think it's very good because we shouldn't use them frivolously. We shouldn't use them just because we don't like what somebody says, or because something happens that we don't like.

It's the ultimate recourse, the ultimate way to correct something that has come really, really, wrong. And in all of the other situations we should use those processes that we use best here, and that's dialogue. So that's why I think those thresholds are good. They should be there, and if you look at the particular power for a SO to remove its director, there is something to be said about that because there is the risk that we will do so because we think the director is not serving our interests best.

And our directors, the directors that we appointed to the ICANN Board are not there to serve our interests. They are there to serve the interests of the entire community. So sometimes they can take positions, which are good for the entire community, which may be that we don't like. We shouldn't then proceed to remove the director, because he or she is doing his job the proper way.

BYRON HOLLAND: Thank you. Eduardo?

EDUARDO: Thank you. My name is Eduardo [inaudible] from dot CO. First of all, I have to say thanks to Giovanni, for [inaudible] here, to this [inaudible], because it is true. This isn't an ideal world, it's an ideal scope of things that we can, we would like to have. But

this is another real world. I have seen, we have been working on these because many volunteers have been working a lot of time on this, trying to get some perfect as we can, as humans can, to do a situation of proposal to submit.

The proposal to submit concern most of the things that we can include in this proposal. I've seen, I'm a witness of how can we go and move forward, we start to work on this. Also one year and a half ago, prior to [inaudible]. And I have to thank you, to thank all of you to hold up the people who have been spending many of   his free time, and their family's time, working on this, in order to get these proposals ready to be submitted at this time, which is the opportunity that we have to get most of the process going.

And as Becky said, we need to do it soon. We do it in this opportunity, or we are going loss two years more, discussing. For sure, we need to continue discussing in order to improve this proposal within the implementation process, or in other changes to come before. But from now on, I feel confident that we have, and again, thank you for your work, a very good proposal to submit. And I'm in favor of that. Thank you.

BYRON HOLLAND: Thank you Eduardo. Patricio?

PATRICIO: Thank you. Patricio [inaudible] from NIC Chile. Well, ultimately we'll have to decide whether we support or not this proposal, and this has been very helpful for people like us who are still trying to understand more before making this decision. I understand that most of people in the panel, are for the affirmative in that decision.

So I'm going to ask Eberhard, who I understand is quite unhappy about the outcome of this process. Eberhard, are you happy enough to propose that we should reject this? And if so, what would your view on what happens next? What about the day after that rejection? Or perhaps you are not proposing that we reject it.

EBERHARD LISSE: I have been very careful in the choice of my language on my slides. I have also very carefully said, I cannot recommend that we accept it. The answer to your real question is we just go and do it, get it right.

We are being pushed, and pushed, and pushed to get it done now, and we are submitting a mediocre proposal. Whether every AC and AC has to report to support it, whether we can just say we reject it with prejudice, or we give no objection

statement, or whatever, is beside the point. I cannot recommend acceptance as it is now.

I'm not saying that we must reject it. I will vote if a vote gets called, I will vote against accepting it.

BYRON HOLLAND: Thank you. Steven and then Annabeth.

STEVEN ERIC: Steven Eric, dot AS. Roelof, I would like to challenge what you said earlier with respect to Nigel's comment. I acknowledge that if you're talking about recalling a Board member for their fulfilling their fiduciary responsibility, I too will have an issue with that. But when you have a Board member that apparently, we're waiting the transcript to verify this, essentially repudiated a ccNSO developed PDP that took over six years.

In my book, that may well be cause to spill that member.

BYRON HOLLAND: So I'm just going to make a comment that's in relation to what may or may not have been said in the meeting with the Board this morning. It is unclear, I respect your comments, Steven, but until we actually look at the transcript, and make sure we know what we're talking about.

I think we should wait until that point before we continue down this track.

[Off microphone]

MATHIEU WEILL: No but, Steven, then I think if, even if it's an example, I think, also in the example it's that we should check the effects first.

BYRON HOLLAND: Annabeth?

ANNABETH LANG: Annabeth Lang, dot NO. I would like to echo those who have said that this is an incredible work you have done. And if we are living in an ideal world, it could have been, of course, even better. But we live in a multistakeholder society, and a lot of different opinions out there are on the table, and in the Norwegian view, we have got as far as we can based on what we had.

And as Becky says, it has to be done now if we want it in the near future. And I also agree it's nothing to do with Republicans or Democrats, it has to be done because we know that the new government will have other things on their mind for a long time.

And it's a kind of… Considering all of the hours that these people working on behalf of us, we have given them our trust to do this work, and they have put a lot of hours, of their free time, as Eduardo said, and we should be grateful because they are willing to do this for the community as a whole. So we support it.

BYRON HOLLAND: Thank you Annabeth. Two more comments, because we're already running late. The last one from the floor, Russel and then a final comment from Lise. Go ahead.

RUSSEL HOWARD: For the record, it's Russel Howard for [Nom-i-net]. We just want to, in many ways, just echo what's just been said. I think there has been a tremendous amount of effort done by the community. I'm not suggesting that we should push this forward just because of the effort that's been put in, but I do think as was said earlier on, the multistakeholder model is far from perfect, but I think it's, from [Nom-i-net's] perspective, we've put an awful lot of time at the cc, at the GNSO, on a number of different councils.

I think we recognize the weaknesses are there, but support, the proposal, because actually it's a moment in time, it's something

EN

which is as good as I think we're going to get. And from [Nom-i-net's] perspective, we support and in many ways, thank all of the effort that's going in from the multistakeholder community.

BYRON HOLLAND: Thank you. And Lise.

LISE FUHR: I'll make it very short. I just, well, I'm very biased because the CWG proposal actually stands or falls with the acceptance of the accountability proposal. But this might not be perfect, but for me, I strongly believe this is a huge improvement for this community, in order to have the ability to actually influence a lot of the areas that are important for us.

I know, well Mathieu highlighted some of them, but like with the IANA stewardship, we've been asking for SLEs, this customer standing committee, I think we gain a real and very important influence in an area that's truly important, the heart of the Internet. And that's the IANA function. Thank you.

BYRON HOLLAND: Thank you. Thank you Lise. And thank you to everybody on the panel and all of the CCWG members for a huge amount of work. This is only the first of three sessions on this topic. The goal here

was to provide you candid feedback from our appointed members, to level set where we're starting this discussion from, to start the discussion itself, and to provide fodder for the next two sessions on this tomorrow, whereas you've had time to discuss and think about it, we'll be able to have more discussion Q&A and also a couple of more presentations.

So I urge you strongly to think about, what don't you understand, what are your concerns? What do you strongly support? And on balance, is there enough here to engender your support? And I also want to, again, thank all of the panelists, and the interesting concept brought up by Giovanni around the idea of the perfect form versus the practical reality. Thank you very much everybody. [APPLAUSE]

Just on a quick housekeeping agenda, we will… It is lunch right now. At 1:30, we will have the marketing session, which will be chaired by Alejandra. See you back here at 1:30.

ALEJANDRA REYNOSO: Well, good morning everyone, and welcome to the marketing session. We are about to start. In this session, we have hybrid business model for African ccTLDs by Neil. Conveying brand image for dot JP by Fumihiko. And measuring the level of satisfaction of dot BE registrars and results for 2015.

Each presenter has, more or less, 10 to 15 minutes to present, and if the audience wants to ask questions right after one presentation, please raise your hand, or you can wait until all presentations are done to ask your questions. Please write them down so you don't forget them. So we start.

NEIL DUNDAS: Good afternoon everyone. My name is Neil Dundas. I'm the CEO of a company incorporated in Mauritius, DNS Africa Limited. We're a backend technology provider to the ZA ccTLD, in particular the ZA registry is our client. We're also a backend registry operator for a few gTLDs, including the upcoming dot Africa gTLD, which we hopefully will be launching very soon. Next slide please.

So in preparing for this presentation, I had a look at some of the challenges that we [inaudible] for African ccTLDs. And before I go into that, maybe I should just give you a quick overview, at least my perception, of the African market at the moment. Africa has a population of close to 1.2 billion people, 330 million Internet users currently, which is a penetration of 29%.

It's under the global average of 46%, but it's rapidly growing. There are, up until recently, 125 million Facebook accounts attributed to Africa. And in total, there is approximately 54

ccTLDs across the continent, and these 54 ccTLDs account for approximately 1.5 million names.

The total domain name market in Africa is unknown. We estimate that it's around about three million, so another 1.5 million names, and I think clarity will be provided around the exact nature of that market, when ICANN's recently commissioned study is concluded. There is a study underway to actually understand the DNS market in Africa, and I think we're all looking forward to getting into some of the results of that study.

So currently Africa, in terms of domain names, it's not a very large market, but it's a very resilient and fast growing market. And we see a lot of opportunities for ccTLDs on the continent. Thank you. Next slide.

On the entire continent, there are between five and 10 active ICANN registrars. In actual fact, a very low number compared to international standards. We estimate, based on our experience in speaking to different ccTLDs from all over the continent, that there are approximately 1,000 formal resellers involved in the market, and these would be traditionally would be entities within the domain name value chain that have some direct relationship, or contractual relationship with a ccTLD.

And we also know that a large number of these resellers, who are not ICANN accredited, do resell gTLDs via European and US based registrar platforms. So there is… In our observation, there has been very limited participation of African ccTLDs in local market space. There is a lot of room for them to improve their market share.

And I think that what we believe is that the influence or the power in the African domain name space, rests with these thousand odd resellers spread all around Africa. Thank you, next slide.

There are a number of reasons why African ccTLDs haven't been as successful with their market penetration in terms of ccTLD products. Just off the top of my head, and I think these are pretty well-known and have been spoken about in length in other forums, cumbersome and uncompetitive policies are key issues. And they're specifically speaking about eligibility criteria and pricing. There has been questionable operational liability and predictability, the adoption of standards and automated systems has been very slow, although that is improving quite a bit.

And then also, a very big challenge to African ccTLDs is the inability to develop and retain skills. It really does put ccTLDs back when people and skills move on to other opportunities. So

all of this has created an opportunity for gTLDs to maybe gain a larger foothold on the African continent and what we would like to see. We would like to see ccTLDs as a collective, owning more of that market share, and gTLDs following it.

But at the moment, the resellers that control a lot of this are delivering products to the end user community based on the demand that has been pent up there, and that they're able to service. So they're selecting domain products from the gTLD ranges, and I think with the launch of the new gTLDs, it's just going to give that market even more opportunities to select domain products that they want, and doing so, sidestepping some of the ccTLDs. Next slide please.

So, obviously the most popular gTLDs on the African continent are still dot COM, NET, and ORG. We hope that something like dot Africa, once it's released, will gain a significant foothold on the continent, but you know, the gTLDs and the launch of the new gTLDs, will also pose new opportunities for the African continent, African end users.

And I think it's always important for African ccTLDs to embrace this challenge. They need to recognize that [inaudible] gTLDs are playing an increasingly more influential role in the domain space in Africa. And ccTLDs should look at adapting the basis

models to actually accommodate the influx, or the demand for gTLDs.

At the same time, trying to grow demand for their own ccTLDs. Next one. So anyway, what we're proposing in terms of a hybrid registry model, is essentially, in a nutshell, a ccTLD registry operator adopting their registry platforms to also accommodate a reseller model. By doing this, we basically mean that ccTLDs will continue to provision their ccTLD domain names, that will do so in accordance with sovereign laws and policies, but at the same time they would look at including themselves into the local domain name value chain by providing the market, through their existing reseller infrastructure, gTLDs, or other ccTLDs, that that market wants.

And that's a bit of a departure from the way this has traditionally been done. ccTLDs have operated in an isolated environment, and in an independent environment, servicing their local resellers. And I think it's about time that ccTLDs look at adding themselves into the value chain, and also act as a conduit for domain names that might be in demand to the end users in their areas.

And of course, gTLDs play a big role here. Dot Africa is going to be a factor to be reckoned with in the coming years. And ccTLDs should position themselves, if they can, both technically and

operationally, to provision dot African domain names via their reseller networks. Next slide.

This is just the final overview of the, and it's a very conceptual overview of the registry, hybrid registry solution we're speaking about, but essentially we are looking at deploying registry technologies in country, to various ccTLDs assisting ccTLD operators with the backend technology, localized data administration, and technology and skills development, and then also helping them engage with their local reseller community.

But at the same time, assisting these ccTLDs to integrate with other in country gateway or a remote gateway, that acts as a virtual domain exchange, to enable these ccTLDs to also provision third party domains, whether they're gTLDs, like dot Africa, or whether they are other ccTLD products from neighboring countries.

It might seem like a farfetched idea and a lot of complication in achieving it, but I think technically it's quite possible. It's going to take a lot of will and effort to actually get it in place, but I think this is sort of the future where African ccTLDs should move towards. This is what we're working towards, rather than simply trying to emulate what successful ccTLDs have done on the European continent and North America.

I think we need to look way beyond what the current ccTLD community is doing, and look at innovative ways of bringing the ccTLD into a value chain, where it can play a much more important role and get a lot more benefit from that role. Thank you very much, that's my presentation.

[APPLAUSE]

ALEJANDRA REYNOSO: Thank you very much for such a nice overview of the African environment. Are there any questions? Please. Can we get a microphone please?

EBERHAD LISSE: Eberhard Lisse, dot NA. I'm a neighbor of Neil. He's basically… You're basically asking me to move from being a registry to become additionally a registrar, something which I really very hard, am trying to move away from. We recently managed to unload another client from our registry registrar, they're just too sticky.

And the other thing is, you are trying to ask us to sell domains that are like, dot Africa, which is directly in competition with us. And probably I don't understand what value chain means.

NEIL DUNDAS: So, if I can answer. So in country, you would have a relationship with a number of your own direct registrars for dot NA, as an example, and that relationship would actually extend to them dealing with you in the local currency, as a way of example. Local currency, pricing, local payment mechanisms, basically in terms of dot NA and your local ecosystem, you have it down.

It works. So how do we get something like dot Africa, if there is a demand in [inaudible]… Is how do we get dot Africa to the end user in Namibia, but at the same time including that ccTLD in that value chain? Maybe it can't be done. It's definitely going to take willpower to do it, but we're saying from a conceptual perspective, this is one way of bringing the ccTLDs into the value proposition of a gTLD like dot Africa.

If dot Africa is going to be a success, it's going to be a success whether the ccTLD embraces it or not. ccTLDs want to embrace dot Africa, there should be a mechanism for them to do that. This is what we're proposing.

ALEJANDRA REYNOSO: We have one more question. First then second. And third in the back. Oh, it was Jay first.

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: Yeah, sorry. Neil, was just going to say to Eberhard, we discussed this very point in Sao Paulo in 2006, and I did a presentation on it. The idea is that each of our ccTLDs has a body of local registrars that we accredit and put a lot of work into doing. How do we help those registrars who are local to us sell domains from another country?

Perhaps we can use our trust links with another country to enable the provisioning of domains for another country through us, for our local registrars. Just a way of helping them through that business. So I'm glad to see Neil doing that, because it has been, that's been 10 years ago, it was been discussed and someone is actually trying to make it happen.

[INAUDIBLE]: My name is [inaudible]. I'm the director of the Domain Name System Entrepreneurship Center. I, if you could please elaborate more on this model you're suggesting about the ccTLDs, and resellers model that we saw up there? If you can talk more about it and elaborate, and talk how it can work?

NEIL DUNDAS: I just want to add that this is not really something that we're dreaming up, and I'm glad that people have thought about it in the past. As a backend registry operator on the continent, we've

been approached by ccTLDs. I won't mention names, who actually want to resell dot COMs to their current resellers.

I'm not sure what the reasoning is, but I certainly know there is a demand. There is a request from a number of ccTLDs that want to give involved in that, let's call it that value chain, the gTLD value chain in their countries.

And that led us to think, how can we bring the ccTLD from a technical platform, into that value chain where it can provision names from a third party, whether that's VeriSign or whether that's a registrar out there or another ccTLD. How can we bring them into that value chain in an automated, in an efficient way?

And this is what led us to believe maybe what we can do is create these gateways, or a gateway, that is able to handle the transactions in a way that we can basically bring it down to some degree of policy uniformity, or some degree of open standard that the ccTLDs can subscribe to. It's a bit of, you know, the thought process is an evolving one. We need to look at it in more detail and obviously, in an application of it, it will be challenges that we would have to overcome.

But the concept is quite sound. And that is that if your registry is able to provision a domain from your own registry database, it should theoretically be able to provision it from any other

database out there. It's a matter of just aligning policies and standards.

Otherwise, it's quite possible.

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: [Inaudible] from dot TZ. I would like to echo Eberhard's comment on, to our model. Within the African continent, you know most of the registries are very small. There may be five to 10 staff. So I was looking at, in terms of marketing that, facilitating three other models, the best way to go, because they will be even able to assist in marketing initiatives.

And these few staff cannot deal with a number of resellers, but having registrars is easier, and then the registry concentrates on other technical issues, and facilitates marketing through the registrars. I think with three other model, there is a good distribution chain in terms of marketing. Thank you.

NEIL DUNDAS: I agree. I think the 3R model, the 2R model, is, and I think with both of them you actually need to accommodate. The registry needs to look at opening up as many channels as it possibly can to the end user. So resellers and registrar registrant definitely, you have to maintain that you have to look after that channel.

I think what we're putting on the table is a one R model, in addition, which is essentially you being a reseller down your value chain. And I want to use a practical example. In South Africa, where I'm from, in ZA, we have 450 resellers. Two of them are ICANN accredited. We have a very, very large active reseller community that are EPP integrated with our registry solutions. So they are pretty sophisticated entities.

But only two of them are ICANN accredited. I know for a fact, if these entities were given access to some African ccTLDs like dot KE and dot TZ, I'm sure you would get business from that reseller community.

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: Sorry. Probably we have a different understanding between a reseller and registrar and registry. To my understanding, resellers don't have any agreement with the registry, but registrars do. So I fail to understand when you say ICANN accredited resellers.

NEIL DUNDAS: Sorry, that's in the context of ZA, which is also a gTLD registry. So we have this anomaly of dealing with registrars as per the ICANN definition, and resellers as per the ICANN definition, but if in theory, each one of them has a contract with our registry. I

know this may be confusing, but let's speak about registrars. Registrars and registrants, it's more or less the same thing.

ALEJANDRA REYNOSO: Thank you very much. If anyone has some other questions for our presenter, I will ask them to write them down and wait for the end of this session so we can pass to our next presenter.

FUMIHIKO YONEDA: Hi everyone. My name is Fumi. I'm from JPRS, which stands for Japan Registry Services. Let me start from a brief introduction of JPRS. It's a for profit private company, established in the year 2000. Offices located in Tokyo and Osaka. And we have 82 employees.

Our services, dot JP registry, gTLD registrar, registry operator for dot JPRS, and we also provide registry services to other registries. So we are RSP as well. Dot JP, we have more than 1.4 million domains under management, more than 600 registrars, local presence required for registration. And we have second level registration for general use.

And several kinds of third level registration. [Inaudible] brand image of dot JP to the market, well we've been focusing pretty much on co JP promotion for the last couple of years. We're co

P is a third level registration, we call it organizational type, which represents companies registered in Japan.

And there is one domain name per organization rule applies. And we have about 380,000 co JP domains being registered now. And a co JP domain will be deleted if it turns out that a registrant is not a registered company in Japan. Why co JP? Well, we have a clear target, startup companies. And this target is fairly large in size.

It's about 100,000 new companies being registered in Japan every year. And they have higher motivation to register domain names than individuals or businesses without domain names for a long time. And we have seen a clear growth trend in numbers of new registration by startup companies. And the renewal rate is very high at 95%. It's really important because basically, we registries live on renewals.

And survey results supports our marketing messages. And here is our marketing messages. Perception of co JP by the Internet users, our company in Japan, trust and secure. And in order to reinforce this message, we're saying that only companies register in Japan can register, 97% of listed companies in Japan can, are using co JP, and one domain name per organization.

And we're also saying that co JP is the way of branding company in order to obtain established reputation, which is about

perception as I just mentioned above. And since we're saying that 97% of listed companies in Japan use co JP, we have this message that SME including startups can also register co JP, just to avoid misunderstanding that co JP is only for listed, you know, bit companies.

And if you're not a registered company yet, but if you're planning to, that's great. You're welcome. We have tentative registration available. So those were the messages. How we want the messages to be conveyed to the market? Well, we wanted our message to be conveyed to the market as is, without any kind of modification. We didn't want our registrars to be innovative, we didn't want our registrars to create something new or different from what we prepared.

We also wanted to reach the target, hopefully through multiple roots, to have the target more convinced. And of course, in the end, we wanted the target to be motivated enough to select co JP when the time comes for them to register domain names, like when they start their businesses.

So we did a couple of things like branding. We did editorial ads on magazines, which was testimonials by co JP user companies. And we really selected companies with a mood of trust or secure that are common to the brand image of co JP.

And we were very careful not to start off the articles by domain related topics, because we thought it was going to be very boring for many of the readers of magazines. But instead, we started off the articles by, for instance, company's philosophy, or episodes of CEO, or how they do their branding, in order to make the article interesting and gripping in the beginning.

And we did a little survey to the readers, and 67% said that they wanted to read articles of other companies, which implies that the articles were kind of interesting to some extent. And 57% said that they wanted to use co JP. We also did promotional ads in order to generate new registrations of co JP.

And our concept was to have someone who could convince the target to do the work for us. So we choose this famous comic character, President [Japanese], and I'm going to show him to you in a minute. But this comic series started more than 30 years ago. It's about an elite business person who started as a section chief, but was successfully promoted, and now he is the chair of the company.

More than 40 million copies of this comic book have been sold. And he is very well-known and popular among the targeted market. So we had him appear everywhere, you know, online, newspaper, magazine. And we also had him on trains, you

know, what we call train vision. We prepared some short movies for that.

And again, survey results, more than half of them said that it was important to use co JP for company branding. And this is an amazing figure, that more than 90% said that they intend to use co JP. We also did a campaign which was a promotion campaign for our registrars, where we gave $13 cash back to them per new registration.

And we did this campaign two times last year for a total of four months. And registrars had to put banners promoting co JP on their websites. And when banners are clicked, the visitors were led to a landing sites where only JP domains were allowed to appear.

We also designated a couple of things like banner size, it had to be a minimum of 500 by 150 pixels. The banner had to be located on the top page of the registrar's website, fully recognizable without scrolling. And we also fixed the messages to be on banners.

We made a longer version and a shorter version, and registers had a choice. Our registers also had a choice of either creating a banner on their own to match their website, mood, color, or whatever. Or to use the banner as we prepared. And it turned

out that 20 registrars created their own banners, while 15 chose banners that we prepared.

And among those 15, five registrars chose President [Japanese] banner. So we were kind of interested in how President [Japanese] has done the job for us. So we compared year to year growth rate between the registrars who used President [Japanese] banner and those who didn't.

And the registrars used President [Japanese] banner saw 42% growth in new registrations, while all the rest saw 24% growth. And you know, 24% growth is already impressive, but you know, 42% is something, I guess.

And here is the whole picture of our sales and marketing activities for co JP. Starting from the top left, we did A) branding, testimonials by co JP user companies, and B) promotional ads, where we had President [Japanese] convince the target market, and the target visited our registrar website either directly or through CR promotional website, if they wanted to have more information on co JP before moving on to registration.

And for our registrars, we prepared D) promotional campaign; and E) web materials like banners in order to motivate our registrars and support them. And here is the result. The result is the number of new registrations achieved, and when we

compare it against the forecast based on past trend, during the period without campaign we went 6.4% above the forecast, while we went 22% above the forecast during the campaign period.

So I think the whole thing worked out pretty well.

Okay, so this is what I talked about today. We designated the messages that registrars use, because we wanted to have them, you know, being conveyed to our target market as they are. Articles like editorial ads should be, of course, interesting to read, so we didn't start off from explaining domain name, which could be very boring for most of the readers.

And finally, we had the message, well we had President [Japanese] who could, you know, really influence and convince the target convey our messages to the market. And that's it for my presentation. Thanks for listening.

[APPALUSE]

ALEJANDRA REYNOSO: Thank you very much for such an excellent presentation, and for sharing your hard work with us. Do we have questions from the audience? So Eberhard, the one in the back.

EBERHARD LISSE: Eberhard Lisse from dot NA. You said 22% growth as opposed to 6% growth. I don't want to have the actual financial figures, but how does this relate to the amount of money put into the advertising?

FUMIHIKO YONEDA: Well, I can't tell you the exact figure, how much we spent, but we spent a lot. But you know, the thing is that I categorized this President [Japanese] thing as our promotional ads, but it was also for dot JP branding, because you know, we wanted to do this and we think it's a point to do that, because we have very tough competition against dot COM.

We've been having that and we will continue to have that. And also now we're in time of having lots of new gTLDs appearing in the market. So that's one of the reasons why we are spending certain amount of money to do the branding and do imprinting to the market.

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: [Inaudible] from dot TZ. From your presentation, I saw the limitation for one domain per organization. And based on the marketing, you have some organizational companies with a number of business lines, which can decided to have multiple domains. Why are you limiting this?

FUMIHKO YONEDA: Okay. Well, first of all, we have second level registration, where we don't limit the numbers of registration per registrant. Okay? So if, you know, some organizations or individuals want to register more than one JP domain names, they have the option there. The reason why we are limiting co JP for, I mean one domain per organization is that, you know, we want the kind of sense of secure, you know, or trust.

If a registrant can register as many domains as they want, it's not a secure image then, you know, having a restriction on numbers of domains.

JAY DAILY: Okay. Jay Daily from dot NZ. Thank you for a very good presentation. I have two questions for you. At the very beginning, you said that startup companies have a higher motivation to register a domain name. Can you explain where you got the evidence for that?

FUMIHIKO YONEDA: Okay. Well, in the past we've been really trying hard to have the individuals, you know, register JP domain names. But we didn't quite succeed. I think we all know that it's fairly difficult to, you

know, have individuals register domain names for their own purpose.

You know, we've been looking at how old the registrant companies are when they register co JP domain names. And we're seeing that, you know, less and less numbers of old companies registering co JP domain names, while we see, you know, so many new companies or very young companies registering co JPs.

JAY DAILY: That's fantastic. Thank you. The second question was, you said that effectively this didn't make you money, but you were willing to do this because of the brand strengthening. Did you measure your brand attributes and see a change in brand recognition or brand change in strength of recognition of any brand attributes?

Okay, so, you mentioned that this was, that this was justified, not just financially, but because you wanted to strengthen the brand of dot JP. Did you measure the brand of dot JP to see if this did strengthen the brand?

FUMIHIKO YONEDA: Thank you. We are, have to say, doing the survey once every year. And we are seeing steady growth in positive brand image of JP.

BYRON HOLLAND: Question for you. Byron Holland for the transcript. You had mentioned a category of domain name, the temporary or transitionary domain name. Could you explain that a little more? And why you've done that, and how successful it has been or the results of it.

FUMIHIKO YONEDA: The bottom one, right? Tentative registration. Okay. Well, as I told you, co JP is for registered companies in Japan. So, standard way of registration, doing registration, is that you register a company first, and then you go register co JP. But we noticed that those people who start their business will start preparing their websites like two or three months before they start up their business.

So we needed this tentative registration for those who haven't started their business yet, who haven't registered their company yet, but still could register co JP because they need domain name for their websites.

And, I'm sorry, I just wanted to add some more. You know, the number of tentative registrations we had, like five years ago, was very marginal, in the sense of the whole co JP registration.

Now we're having like about 10 to 20% of the whole co JP registration. So it seems to be working, yeah.

ALEJANDRA REYNOSO: Thank you. One more question, and I will ask the next questions to be written down so that we could ask them after our last presentation please. Go.

DAVID ABRAHAM: Thank you very much. David Abraham from [Nominet]. Thank you very much for this presentation. Very, very interesting model that you've got. I was interested in how you did the confirmation that these were indeed listed companies, and made sure that there is an authorized person in the listed company, sorry.

And authorized person in the registered company who is registering the domain name. Was it you, or was it the registrar? Did that create any problems between you and the registrar?

FUMIHIKO YONEDA: Well, first of all there is a database of registered companies in Japan. You know, we can see that electronically. So whenever we have new registrations, we go to this database and check it, if they're there. And if they're not there, we ask our registrars to

verify what the registrant, if they are really a registered company.

So that's how we check.

ALEJANDRA REYNOSO: Thank you. Now we go to our last presenter please.

RON GEENS: All right. So I'm Ron Geens, working for DNS Belgium, the dot BE registrar, of course. We are measuring the satisfaction of our registrars already for quite a long time.   And here is a presentation about this. So I hope that this works, yes, okay.

So history. Well, this slide was handed in last week or the week before. Since then, we have found some measurements from before 2007. So this slide still says there weren't, but we have found some. The conclusions will be the same. So let's just forget about that.

So we did the thing we looked at. We started looking at from January 2008 until now, we have done registrar satisfaction survey every year. Initially this was done by a specialized agency that it used of telephone, with the registrars. In the beginning, we [inaudible] interviewed one in 30 people, and we had a score of 8.4 something.

Okay. Now the last addition, the addition to the 15, what the ninth addition then, but that's not true. We've done more of them. And the mention there is that we also included questions about our new gTLDs that we are also, having in DNS Belgium these days. Like Flannan and Brussels. So we go to the next slide because this is where it gets interesting.

So the topics we ask our registrar's information about, this mainly the overall satisfaction, that's also a topic of what I will discuss further. But the total list is about 40 to 50 questions, where we also poll for satisfaction of certain other topics, called contact topic here so we explicitly question about how satisfied they are with the technical aspects, with the legal support, to get administrative aspects like define as the invoicing and all of these things.

Also more technical aspects like the EPP interface with interface, are they happy with this or not? We also compare each, every few years, we compare the satisfaction score with other registries. I'll get back to that later. And then there are always some specific questions on specific questions and features that were introduced in the last year, such that we can always get immediate, well more or less immediate feedback on those new features.

So what do we use? Like I said at the beginning, we used interviews over telephone. Today this has changed, not today since a few years already, this has changed, in the sense that we now use the Internet to get our surveys. It's an anonymous survey using Survey Monkey in three different languages, which is not that easy because Survey Monkey is mono-language actually, so we have three different surveys that we combine at the end.

We send the invite in the middle of somewhere, at the beginning of January. And then we send up to two reminders in order to get as many people onboard as we can. Each of the questions gives us a score of 10. But we always allow an optional comment. People don't have to fill in comments, but this in fact, comments also give us very much inputs on what are generally thinking about us, and why they give us their score.

Afterwards, the report about is on the website. But that's just for the general public. How well we are doing, of course. And then we also follow-up with via our registrar forum, where the comments that we see coming back year after year, or the same year from different respondents. Those we go in deeper and try to discuss with our registrar forum, whether they have ideas on how to solve or improve these things.

Okay. So, the result of the [inaudible] 15. We see that, there will be a graph later. Important to notice that the number of respondents is declining, which is a bit, which is a pity, because we of course would like to get as much response as possible to get a better view of what the full community is thinking.

The overall satisfaction score is more or less stable. There are no big fluctuations. We do see that the satisfaction about the individual contact points like legal or support or finance, is going up, which is good. It's not reflected in the overall score, which may be a bit strange, but that's what we notice. We do get a lot of positive comments, and not all of the comments that are entered are negative or suggestions for improvement.

We just sometimes we get, good job guys. Doing well, which is always good to hear from the channel. And some of the remarks that we get are really useful, saying well, have you looked at this or have you looked at this, or have you considered this or this? And then we try to take this into account, of course, and development for the future.

So first on this evolution of the responses, you see that it's going down. We're not really sure why. Is it because people get tired of the concept? Or maybe they're not happy with the one or two dinners that we give to the respondents. So we'll try to find a

way to improve it again, because we do think that it's important to have the numbers high enough.

If you look at 2012, we had about one-third of our registrar base which responded, [inaudible] was only one-fifth, which is, of course, less representative. It's still okay in this kind of things. You cannot expect 100% response rate, but still we would like to improve this in the future.

Looking at the scores, as I said it's more or less stable, and we're always balancing between eight and 8.5. There is a bit of two years consecutive decline. There has been some price increase the last year, so this could be related. We don't really know. We didn't get too much responses. We didn't get too much comments on the price increase in the survey.

So it may not be related. Like I said, the important thing is that the individual scores go up, and this could be just a measurement error because the number of respondents has decreased. So comparison with other registries, we take a few registries that have a considerable customer base in Belgium, we ask the people that respond to this are registrars, that are also registrars with those other registries, those will give a score.

We see that the number of fluctuations are somewhat higher than what we typically see. This could also be related to the number of respondents of course. We always ended up on top,

except for now this one registry apparently does a little bit better, but again, this must be a measurement error.

And no, we're not going to give the names of those other registries for sure. That's also a given. Okay. But I think it's important to see that for most, well like I said, we're really quite stable in this way of people are satisfied. We do keep improving things, and we still get positive feedback. So that's our main goal, or our main conclusion in that one. So the satisfaction is stable, everything above eight is considered good, if we really see a decline.

Like, for example, if you would see a draft there like the yellow one where all of the sudden you have a decline of more than half, then we would really start worrying, but today this is all quite stable, so we'll continue like this. Again, the suggestions are in fact, maybe even more useful than the confirmation that we are doing good.

The suggestions allow us to keep on doing good, so this is a really important take back that we have from this survey. And for the future, it's clear that people keep on measuring on a yearly basis, with this big questionnaire. We will be increasing efforts on channel relations in general, and we hope that by doing that we can also increase the number of respondents that

we can ask to reply and give their honest feedback, in an honest way.

And we also want to introduce something new starting this year, is that for the direct customer support questions, we would like to have some quick feedback, like you sometimes get when you contact other companies and they send you a mail. Were you happy? Not happy? Or dissatisfied? Whatever.

So, in that respect we want to be a bit more responsible to see whether something would be going around, but it's just to increase the number of measurements because now it's limited to once a year. But that's basically what we're about to do.

And then, I guess, it's time for questions.

ALEJANDRA REYNOSO: Thank you very much.

[APPLAUSE]

Thank you for sharing your work with us. Are there any questions from the audience?

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: My question is about the surveys. Usually, which areas do you find the registrars less satisfied with? And do you usually work on improving?

RON GEENS: Well, we do see that for the different contact points, that also those scores are typically more or less stable. There is some fluctuation. If I would compare, I think that there are, well it depends. I think most people are very satisfied with the technical things that we do, there score is highest. The score of, for example, legal support varies a bit more, depending on whether more or less cases.

Same for marketing. If there is a successful campaign, we see better satisfaction. So it varies a little bit. The way we act is to mostly take the suggestions into account in order to improve. So the numbers are, like I said, not that important. It's good to measure stability, but the suggestions are the main driving force.

ALEJANDRA REYNOSO: Other questions? I have one question. You have around 140 registrars? How many?

RON GEENS: So we have roughly, during this whole period, roughly around 450 registrars. So the response rate, like I said, it's in 2012 it was about one-third, and now it went down to one-fifth.

ALEJANDRA REYNOSO: Okay. So you have even more. How do you handle change? Because if they make suggestions is because you need to change something. So how do you manage a change? Do you announce it? Like we are going to do this because we get suggested this was something good to do? Because maybe that change can affect other registrar.

RON GEENS: Yes we do. I mean, we have, well next to this, we have our registrar forum, in which there is a representation of 15 registrars. We have regular meetings with them, three times a year. So if there is new suggestions that come in, or remarks that come in and we have a suggestion for improving this on how we can cope with that, we present this [inaudible] first to our forum, where we discuss and do some fine tuning.

And then of course, these conclusions are put on a roadmap. Sometimes this can be implemented very fast. Sometimes it takes some development so it can take a while, but typically we work together with this forum or with a number of other registrars that we regularly meet.

ALEJANDRA REYNOSO: If there are no other questions for our presenter now, I will ask you one more. Do you handle feedback on feedback, as in suggestions, maybe some explaining? Since you don't know who answer what, if you have some sort of newsletter or something that said, oh we were asked to do this, but there is a reason why we can't or something like that?

RON GEENS: We try to do this for things that are asked or remarked multiple times. If it's only a single remark, then maybe somebody had a bad day, or it happens. So, yeah.

ALEJANDRA REYNOSO: Okay. Thank you very much. I know we still have some time for this session, and there were some questions left for our other presenters. So we can have them. So first here and second there.

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: My question is toward the Japanese friend. You talk of dot CO, dot [inaudible] only, and I guess you are targeting businesses. Do you have interest in other extensions? Like dot name, dot [inaudible], dot hi, dot [inaudible]. The other extensions? And then, [inaudible] trademarks. You said it's only one domain per company.

There are many companies who have different products, and they want to protect that [inaudible]… How do you handle it?

FUMIHIKO YONEDA: What's your first question regarding the competition? If there is any other…?

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: The extensions dot CO, dot JP, do you have other extensions besides dot CO?

FUMIHIKO YONEDA: Yeah, we do.

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: What are those extensions?

FUMIHIKO YONEDA: Well, recently we're seeing a lot of registrations in dot XYZ. And it used to be dot INFO in the past, because probably because it was really cheap. So we do have competition other than dot COM.

ALEJANDRA REYNOSO: Wait, we'll give the microphone. One second.

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: Okay. I'm talking of top level extensions, apart from dot CO dot JP.

FUMIHIKO YONEDA: Yeah. We have other third level registrations like ED, JP, or AC JP for educational institutes, that kind of thing.

FRANCIS: Okay, thank you. My name is Francis from Ghana. I think you did very well with your presentation. I know renewals has been a challenge for many ccTLDs, but I think dot JP is doing very well. I want to know, what will you say was your [inaudible] end points, and what [inaudible] end point in the domain business, because it seems you've been in it for about 15 years now.

So what your initial challenges? And what was your major turning point that made you get this high number of registrations and renewal? And the second question is, I think you were dream of marketing advert for your registrars as well. Was it shared expenses? Were you paying for them or was it a shared expense? Or it was all paid by the registry? Thank you.

FUMIHKO YONEDA: Okay. Well, to answer your first question about our initial challenge. When we started, we actually had almost no competition. Dot COM was not in Japan yet. So, that's why we have, you know, as I wrote here, that's why we have a very high share in, you know, companies using CO JP. One of the challenges in the past that we had was, of course, when we started to see dot COM in Japan, we only had third level registration, like CO JP.

And you know, people were, at that time, looking for a very short domain names. So they, some of them started to prefer dot COM rather than third level registration of JP domains. So we had to come up with, you know, new service to provide second level registration very quickly.

And I think that's one of the challenges that we had in the past. And, I'm sorry, what was the second question?

FRANCIS: The second question was… I was saying, I was asking, I think, you make your marketing strategy was doing banners advert. So I want to know whether it was a shared expense for you the register and the registrar? Or you bared all of the costs of doing the adverts.

FUMIHIKO YONEDA: Do you want to know how much…?

ALEJANDRA REYNOSO: No, if you shared the expenses of the marketing strategy?

FUMIHIKO YONEDA: No, no, no. We don't do that. We just paid back per registration, a certain amount.

FRANCIS: So if I'm getting you all, the registrars and you benefitted from the money you pumped into marketing. Because at times, as a registrar, I have to do my own marketing. But from what you're saying, they use some of your banners for your personal advert. So that means they were benefitting from you.

ALEJANDRA REYNOSO: Yes, exactly that. He was saying that they were benefiting from your company because you did all of the work and still you give money back to them. Please.

FRANK: Hi. This is Frank [inaudible] from EC. I'd like to ask a question to the Japanese presenter again. Sorry. I'd like to know a bit more technicality of running a banner campaign across so many

different sites. Did you retain control on what was displayed on the sites? Did you run AB testing? Multi-variant testing? Did you do any marketing? Did you run your own ad server so that you could control everything, or you just gave the banners to the registers and, you know, hope that it could bring some kind of returns back to you?

FUMIHIKO YONEDA: Yeah. That's actually what we did. We just gave the banners out to the registrars.

ALEJANDRA REYNOSO: Was there any way that you could verify that they would follow your instructions?

FUMIHIKO YONEDA: Oh yeah. We were checking registrars website who participated in our promotional campaign every working day, if the banner is located, you know, on this specified location. Yeah, we are doing some labor there.

ALEJANDRA REYNOSO: And one follow-up on that. Did you do that manually? Like people were getting…

FUMIHIKO YONEDA: Yeah. We had our staff do that.

ALEJANDRA REYNOSO: Okay, thank you. Any other questions? I see one in the back, and then I have another one in the front part. Thank you.

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: Thank you. My question goes to you both JP and the Belgium. I just wanted to find out, it must have been obviously very, very extensive and comprehensive, the marketing campaign that you did. I would like to know, seeing as you're technical people, did you actually enlist the services of like a marketing agency? Or a copywriter? Or something like that? Thanks.

FUMIHIKO YONEDA: Yes. We are using ad agent or agency, but about the marketing messages for banners, we prepared, remember I told you we prepared two versions, longer one and shorter one? The longer one was prepared by the agent, and we prepared the shorter one. And I don't know, for some reason, there are registrars who tend to chose shorter one, which is not really professionally because…

Some registrars go simply for the longer ones. We don't really know the reasons, but we do use agent.

ALEJANDRA REYNOSO: Thank you. Next.

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: I had a question for dot BE. Yeah, can you please share the [inaudible] question for 2015? And [inaudible] our year, I mean, the [inaudible] questions you put on the survey in 2015? And how does they chain other year, actual years from the first time you do it until now? Yeah. That's my question.

RON GEENS: So the answer is that since let's say, the last at least five years, we have been asking the same questions, but we, every year when we introduce new things, new features, we add specific questions about things we introduced the last year. So those the mostly the only variation we have.

So we can compare results of the satisfaction scores. We sometimes have additional questions to ask specific feedback on certain features, but that's a separate part of the survey.

ALEJANDRA REYNOSO: Thank you. Any other questions? In the back. Good exercise.

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: It's [inaudible]. I'm still interested in what ccTLDs are doing, particularly in the marketing issues. My question goes to the person from dot JP. And it's in a way a follow-up on Byron's question on the tentative registrations.

My question is, how do you decide who qualifies for tentative registration? Because you have no database. And secondly, is there a limited period of time during which they have to prove that they actually also, after having their great idea, have to start up their company?

FUMIHIKO YONEDA: Okay. Well, actually anybody can use tentative registration to begin with, but it expires in six months. And then why, how do you say, do the actual registration, like you know, standard new registration, we will do the checking, using the database.

ALEJANDRA REYNOSO: I will have a quick follow-up before our friend in the audience. Just one quick question. Do you have that period of reservation for all of your domain names? Or the levels?

FUMIHIKO YONEDA: Do we do the checking for all the domains?

ALEJANDRA REYNOSO: The six month period, do you have them for all of the domain names? Or just for dot CO, dot JP?

FUMIHIKO YONEDA: Just limited kinds of third level registration, not all of them.

ALEJANDRA REYNOSO: Not all of them, okay. Thank you.

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: Okay, sorry. I asked about trademarks, but you didn't answer the question. The company two or three products, I want to build a website around those products. You said it's one domain per company. How do you stop that?

FUMIHIKO YONEDA: Okay. Well, of course there is a limitation where one company can only register on CO JP domains. But since we have second level registration, a registrant can register as many domains as they want. So if they want more domains, they can go for second level in order to register their brand names or service names.

ALEJANDRA REYNOSO: Any other questions from the audience? No? Well, I have one from my friend here from dot Africa. I wonder, in your strategy to cover all of the ccTLDs in Africa, have you planned how you're going to do it? Is this still an idea or are you going to start talking to people? Or…?

NEIL DUNDAS: It's a very big challenge for us. When we are going to be successful with dot Africa, one of the key challenges is how we are going to get dot Africa domain names to end users in Africa. Because, as I've said in my presentation, it's between five and 10 active ICANN registrars. And to bring that into a practical context in terms of South Africa, we had CR dot ZA, over a million domain registrations.

We have 450 registrars in South Africa. So the ecosystem is matured. We could get CR dot ZA domain names to end users in South Africa. But when we brought gTLDs onto the platform, Cape Town, Jonannesburg, and Durban, we hit a brick wall.

We couldn't get the domains to the end users anymore because now we had to work through ICANN registrars. And this is the same challenge we're going to face with dot Africa is, we have to find a way of engaging that reseller community. I'll use that as the informal registrars in South Africa.

We have to find a way of engaging with them, and one of the ways we're contemplating is the hybrid registry type model where we engage the ccTLDs to get access to those models. It may not work. We might have to engage the resellers directly. We'll try all channels in which to do that.

But of course, the international registrar community, they're already onboard. So as strange as it might sound, it's likely that we'll be able to get easier access to dot Africa than people in Africa.

ALEJANDRA REYNOSO: Okay. Following a little bit on that, have you thought of any strategy to motivate the ccTLDs to join the program, as in software, hardware, I don't know?

RON GEENS: You know, so we constantly pushing partnerships and amongst them would be the provision of technology and training. We participate quite actively in things like the DNS forum and AfriNIC, and we provide our own range of DNS training back at home. So we try really to engage with the African ccTLD community, wherever we can, wherever we get the opportunity.

And also, I don't know if you're aware, but the way that the dot Africa project is formulated, there is a foundation that is being

established to specifically develop ccTLDs in Africa. So some of the benefits flowing from dot Africa project must go towards ccTLD development, and there is a MOU with AFTLD natural [inaudible], there is also a push towards registrar development on the continent, as well as content development and other socioeconomic developments.

So there is a beneficiation model built around Africa that sees development progress in Africa. It's the [inaudible] which dot Africa has been pursued.

ALEJANDRA REYNOSO: Okay, thank you very much. If there are no other questions, I think we can close the session. Thank you very much to our presenters. [APPLAUSE]

KATRINA SATAKI: Dear colleagues, so it's time for another update. It's an update on the guidelines review committee on the work of the guidelines review committee.

So, you might not remember, but the purpose of the guidelines review committee was to review the set of current guidelines. Make sure that they reflect current practices and a working method that we use here at the ccNSO, identify potential gaps.

That is to find those areas where we do not have proper guidelines in place to describe the process.

And of course propose changes to the council. Actually, that's what we are doing this time. We expected to submit some review guidelines, maybe not a year ago but close to a year ago. It took us longer than expected.

So the question might be, why does it matter? Well first, if you look at the current guidelines you'll see that some of them date back to, okay maybe not the previous century, but still early years of the ccNSO. For example, the rules of the ccNSO. But some other guidelines are pretty old. You see they're from 2008, 2011. It might not seem as an old piece of document, but we have evolved during this time, and it really, if you start reading guidelines, you see that no, they do not reflect our current practices.

For example, I have a couple of examples here, ccNSO members and nonmembers will have the opportunity to suggest items for the agenda within two weeks after the tentative agenda was sent out to the ccNSO secretariat. That's not how it happens. We give much more time to the community to propose their presentations, and it's not sent to the secretariat anyway.

Or we have texts like, at it's workshop in San Francisco, who remembers where this San Francisco, when this San Francisco

meeting was held? So we went through the guidelines and tried to be really pedantic, read every piece of process, procedures. And well, put everything in place, well at least as we see it.

Why? Because if there is a problem, if there is an issue and if we don't know, do not know what to do, where we look, we look in our guidelines. So, what do we have? Right now you can go to our Wiki page. Well, it might not be easy to find us, but yeah, it's community ICANN ORG, you go to ccNSO tab, and then go to guidelines review committee and you see everything that we have.

We're very open, trying to be accountable to the community. And you can see everything we've done so far there. If you go, click on docs by topic, you will see the list of finalized documents. And we have like six guidelines and two charters published there. So what do we do? Well, first of all, well our working method is we pay attention to structure, to the content, and the form.

So structure, we try to structure every guideline in the more or less same way. So if you read one, it will be easier for you to understand another one because it's structured in a very similar way. The content, again, as I already mentioned, we make sure that it shows and it captures the current practice, where at least if we see there is a gap, we propose a new way to resolve it.

And the form, again, as I already mention, it concerns structure, so it must be easy to follow and easy to find the right part needed. And the content. It must be easy to read, so it must be in plain English because most of the ccTLD community is, they are not native English speakers. So complicated sentences using really, hard to memorize or understand words. We try to avoid it and native speakers in our group, they work, as we call it, translated our documents into plain English.

And of course, they must be easy to implement, which means that they have to contain clear instructions, nothing that you know, send you first to Mars than back to Earth. Really clear and simple. So here you can see the list of documents we have worked on. One of the things that we changed, we changed the approach to the titles, how we name our documents.

For example, we had an old title, guideline to maintain and update ccNSO work plan. Now, we propose a revised guideline, and the title is quite simple, guideline ccNSO work plan. So you can immediately see that first it's a guideline, it's not a charter, it's a guideline. And while it clearly states this is about a work plan.

Another one, assignment of roles and responsibilities, now it's guideline roles and responsibilities. Then we had guideline ccNSO procedures for ccNSO statements. And other document,

tentative timeline ccNSO response and statement procedure. Now we combined it into one document, or the timeline is included into the actual guideline.

And the title is, again, very simple, guidelines ccNSO statements. Then guideline for setting up ccNSO working groups. Here we realized that this one, guideline was not enough, actually or it mixed things together that needed to be separated, that's why we proposed two guidelines onto this one. One is guidelines ccNSO working groups, and another one is guideline ccNSO collaboration groups with a limited scope.

So working groups is something that takes longer to, they work for a longer period of time. Collaboration group, that's something else. Not exactly working groups, there are other forms of, sorry? Yeah, more lightweight, not so heavy. And yeah, also ccNSO program working group charter, now it's charter meetings program working group.

Completely new guidelines as we proposed, as I already mentioned, it's a guideline ccNSO collaboration groups, with a limited scope and another one with charter for the ccNSO Council triage committee. We had this triage committee for several years now, but now this standing committee had, oh. It doesn't have a charter yet.

We just proposed to the Council this charter. What are we working on at this moment? The to do list is still very long. We work on the guidelines ccNSO appointments to the nominating committee, and there are some issues that we had to resolve as the last, in the last appointments. May not go as smoothly as we anticipated, so we definitely need to pay more attention to this guideline.

And oh guidelines, ccNSO Council elections. And guidelines ccNSO appointments to the ICANN Board. That one also was quite hard to follow, so we restructured it, and well I think it already looks much better, but we are still keeping working on it.

So some of the most substantial changes we would like to highlight here. For example, the guideline ccNSO working groups, now got one, well new part where we tried to set some standards or behavior. For example, we say that working group chairs and members will behave in a mature and professional way when they participate in working groups.

And so that we want, because we want our representatives in these working groups to be more professional and efficient, and of course they have to remain inclusive and productive. Unfortunately, one other things we have to address is that many people, when they apply to working groups, they are very enthusiastic in the beginning, but then they just disappear.

And well, they're still on this working group theoretically, but in practice they do not participate in the work of the working group. In this case, we believe that there is no need to carry this, that weight. Just say thank you, this meets them from a working group and get new people onboard.

And the new guideline, we give more power to the chair of the working group, to decide what to do with the member who does not deliver. And the same guideline, we also address conflict resolution. What to do should a conflict arise in a working group? For example, between members. Well first, the concern should be raised with the member.

If it's not resolved, then a formal complaint should be raised the chair of the working group. If that is not possible, it's not possible to resolve the conflict, the chair of the working group is empowered to restrict the participation of working group member, if it disrupts the work of the working group. And a working group member should be first warned privately and then warned publically before any restrictions are put into effect.

That's the proposal we have. Another edition to guidelines, guidelines ccNSO statement, they added more clarity around the minority view and how it should be included to the statement, if we cannot come to unanimous support for a

statement, how minority can object or disagree with the statement. So that is a very short update on the work we have done so far.

Bart, is there anything you would like to add? Because we still have time.

Yes. Well, as you all saw, we still have a long list of to do things, and well, the ones I showed here, the list is not complete there, because we still, according to our charter, we still need to address the last document, the rules of the ccNSO. That's a document that was first, well it was adopted in 2004, and definitely is obsolete. But to change it, we need all the members to agree with it. So it will be a challenge.

But there is another issue, another issue that's now where the… Assuming that we will enter the implementation phase for the stewardship… Assuming that we will enter implementation phase of, is that we will need a set of procedures and process descriptions of guidelines, who we proceed, for example how we are going to form a customer standing committee.

Taking into account the fact that we are really pressed for time, because if everything goes according to plan, for example, a customer standing committee must be in place by mid-August. So we will need all the procedures and guidelines in place by June, most probably, to have to time to select members.

So one of the, of course there are two possible ways to do that. One is to create a new working group, ask a call for volunteers, set up charter and so on and so on. It will take time. Therefore, one of the proposals is to update the charter of the guidelines review committee, and ask the guidelines review committee to do the work.

Of course, we will need experts and subject matter who will need to join this committee. I think at this point, I don't count Bart who knows everything by heart and he can, I think, he can quote bylaws, everything. But if you look into the committees, and I believe that members of the guidelines review committee are among those who know the guidelines and the documents better than average ccNSO, so to speak. So it wouldn't be wise to waste this expertise and this knowledge, so that's why there is a proposal the GRC takes on this work.

And delivers by June. We have infrastructure. We have internal procedures in place, so it might be easier for us to deliver the documents. So the group agreed we had a face to face meeting on Sunday, and the group agreed that if the community and the council entrusts them with this work, they will do it.

BART BOSWINKEL: In addition to what Katrina just said, I just forwarded you an email of the work, excuse me, that is identified around the

implementation of the CWG stewardship for the SOs and ACs, which structures need to be in place. Tomorrow afternoon, that will be discussed during block B, or block two, by Lise and ICANN staff.

And preempting on that discussion, we already raised that the ccNSO is one of the organizations that definitely need to have procedures in place, at least if it wants to be accountable, etc. for what it's doing, to make and to ensure that the CFC, and other entities, are working, are formed in time to make the transition happen.

So that will be part of the discussion tomorrow afternoon as well.

KATRINA SATAKI: Thank you Bart. Are there any questions from audience? Any suggestions? Maybe you realize that you need some specific guideline. Nigel, do you really need a guideline?

NIGEL ROBERTS: No, I'm not looking for a guideline. You asked for suggestions. I've got a suggestion. It would be very helpful going forward, if these disparate guidelines, as they're titled, were triaged into rules, procedures, and guidelines, because the word guideline to

me means it's something that you don't kind of have to do if you don't want to.

KATRINA SATAKI: That is correct, and I think in my first presentation, I used the quote from the *Pirates of the Caribbean*, saying that those are guidelines anyway. Yes, but according to the bylaws, we have rules, and that's one document, and then we develop guidelines. Those are the words used in the bylaws.

BART BOSWINKEL: And also deliberately to distinguish them from the effectively the core document, that was developed in 2004, because these are rules in the sense you are using the word rules. These are softer than, say, the rules of 2004.

NIGEL ROBERTS: Okay, but I think we definitely have an issue then, in that case, because I've been involved in electoral matters for years, both in an internal and slightly larger scale. Election procedures cannot have the force of something that is softer than rules. Election procedures in particular, you can't change them on the fly because this year something is slightly different.

We need a set of rules for particular election procedures, and I'm sure there are other things in the list that are, that should be promoted to this documentation on rules, rather than just simply guidelines. Just a, again, suggestion.

BART BOSWINKEL: I think it's a good observation, and it's probably something worth a discussion, [inaudible] how solid you want to have them, because that was one of the experiences. And most of you will know, when they were drafted, the ccNSO was a group of 70 members in 2008. Since that time, the ccNSO has grown dramatically, the work load has increased, and at some point, the rubber hits the road, with respect to sticking to very strict procedures, which become unworkable.

And that's always the, probably, discussion we need to have around these, how far you want to stick, but that's not my role to say, but that's how they evolved, and that's why they were called guidelines at the time with that taking that into account, and that's still called guidelines at this time.

KATRINA SATAKI: Thank you very much. Any other questions, comments? I've not done a final, final note from me. After this meeting, Leslie [inaudible] will be stepping down from the guidelines review

committee. And I would like to thank her for her contribution to the work of the guidelines review committee, to be, well, it's really very hard to over-appreciate, because it has been really, really very constructive and valuable input.

So thank you very much. Yeah, thanks. [APPALUSE]

And now we have five more minutes and I would like to ask Annabeth, would you be ready to give an update, a very short update on the use of country territory names working group? It's not on our agenda because we did not know if the group would have anything substantial to report, but apparently they have, so Annabeth will give a very short and interesting update.

ANNABETH LANG: Thank you. I have sent my presentation that I held [inaudible] to the secretariat so they can put it up afterwards, so you can see in details. I've just updated it a little. For those of you who don't know the proposals so far, we don't have time to go through everything, so just short.

So this is the cross community working group on use of country and territory names in the next round of gTLDs. And we have been working together for quite some time, and it's a follow-up of a study group that ccNSO established, and that was also cross community.

We are a starting point in the [ISOC three] one six six list, because that was protected in this round on the new gTLDs. So what to do with them in the next round? And naturally it's quite diverse meaning on how to use them, if you should use them at all. And we've discussed, first we've discussed two letter codes, and we ended up with the GNSO ccNSO, their representatives from these groups, and also ALAC and the GAC and the others.

That two letter codes, our preliminary recommendation is that two letter codes and all two letter combinations will be protected also in the future rounds. So next thing we worked with is three letter codes, and that is much more difficult. And what we did was to send out questions to the community, to ask them what their meaning was, and not surprisingly, it was a very diverse opinion from the right to the left, and from protecting everything to open everything.

So we had to find, if possible, if we don't find a compromise, then that's the result. And we have to tell the community that it's so difficult to find a way that everybody can agree on, then that will be the message. But if we can find some kind of compromise, that will be, of course, the best, and it would be easier to implement that in the new PDP when that comes to that, if the community can say that we agree.

So, we had a face to face meeting yesterday in the working group, and this secretariat has tried to summarize all of the different input we have got from the community, and made possible way forward, to say that what the problem is, is of course, the ISO three 166 three letter codes. And some of them are already out in the root, or in the name space, as we all know that little three letter TLD dot COM.

And since it's there, it established a way that we have to take into consideration. But dot COM and the other three that caused the original TLD codes were made for a long time ago, even before the two letter codes, so probably it was not thought about that we should open up for the rest of the three letter codes in the future, now we have a situation where we have to take that into consideration.

The way it is today is that ISO three 166 three letter codes have been, those on the list that's not already open, they have been protected. They're not in this round, but all other three letter combinations are open. That's a status as per today. So what to do with those three little codes on the ISO list in the future? That's a difficult question.

Some suggestions have been, of course, to open everything, no restriction, no conditions. And others have suggested, it will be a gTLD, whatever we do it will be a gTLD, but it could be used by

[inaudible], it could be used by the ccTLD operators as an alternative, but it will still be a gTLD on the global rules, whatever we do.

And suggestions have come to make conditions like, it's okay to take them into the root or open them up, but then it should be under certain conditions. For example, not marketed to the country, like if dot FRRA would be opened, it should not be marketed as an alternative to dot FR.

But that is a condition that is really difficult to use in practice. Is it practical? Another suggestion has been to have the same rule as we have today for cities or capitals, that kind of thing, that you have to have support, non-objection by the relevant government. And that is also there, it's some difficult connected with that as well.

So the status now is that it will be sent out, the straw man paper, after this meeting, which everybody can comment on. It will first and foremost go to those that have signed up in the working group for this work, but of course, if you are interested in coming with your views on this, we are more than interested in getting as much support as we can.

We are working with the GNSO, and they have strong interest in opening everything. So if there are some views here that you

want to have some protection, or views on that, please come to me or send it to the working group, we are interested to know.

When we have decided then it's much more difficult to do something afterwards. Thank you.

KATRINA SATAKI: Thank you very much Annabeth. [APPLAUSE]

Oh, any questions? Are there any questions to Annabeth? If no, thank you very much again, and so now we have coffee break, and after coffee break we have a meeting with our ICANN Board members, and Chris is already here.

BYRON HOLLAND: Okay. Welcome back everybody. This is our opportunity to have a conversation with the ccNSO appointed ICANN Board members, and the usual suspects are up at the front with me. There isn't a formal structure, per se, because it is really focused on allowing everybody in this room, our members and other ccTLD managers to raise questions and issues with our Board members that are relevant to the community, and engage in an informal discussion around the issues that matter to us.

So while you're composing your questions, Chris and Mike, is there anything you would like to bring to our attention that you

would think would be relevant and germane for this community?

CHRIS DISSPAIN: Good afternoon everybody. Thanks for coming back from coffee for this. Just to say, that it has been a long week already, and because of the CCWG day on Friday, the Board actually met on Thursday of last week. We would normally meet on the Friday, but things seem to be progressing pretty well with the transition so far.

I think the proposal has been ticked off now by three of the six, and GNSO, ccNSO will make its decision tomorrow. And GNSO maybe today, I'm not sure, and GAC possibly today. The Board stands ready to work really quickly and closely with the community to make sure that the recommendations, assuming that the report is adopted, that the recommendations are dealt with as quickly as possible.

Just so that you know, you may know this already, but last night, a small group of Board members and some representatives of the CCWG, including Mathieu, met for dinner. Larry came as well, and some of our staff. And we talked about the timeline. Larry basically said, we need you to have drafted the bylaws and have them ready to, by June 10th.

EN

So we do not have a lot of time, and we're going to need to knuckle down to get that work done, but I can ensure you that the Board, assuming that the proposal gets ratified, the Board is ready and willing, as are the staff, to help.

Other than that, it's just been a normal week with all of the usual stuff happening. Mike, did you want to say something?

MIKE SILBER: Well I think to, thank you for the opportunity. In other occasions, we've met with the ccNSO before. You met with the Board, in this case it's afterwards and it seems to fluctuate from time to time. But I think this is really an opportunity, if there was anything that was left unsaid that you're not satisfied with the response of the discussion in the ccNSO session with the Board.

If there is anything that you want to, for us to take through to the Board, as a message from the ccNSO formally or very informally, as well as just to ask us any questions, views, perceptions, and as best as we can answer and respond, we'll certainly try.

BYRON HOLLAND: Mr. JJ…

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: Because he's not actually in the room.

BYRON HOLLAND: Could we get a mic? Thank you. Over to Jay over there.

JAY DAILY: Jay Daily, dot NZ.

BYRON HOLLAND: Mic is not on.

JAY DAILY: Jay Daily dot NZ. Tell us about the new ICANN chief executive.

CHRIS DISSPAIN: He's about five foot 11. [LAUGHTER] Have you actually…

MIKE SILBER: Likes long walks in the…

CHRIS DISSPAIN: Some of you have met him? Some of you? Anyone? A couple of people, okay, cool. I assume that he would make an effort to come down here today. Sorry?

BYRON HOLLAND: Just before you carry on. We are working with the new CEO's office to get him here to introduce himself. He will be here tomorrow at some time, we're just trying to nail down the dates.

CHRIS DISSPAIN: Fantastic. So you'll meet him yourself, hopefully tomorrow. He's a very straightforward guy. He seems to be, I don't know the Scandinavian… I learned through this process that there is a thing called very Scandinavian, so I'm not entirely sure what that means, but apparently that's what he is.

But you know, we wouldn't have appointed him if we didn't think he could do the job. So I'm happy to answer any questions. He's relocating to LA. He's taking his wife and children with him. And those moves are already underway. He will be finishing up the government, Swedish government at the end of this month, I believe.

He will then move into sort of learning mode. He won't become the CEO, he'll move into the sort of learning mode where he'll be wondering around doing things, and then I think, if I remember correctly, I don't know there is a specific date, but I think we're talking about the end of May for him to actually officially step into the role as CEO, by which time he will have had an opportunity through April and May to, you know, go to places, learn the stuff and so on.

I can tell you, I believe that he might have been in tech day yesterday. And so those of you that were there can probably attest to whether or not he was more aware, less aware, than you would have liked to have been about stuff.

MIKE SILBER: If I could add to that, as Chris says, this was a careful selection process. Very concerned, we spent a lot of time thinking about what we wanted, as well deciding between some really excellent candidates. And the one thing that I think we all appreciated about Göran is that he's incredibly straight about what he knows, what he doesn't know.

And he brings an enviable reputation from his staff, from people who have worked with him. And while he has been with a regulator for the past, I think it's five years, and has just had his contract renewed, he has a very strong, private sector background.

So it's not as if we're taking a lifelong bureaucrat and trying to move them out, but it's rather somebody who has brought private sector expertise and practices into a regulatory agency, and has done incredibly well. He's looking for new opportunities and challenges, and we thought that was a really good mix, and we're hoping that it can bring real value to ICANN going forward.

BYRON HOLLAND: Any other questions? Peter?

PETER: Peter for [inaudible] dot BE. Assuming that all ACs and SOs push the green button by the end of the ICANN week, clearly a lot of the work will only start then with the implementation phase. Now can our two Board members enlighten us a bit on how the Board has, what the Board's thought or thoughts are towards the implementation. How will the Board assist the SOs and the ACs to monitor that the implementation is done with 100% match, which actually proposals, how they have been laid down on the table? Thanks.

MIKE SILBER: Peter, if we keep you in the sun any longer, you can potentially act as the red button that needs to be pushed. Sorry, I just said that.

BYRON HOLLAND: Oh, there is the Mike we know. Yeah, okay, I thought we lost you at the Board meeting.

MIKE SILBER: One of the critical elements is to actually get out of the way. This is the community's proposal. It's not the Board's proposal. We're here to facilitate. We're here obviously to get this moving. And I have no doubt we're going to be a couple of places where there are slight sticking points in terms of what was actually meant in the original language and how exactly to map that into bylaws.

And the Board is very clearly understanding that its job is to ensure that the community proposal is translate into real language, and not for the Board or for any members of the CCWG or the ICG to get a chance to re-litigate any issues that are closed. So as Chris mentioned, we've already started with a support team, which hopefully won't be needed, but a small group of Board members who are available to actually step in and to act as a first call, if there are any areas of friction, or more likely, any areas that require clarification that we're available on very short notice, without having to go back.

And there have been concerns about delays, because in certain circumstances, an issue has been raised, a person has had to take it back to the Board, the Board needs to understand it, discuss it, come back with a response, and there have been some delays. The idea here is to obviate that situation, and similarly from the CCWG side in particular relating to the bylaws, but also from the ICG side.

And Lise can maybe respond as well because she was there as well, is really to find a way of getting this done as quickly as possible, because it's not going to be absolutely perfect. We need to send it out for public comment. We've got comment requirements, and people need an opportunity to engage with it. And so they need something that they can engage with sooner rather than later so that we can meet the timelines.

CHRIS DISSPAIN: If it's okay Byron, just to, I think, the other thing I would say about, agreeing with everything that Mike has said. The other thing I would say is that, I said this in the CCWG on Friday. The key for this is for everyone to get out of the way and let the lawyers do their job. Without a lawyer, you can't draft bylaws. It's as simple as that.

So the care is to get out of the way, let the lawyers do their job. The risks that I see, because it's not a risk free environment. The risks that I see are two fold, I think. One is if something in the proposal is interpreted by the lawyers in a different way than the community thinks that it should be, and that's not a risk of failure because they'll change it, but there is a timing issue there.

And the second risk is as if the community itself has different interpretations on what they meant on what was in the

proposal. That when the light of the legal wording is shun on that, produces a problem where some in the community say, no, no, no. We meant this, and others in the community say we meant that.

I'm not saying that's going to happen, I'm just saying I see that as a risk. But other than that, I think we just need to get out of the way and let the lawyers draft and trust our lawyers, just trust our lawyers. If the lawyers say, the key is to make sure that the lawyers are crystal clear what it is we want to have happen.

And then, trust them if they tell you that what we have drafted does this for you. That's basically it.

BYRON HOLLAND: Thank you. Jordan and then Steven.

JORDAN CARTER: Is this on? It is, yeah. It's loud. Thanks Byron. I'll try and speak quietly. I largely agree with what you both said about the process that needs to come now in terms of drafting the bylaws. I think it's worth saying that in the CCWG, we were under the reasonably strict impression that we weren't allowed to have any bylaws done until the US had assessed the proposal.

And that was an [inaudible] that was given to me by NTIF officials last year, and I know they had the same message. So last night, we got the understanding that the bylaws had to be finished before they finished assessing the proposal. So, I think it's fair to say that we would have some drafting underway more quickly if we had that.

CHRIS DISSPAIN: I wasn't… I didn't realize that. Okay, wow.

JORDAN CARTER: Yeah, it's a bit awkward. That came from Dublin. So I think that we're on the right track in terms of saying get the lawyers in the room, get them sorting it out, and I agree that the key risk is going to be people projecting what they wished had happened in the discussions that led to the report onto the bylaws. And the [inaudible] risk for us that we're going to have an explosion in some parts of the CCWG in trying to meet that timeline.

So I don't really have a question, just to sort of add that comment and perspective to it. And you know, the sooner we can get the lawyers going, the better I think we're going to try and get them going today. So you know, stuff is happening quickly.

BYRON HOLLAND: Thank you for that Jordan. Steven?

STEVEN: In my nightmares about this, I see the transition finally coming to a conclusion when ICANN's bank account has gone to zero. My question for you guys, I know you're thinking about it, but based on the costs that have been incurred to date, how are we going to get the additional work, particularly the bylaw drafting work which you rightly point out Chris, is in the realm of expensive lawyers, completed without bankrupting the corporation? If you could give us an overview of cost controls and other things you guys are thinking about that would be useful for the community.

CHRIS DISSPAIN: So my understanding is that, and this is a movable feast at the moment, because things are happening all over the place, but my understanding that there has been an agreement that we will put in a vendor manager, to manage the lawyers. So there will be a person who will be specifically charged with running and managing the lawyers, which from a commercial point of view is called a vendor manager.

I believe some work is being done about who that will be. I don't believe it's intending to be anybody from ICANN, I think it's

intended to be somebody that's brought in to do that. And that would run… The important thing to remember is that it's not just running through the end of work stream one, you've got to run work stream two as well.

Secondly, we've agreed to start a pilot, and I can't remember what it's called. There is a project management support team, or something, anyway, whatever the hell it is called. And that's, the idea is that a legal person, an accountant person, and so on and so on, will get together as a pilot and do some work over the next four weeks to run some estimates to get the process in places to start estimating what the stuff is going to cost.

And that's not just estimating in effect what it's going to cost from the point of view of lawyers. It's estimating what it's going to cost from the point of view of ongoing meetings, all of the other stuff that's wrapped up into all of this. And my understanding is that if that pilot project produces work that is acceptable, everybody thinks it's okay, then that will step into being as a body that will, in effect, assist the community's working group or working groups to budget for the work that's being done.

And in fact may, assuming that it does work and it is successful, may actually become something that is a feature of everything that happens in ICANN, and you know, if the ccNSO needed to

set up some kind of new policy development working group that was cross community for some reason, etc. and had to be formal, you know, you might [inaudible] that process. So I think it's… I'd characterize that as sort of a sort of growing up move, you know?

Sort of like, we're getting our own stuff in place now. But that's roughly what I think we are, but as I said, things may have changed a bit since yesterday.

BYRON HOLLAND: I'm just going to follow-up on a point that [Shereen] mentioned in our meeting this morning, that I meant to follow-up on and did not. And when he articulated the expenses he said, I'm quite sure he said, in FY 15 and 16, $25 million has been spent on this endeavor. And the expectation is in FY 17 a further 7.9, I think he said, would be spent. Now, in earlier conversation, recent conversations, I'd understood the entire project to be budgeted at $25 million, including into the future. So I was somewhat surprised when I thought I heard it be explained as $33 million.

Was I mistaken or is $33 million the expectation between FY 15 and 17?

CHRIS DISSPAIN: You're testing our member of the numbers. But my recollection is that we have, we set a number in Dublin, no. When we had a Board retreat in Singapore, something between seven and $9 million to take us to the end of this financial year. Now the reason why you'd expect that to be heavy because of the bylaw drafting, so I think we set seven to $9 million as a budget for that.

We've since, we've set four and a half million dollars to the end of Marrakech. And we've announced that we've set another $1.5 million, or if we haven't announced it will be in the minutes, another $1.5 to take us through until the end of the pilot study for the PS, whatever it's called, PST. In respect to 17, sorry, in respect to next year, I can't answer you, I cannot remember the numbers, but the budget has been published.

So if anybody has got it up there, they'll be able to find it. I cannot actually remember how much it is. Sorry? Next year. Okay. All right. So I don't know where that… I'm sorry. I'm not sure where that takes us to, so I'll check and I'll get back to you because I can't remember myself, but I'll check.

BYRON HOLLAND: That would actually be helpful if you could get back to me because I want to make sure I'm not double counting in my own mind.

MIKE SILBER: Byron, again, subject to confirmation, I don't think you are.

BYRON HOLLAND: Thank you. Any other questions or comments?

MIKE SILBER: What I would say, for what it's worth, is this has been an incredibly expensive exercise, that to some extent, as a corporation, we've been reaping what we've sown, because there have been actions that have been taken in the past that have led to mistrust by the community, and that's late to the community, feeling the need that they need to get external advisors to tell them when to blow their nose.

And they can't trust ICANN legal and ICANN's external advisors to even give them the time of the day. And that's a very unfortunate reality and I'm really hoping that at the end of this process, we can actually start rebuilding some of that trust, because otherwise the need to second guess every move that everybody else makes with the expense of external council with everybody watching everybody else's external council, and the people, and the process, it's really…

I think, Byron you would have seen some of the comments on the list when people are already starting to spend auction proceeds.

BYRON HOLLAND: Thanks. One of the things, actually just picking up on that. One of the ongoing comments and challenges, of course, is around [inaudible] day. There has been a lawyer from day one, external council from day one, and I know that there has been some discussion on list whether that would ever be tendered in the near future, or whether we would just continue on, or ICANN would just continue on with [inaudible].

Is there any discussion of that at the Board level?

MIKE SILBER: Byron, that has been raised by one of your representatives, in fact, I think both of your representatives on the Board at various times. So believe me, Chris and I have both raised that issue, and at some stage, I thought we were actually getting some traction, in terms of at least the legal work been put up to some sort of competitive tender process, and looking at alternative fee structures and arrangements, and other ways to contain fees.

For various reasons, that hasn't happened, but certainly that's…. With the middle of my agenda, I would think that unfortunately in the last two years, that has been somewhat assumed by the agency relating to the transition, and has not been such a high priority.

CHRIS DISSPAIN: If I could just briefly add to that. It's a perception that [inaudible] does everything, they don't. Actually, we do use other firms of lawyers. When you managing an organization of this size, you've got, there are experts that you go to. So, there are other firms of lawyers that are used for specific tasks, or purposes, or jobs, but it is correct that [inaudible] is the sort of, you know, outside firm, etc. and everything else that Mike said is correct.

BYRON HOLLAND: Thank you gentlemen. Jordan had his hand up.

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: Just to give you some confidence that we're not asleep at the wheel.

BYRON HOLLAND: Thank you.

JORDAN CARTER:	Just a follow-up on that discussion. Does the Board have a policy that is about regular re-tendering for professional services generally?
MIKE SILBER:	We're trying to move towards it. So it was introduced on the audit side, and we tried, at that stage, when it was introduced to include legal as well, and that was unsuccessful, and so we will put it up again, and we'll raise it again until we get some traction or we leave. And our successes is going to carry on banging their drum.
CHRIS DISSPAIN:	I think it's important to remember that there is another side to this. I'm not advocating it, I'm just saying there is another side to it, which is that this is a particularly arcane area, and your average law firm is not going to, even the larger ones, are not necessarily going to have the faintest idea about a lot of this stuff.
	So it's a limited pool, and there is merit in the history, and the consistency of that. Again, I stress I'm not, I'm just saying that has to be taken into account as well.

BYRON HOLLAND: Thank you. Jay and then Alan.

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: There is also one question from the floor, from the remote participation room.

BYRON HOLLAND: Can we go to the remote participation one first? So we'll go Jay, then Alan, then Lise.

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: David [inaudible] asks, Chris, I did not fully hear. Did you say hiring offender manager is in process now? Or is it just for work stream two?

CHRIS DISSPAIN: I believe it's of indoor manager is in respect to the law firms, and that it is being done, well, it hasn't happened. That process needs to happen. My understanding is that it's starting now. I don't know how long it's going to take to find somebody. But my understanding is it has been agreed with the CCWG, and the CWG actually.

And so therefore, I believe that process is about to kick off.

JAY DAILY: Thank you. I would very much like to see dot Africa delegated and out there and up and running, and I think many people here would like to see that as well. And it's important, not just because of the contribution that it will make to Africa, but also because of the importance of our community process and the way our community process works.

Now I realize that you're in a difficult position with legal cases and other things, but can you tell us what you two as ccNSO Board members are trying to push to make happen here for dot Africa?

MIKE SILBER: Jay, I think at the first stage, or the first thing to note is that this has been an incredibly frustrating process for everybody. I think its indicated some rough edges in the new gTLD program, which for further rounds need to be addressed. I think it's also indicated some missteps and some strategic areas from the GAC, from the applicant, and from ICANN itself.

And unfortunately, those have conspired together in a way to lead us to the situation that we're in. The fact that we had a panelist who passed away in the middle process, causing further

delay, didn't help that as much. But yes, it's an incredibly unfortunate situation.

At the same time, Chris and I have been both have been accused of being conflicted on the matter. We've been cleared. But I personally am a little reluctant to advocate too hard on this matter, for fear of providing… I don't believe there would be any basis, but I'm concerned about providing the perception of conflict, which would raise another ground, spurious as it may be, and it may be defeated in the end, but yet another claim that the lawyers could raise to yet again delay this process by another four or six months.

So, I've personally been trying to keep my head down. I know, it's always difficult given the size of my mouth, but I've tried to remain outside of the process so that it doesn't potentially create additional difficulties.

CHRIS DISSPAIN: Hi. I have no such issue. The suggestion of the conflict about me was just factually wrong. So it's ridiculous. But just to give everybody a very quick overview. The Board passed a resolution on Thursday to move forward with dot Africa. The application from DCA had failed the geographic panel.

Just before we passed that resolution, DCA filed an application for an interim injunction in California, to prevent us from moving ahead. Anyone who is a lawyer in this room will know that an application for an interim injunction is always going to tilt in favor of the applicant, because the court is going to take the view that the safest and most conservative approach, whilst the facts are being put together to be considered, is to do nothing, and doing nothing means that you say we grant you the injunction.

In this case, it was also noted, quite correctly, that once it's delegated, it's delegated. And so therefore, whilst there might be a claim in damages, there is no going back. So it came as no surprise to those of us who are lawyers that the temporary injunction was granted. I don't know what else there is after this, if assuming that we manage to deal with this matter and get that out of the way, I don't know what else there is.

It's hard to know. But I share your concern and your, you know, your reasoning to get this out if we can. Thank you.

MIKE SILBER: And I think in particular when geographic TLDs, in many respects have a close relationship with ccTLDs, and a fair number of them were being operated or applied for by current ccTLD registries, it would be useful, and I would really encourage you for

subsequent rounds to look at providing as much input as possible into the process, so we can remove any of those rough edges.

I'd like to turn that one around, if I may. Because the other thing that I've started hearing over the last couple of days in the high level government meeting and elsewhere, is a concern around delegation and re-delegation of African ccTLDs. And a request for ICANN to get involved.

And yes, the glib answer is there is a fortune of work that's being done in terms of the framework and interpretation, in terms of the working group, in terms of what this community has put in. But there are a number of people out there who are looking for practical assistance on resolving an issue, rather than documents to which they can refer so that they can get an understanding of what potentially should happen.

And what concerns me is some of these people are looking for shortcuts and quick answers. And I'd like to throw it back to the ccNSO and ask you how matters like that are best dealt with. And it was raised to some extent, in the meeting with the Board, but we've been hearing these murmurings, and they do come up every so often and then dive back down.

But I'm curious as to how the ccNSO would like those to be dealt with. Do we toss them to you? Do we keep them as far away from you as possible?

BYRON HOLLAND: Nobody wants to field that one? We have, since it's on this topic, Alan, we'll follow-up with the one response here and then we'll go to your question.

PETER: Peter [inaudible] from CENTR. I believe that the fact that the ccNSO right at this moment is starting the discussions on the process development for the PDP on delegation, re-delegation of ccTLDs, is probably at the moment a perfect answer. I don't know if that will help you installing those questions by referring to the work that is being done here.

That was a result of FOI, there is no process. And I think this community really appreciates that the Board throws this question to us, and is looking for answers that will hopefully be answered by what we're going to start doing tomorrow. I had a quick follow-up question on that.

Is there a link between the discussions that you're hearing now on these specific ccTLDs and the survey that was organized by the GAC, after Buenos Aires where there was a survey shared

between governments, particularly in developing countries, on delegation re-delegation practices, and the legal relationship between the ccTLD and their governments?

Apparently the results are out, but we haven't seen them yet.

MIKE SILBER: Peter, if I can respond to that. Just two of those that I've heard from directly, no. These are issues that have been discussed in this community and outside for something like 14 years. But at least has been, the other one got a lot of publicity when they handed over their registry to a free name provider, and who then started spoofing or trading on the name of another ccTLD.

I think we know what we're talking about, and I think really the case is rather that with the high level meeting, there were representatives from some of the countries who don't usually arrive.

And so their concerns were heard more loudly, rather than just the occasional email backwards and forwards.

BYRON HOLLAND: Thank you. We're going to Alan, then Lise, then Steven.

ALAN: Actually my comment was back on the legal services thing. And I just wanted to pick up on Chris's comment about the fact that these are specialized legal services, which can make it difficult. I actually see right now as an ideal opportunity to do this, because we now have two external law firms that now have some expertise, so that argument doesn't wash as much, as it has in recent years.

And I, for one, am very supportive of doing something. Obviously, you don't want to contracted it all out, but certainly just to do a little bit, I think, is going to keep everyone honest, thanks.

MIKE SILBER: Well Alan, the other thing, just picking up on that and I wanted to respond to Chris earlier, is it may turn out that our current lawyers are the best lawyers for all of the work, or we may decide to split the work up and there are different ways of looking at it, and as Chris said, we do seen some specialized work to other firms, maybe, we'll see more of that.

But it does present us a unique opportunity when going out to tender to discuss alternate fee arrangements and other creative ways of actually keeping the costs in check. Because I think we've all been somewhat shocked by the costs of around the transition process, and in particular, the CCWG legal fees. And

that's external council from all parts, and that's not pointing fingers at anybody, but just saying we're, it feels to me sometimes we ask lawyers what the time is, and they charge us for it.

BYRON HOLLAND: Lise.

LISE FUHR: Well actually, I was going to respond to the same comment made you and Mike, because I feel it's not a completely true picture of your drawing of the use of the legal advice from both groups. And this has been a process with a very steep learning curve, and it's the first time we do it.

Everyone has been, we haven't tried this before, it has been very complex. Furthermore, even ICANN itself has a tradition of, you know, signing everything off by the legal department before anything goes out. So I guess this tradition formed the attention, and also made the groups feel that they needed their own legal counsel.

I don't think we should continue this path, but I believe the lawyers were good for both groups. Maybe something could have been done differently, but that's water under the bridge. Let's look forward. And I completely agree that we should have

these bylaws done as fast as possible without too much intervention on the nitty-gritty details. Let's get it done according to the proposals, and the spirit the proposals were made in. Thank you.

BYRON HOLLAND: Thanks Lise. Steven?

STEVEN: Thank you. If I could go back to what Mike said a little bit ago about, it sounded to me like both the Board and the IANA staff are getting nudged about re-delegations and shortcuts, as you mentioned. I would submit that policy is important, and if in fact the case is you've got situations where people are coming to Board members and/or the IANA staff looking for shortcuts, as you described, I would refer both the Board and IANA staff back to the framework of interpretation final report, which is adopted by the Board and is per current policy.

It's only 19 pages long, including the title page. And take a look at it and that's your fallback until we get a PDP going to sort out some of these operational issues.

CHRIS DISSPAIN: Steven, I agree with you. I think in all fairness to the staff, I think I've been pretty good at avoiding getting involved in internal disputes. It's not perfect by any stretch of the imagine, but I've been pretty good over the years, those of us who have been around a long time will remember a number of cases where we've had governments wondering around saying, we want you to move it, we want you to move it, and staff have been really firm, straightforward and said, you need to solve the issue at home.

Go home and solve the issue. So I understand what you said and I agree with you.

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: Sorry, if I could just clarify. I haven't heard anybody asking for a shortcut, but I've heard people looking for practical guidance in how to do things. And I suppose you could interpret that as a shortcut, or you could just give them honest advice in terms of, this is how it needs to be done. The question is, do you point them to a document and say, read that and you'll get an idea of what to do?

Or is there anybody in this room who is willing to handhold? Because let's be honest, in the current state, I don't think anybody in Elise's team actually has the time to see their families, never mind handhold somebody who is looking at a re-

delegation process through it. At least not for the next several months.

So it was really a tossup in there. It's not anybody trying to do shortcuts, and there hasn't been lobbying, but it was rather awareness of problems, and a dissemination of awareness of problems, and I was just wondering if this room had a view?

BYRON HOLLAND: Steven again, and then we'll probably have to end this session with this final comment.

STEVEN: I'd be happy to help, let's put it that way. I'm available.

BYRON HOLLAND: Thank you. Any final comments from our Board members?

CHRIS DISSPAIN: Yeah, just two from me. On the budget, as Xavier says, we currently have no envelope included in the FY 17 budget, as we've indicated that we need to develop estimates with the community, but we have indicated that we expect it to be somewhere between six and nine million. And we're already over budget for this year, so there is no budget because we're

over budget. So I don't know how that adds up, Byron, I can't remember, but that's what he said.

And I just had a note from my spies in the GAC to tell me that the GAC has reached an agreement on wording just now. That they will, it will likely be that they will approve with the exception of saying that there is no consensus on recommendation 11. So that's where we are. They're still arguing apparently, but almost across the line, it would seem.

BYRON HOLLAND: Thank you. Thank you for the up to the minute reporting. We're going to move on now to the next session…

MIKE SILBER: Byron, sorry, if I could grab one opportunity. I made the comment in Dublin, if I could make it again, succession planning. Please.

BYRON HOLLAND: Okay, all right. Thank you gentlemen, much appreciated. I think that was a good conversation. No lack of subjects for our 45 minute conversation. Thank you. [APPLAUSE]

And we'll move on to the next session, which is being chaired by Barrack, but just before we get going on that, I wanted to make a

quick announcement about the cocktail party tonight. Buses will depart from just out front of the conference center, between here and the bowling alley room.

So essentially, they should be just out front. They'll be two busses leaving at 18:50, and two busses leaving at 19:00, to go to the cocktail party. And then there will be, those four busses will return at 20:15, 20:45, and 21:15. So you have options. I've been told that you can get dinner wherever it is we are going, however it's not actually part of our cocktail party.

So we will provide the cocktail party, should you choose to eat, it's available, but you're on your own. Anyway, just a reminder at 18:50 and 19:00 the busses depart out front of this conference center. And over to you.

BARRACK OTIENO: Thank you Byron. The next session will be receiving ICANN and IANA updates. And I have the presenters up there, Don, if Don could please join us on the panel. Meanwhile, we'll start with a NomCom update.   Jörg, you may proceed with your presentation.

JORG SCHWEIGER: So hello everyone. If you do have the feeling that you want to be in Chris's or Mike's shoes, so just listen, this is an announcement how you can do so.

So basically, it was… I'd rather recently just became aware of the fact that what the NomCom is really doing, and I thought so that you do not fall into the same pitfall, I just familiarize you with what the NomCom is doing and what NomCom is all about.

Well basically, the NomCom fills in leadership position within ICANN. So it is important. What precisely does the NomCom do? Well, the NomCom fills in eight of the 16 elected voting ICANN Board of Directors positions. But as those positions and terms overlap, what the NomCom does now, it fills in three positions for three years term for the ICANN Board of Directors.

So basically we are selecting Board Directors. What else do we do? Well, we do select At-Large advisory committee members. We do select this year, one member of the ccNSO Council, and the same applies to the GNSO Council.

So who is NomCom? Well, NomCom basically consists of about 20 individuals, and they are comprised of three chairs. Those chairs are nominated, elected by the Board respectively by the chair himself. And what they do is they drive the process.

They drive the process of nominating. They are not entitled to vote. Right? So basically the chair, as I said, he's responsible for selecting, for driving the process, then he selects an associate chair. What the associate chair does is he just supports the chair, and normally the associate chair is just a formal chair who is giving guidance to the new char.

Of course, the chair has been determined year for year. So we have a constant flow of people within the NomCom. And then we have the chair elect, that refers once again, to this rotating principle, because when the chair leaves, we want to have somebody in place who can easily follow-up on.

So the chair elect is selected by the Board and is a designated follower on the Chair position. But once again, to stress that, those guys are not voting, they are just facilitating the process. Voting, on the other hand, are five representatives of the ALAC representing the different regions. We have seven voting members of the GNSO representing the different constituencies of the GNSO.

We have one delegate from the ccNSO, speaking to you. We have one voting delegate from the ASO, one from the AIB, and in addition, we do have liaisons from the SSAC and the RSAC, and they could vote according to the choice of the committee. So the committee makes up whether or not the SSAC and ALAC are

really voting members or not, and the GAC finally, they do have a position in the NomCom as well, but they choose not to fill it because they feel they do have a conflict of interest.

By the way, just feel free to interrupt whenever something is unclear. Okay, so how do we work? Well basically, there is a preparation phase. In that preparation phase, what we are doing is we get acquainted to our colleagues, we get acquainted to our process. We determine the process, and even some sub-committees are incepted, just to make sure that the process is even further optimized and we report on everything we do. And so this subcommittee are just for a better process in the following years.

Then we have the outreach phase. The outreach phase is basically meant to address the public Internet Society, because virtually everyone can apply to become a member of one of these Boards or councils respectively. So until March 13th, this is not only an information, this is also an outreach. If you want to say so, so you sitting here in that very room, can apply for any of those positions I just mentioned before.

So once outreach is finished and done, then the selection phase begins. The assessment phase. In that assessment phase, what we do is we take a look at the applications that are being provided by an electronic interface. Everything is strictly

confident, no candidate will be disclosed whatsoever. And finally, well there is white steam coming up because we come up with the designated candidates for the different Boards.

And that for sure, ends the process. Well the next NomCom is being setting up, and you can be a part of NomCom as well. By, I think, by being selected by your council, so that basically I think, sums up what the NomCom is doing.

[CROSSTALK]

BARRACK OTIENO: Do you still have something?

JORG SCHWEIGER: …wasn't sufficient, you could always refer to the web, what's been presented there.

BARRACK OTIENO: Okay. The floor is open to questions, if you have any question to Jörg.

I think you are clear. Moving on swiftly. Yes. Moving on swiftly, we'll here, we'll get IANA update from Kim Davies. Kim, you may proceed with your presentation.

KIM DAVIES:

Thanks very much. Good afternoon everyone. I'm here to give the customary update on what we've been doing in IANA the last few months, since everyone last met. I'm going to… I think given the location, there is probably quite a few people here that are not familiar with IANA, or this might be their first ICANN meeting, or thereabouts. So just give a quick overview of what we actually do, for old hands, there will be nothing new in that.

I'll give a quick overview of our recent performance with respect to root zone management. I'd like to talk a little bit about the work we're doing for the post-transition performance metrics. And update on our implementation of the framework of interpretation that came out of the ccNSO. An update on RDAP, and then a summary of the other work that we have in progress at the moment.

So what does IANA do? Every time I produce this slide, I try and make it a little simpler. Kind of settled on the description that we're record keepers for globally unique Internet identifiers. I mean, that's a bit of a simplification, but in essence, that's what we're there to do.

We're not there to set policy. We're not there to create new things. We're there to take things that have been decided somewhere else, and keep the official record of them, whether it's the cards and the internal numbering systems that are used

inside protocols that no one every sees, to obviously, top level domains that are your business.

To be clear, even though we consider them all protocol parameter registries, we typically divide them into three categories, depending on which of the community groups we report to, and we primarily liaise with in managing them. Firstly is the protocol parameters that we engage with the Internet engineering taskforce regarding.

We have over 200,800 registries there. Each of them is used in some protocol or some fashion to ensure Internet interoperability. So examples of those are media types, port numbers, time zones, resource record types, and so on. There is quite a few of them.

So when technical standards are developed in the IETF, there is a component where IANA is involved in showing that the codes, the numbers, and so on, using those technical standards are coordinated, so they function correctly. The next grouping is, of course, domain names. Here we maintain delegations in the root zone. In essence, what are top level domains.

We also maintain the root zone key signing key. This is the upper, the top of the DNSSEC trust tree. And we manage that KSK by holding key signing ceremonies involving community members, to ensure that it is operating correctly. We also

maintain the dot opera and dot [Nint] domain registries. IDN tables, label generation rule sets. And they're a primary community we deal with is, while we're here this week, TLD managers.

The last grouping is number resources. These are IP addresses, autonomous system numbers. These are used in Internet routing. The vast majority of these numbers are handed out by regional Internet registries to ISPs, so our primary community group, we deal with their regional Internet registries.

So, we're now sort of three years, I guess, into the expansion relating to the new gTLD program. And I think, this graph, in a fairly simple way, illustrates the impact that it's had on the root zone. And as a result of that, the impact that it has had on IANA operations. For the longest time, ccTLDs fire a number of gTLDs. You can see around 2010, ccTLDs grew a little as a result of the IDN fast track program, but overall comparatively, it was only a few percentage increase on the size of the root zone that we had been seeing.

However, you know, you can see a dramatic uptick for the last couple of years, as a result of new gTLDs being put in the root zone. And as a consequence, the number of gTLDs now significantly larger than ccTLDs. And you know, what this means

for us is firstly just numerically we have a lot more customers to deal with.

But you know we also have a different mix of customers. I mean, as staff, you know, prior to the new gTLD program, the number of gTLDs you can almost count on your fingers, and they're all run by a very small group of companies. And now, we have a lot of new entrances into the industry, a lot of them have never dealt with IANA before, they've never run a TLD before.

So it's different. And it's something that our team has been working well on establishing those new relationships, setting expectations, understanding the requirements of those new customers so we can forge ahead and make everyone happy.

You know, as a result of this, here are some graphs of case load pretty much since, or just after the commencement of the new gTLD program. I think the figure I quoted almost year in, year out here for our average root zone workload, prior to the new gTLD program, was about one per day.

I mean, you can almost count it on your watch that we get about 30 requests per month, and that was pretty constant over the years. You can see by this graph now we regularly exceed 100 requests per month. In fact, that's the new norm. And in the case of July 2015, we had almost 300 requests in that month.

So for us, that's a big change. But the graph at the bottom is the average time taken to process requests. Bear in mind, this is end to end time, it's not just IANA processing time, but the time customers take to provide us documents. It's implementation time and so on.

But it has been relatively consistent. There has been no uptrend there, you know, it has its various little spikes from time to time, but there, you know, within a few days difference. So, we're quite happy that we've managed to stay consistent in that fashion. Of course, we're very interested to hear what you think.

But we've remained relatively consistent and always meeting our SLAs despite the significant increase in workload. Okay. Our next topic is SLE development at IANA. I'm really just going to gloss over this topic because I know there is a dedicated session to this tomorrow. I think that this slide will appear there again.

But in essence, the design team of the CWG has created a new set of measurements that IANA is expected to report on. That was in the CWG final report. Since that report was finalized and accepted, ICANN has been working on software modifications. So that our systems can generate this new data.

The systems we have in place previously, you know, didn't necessarily capture all of the time elements required to measure what the design team had come up with. We've deployed the

co-modifications to our primary system, our root zone management system, on the second of March.

So for the last week or so, we've started piling up data which, commencing next week, we're going to start crunching. So after we're all back from this meeting, our development team is going to work on how to quench that data and turn it into graphs, and dashboards, and other ways that the community would like to access it.

Once we have a lot of data, we're going to come back to the community and ask, and settle on what the threshold should be. Like what is the expected performance? And we'll then put them back to the dashboard, so the dashboard can highlight when we go over the community agreed threshold, and our monthly reports will show if we met our commitment or not.

And then, importantly at the very end, there will be an evolutionary cycle. We expect that we'll report regularly. The community will give us feedback, we'll adjust and tweak with our customer standing committee being a key part of that. Again, we'll talk about this more tomorrow, so I'm just going to leave it at that for now.

Framework of interpretation. As we heard earlier, the ICANN Board approved it for implementation, to prepare the implementation of the Buenos Aries meeting, and the Board

resolution asked staff to prepare an implementation plan. The ccNSO appointed two liaisons, Becky Burr and Keith Davidson. And they've been working with us on developing this implementation plan.

We've had meetings with them. We've had internal meetings as well, fleshing out the actual implementation details of how all of those recommendations need to be put into practice. The current status is that we don't have an implementation to share with you just quite yet. I was really hoping to have it ready for this meeting, but I have to be honest, it's not ready today.

But that work is still ongoing. The open actions, as we know it, as we have some clarifying questions out to those ccNSO liaisons, regarding a number of topics, including manager consent. And we obviously need to take that feedback from Becky and Keith and put them into the implementation. Wrap it up, put a bow on it, and put it out for public comment.

The notion is, once we have this implementation plan drafted and complete, in our view, put it out for public comment, everyone here will be able to read it, study it, provide their feedback, we'll then take that public comment, make any final edits or changes, and then we'll put it into practice.

Next topic is RDAP support. For those that are not familiar with RDAP, it's the registry or registration data access protocol. In a

nutshell, this is next generation WHOIS. It's a technical protocol for transmitting WHOIS data over the Internet. It adds a lot of features that the WHOIS protocol doesn't have today, that may or may not be of interest to you.

But nonetheless, it's something that the IETF standardized recently, and allows you to distribute your registration data in a new way. It's designed to be a successor to WHOIS, but you don't have to replace WHOIS with it. You can run both in parallel if you so desire.

So what is IANA's role in this? Well, one of the benefits of RDAP is that today, when you do a WHOIS lookup, you either need to know where the WHOIS server is, or you need to rely on some third party compiled list of WHOIS servers that may or may not be up to date.

There is no comprehensive directory of every single WHOIS server in the world. You know, even if you just had TLD WHOIS servers, which IANA does maintain, that doesn't include WHOIS service for IP addresses, for second level, third level domains and so on. RDAP tries to solve this by providing an automatic mechanism. And the idea is that with RDAP, essentially, you just type in whatever you're looking for, domain name, an IP address, into a RDAP client, and the protocol just works it out for you and comes back with your answer.

And the way it does this, is by in part, contacting IANA, and IANA gives that first referral to a top level domain RDAP server. So the news I have to share with you today is that we now support RDAP servers in root zone management system, which means that as of today, and TLD that is running a RDAP server can log into RZMS, and submit their RDAP server.

And once you do an absolutely routine root zone change request, much as you would list your WHOIS server with IANA, it will appear in the RDAP protocol, and this would allow RDAP clients to access your registry data using RDAP. It's really that simple. So that those who have already deployed RDAP probably know exactly what I mean.

For those that haven't looked at RDAP yet, probably don't really mind so much. But I'm happy to clarify anything about that, but it's really quite simple. You just list the RDAP servers. Unlike WHOIS servers, you can have more than one, and you just list them in our web interface, submit your change request, and it gets processed as normal.

Just really quickly to illustrate the concept. We maintain this special file called the RDAP bootstrap registry, it has a special format to it, and we generate that from the root zone database. When a RDAP client on someone's computer anywhere around

the world wants to look up a domain name with RDAP, first thing it does is it grabs this file from us.

This file contains the top level referrals for TLDs, for IP address blocks, and so on. And then from that point on, it uses that file as a jumping point to find your server. Now, your server can give referrals, so it can refer to other RDAP servers. This is a simplified graphic, but that's, in essence, what's happening when a RDAP query is made.

Some other work. First item on this list is parallel operations. As we all know, we're contemplating a post transition environment. And part of that is that today, every time we do a root zone change request, or a change to the root zone database, once ICANN has completed its processing, it needs to submit the change request to the US government for authorization to implement.

So post-transition that won't happen. We're working with VeriSign to test our systems, to make sure that in that post-transition environment everything works as expected. So in essence what we are about to embark on is running two systems in parallel. We're going to have the root zone system that used our production system. And we're also going to have a testing system running at the exact same time. And both of those systems will do all of the root zone changes in parallel.

And the idea is what we're going to do through the period of testing, is look at the output of those systems, in essence, the root zone file that you get at the very end, every day, and make sure the root zone file is the same. And if we can establish that over a period of several months of parallel testing, if the root zone file looks the same day in day out, then we're confident that those two systems that have worked in parallel are doing the same job.

And therefore we're confident that when we switch out the component that involves NTAA, will work as expected. Second item is label generation rule sets. These are the next generation IDN tables. There is a standard for describing label generation rule sets that is just being finalized in the IETF.

It's going through what's called last call. And this format will provide a universal way of expressing what we call today as IDN tables, but also other things. This is a critical piece of the puzzle for implementing variance in the root zone, but it also has practicality far beyond that. I'll talk more about this at future meetings, but I'm one of those that are interested in this to have an opportunity to go to the IETF and look at the draft, if you so desire, and get ahead of what's to come.

Third item is the rollover of the root KSK. Today, in fact, a community design team report was published. That community

design team was made up of technical experts from around the world. And that report has a series of recommendations on how to do a roll over.

For those who don't know what a roll over is, essentially we're replacing the key that secures the root zone. We've never done this before, the key that's used to secure the root zone, is the same one that was put in place in day one of DNSSEC support in 2010. And there is a number of technical obstacles associated with changing the key, which is why it has been done in a very cautious, deliberate way. We've got experts involved in designing the process, and we're doing it in a very careful manner.

Four item is TCI renewal. As part of doing the KSK management, we have these trusted community representatives, who observe key ceremonies. They coming to watch us do our work. They attest that it was done correctly. And they report back to you as the community that it was done well.

We're expecting to shortly ask for more volunteers, and to change the application process a little. So this is an advanced heads up on that as well. Another thing we're introducing is travel support. Up until now, in essence, TCRs were generally expected to cover their own travel costs. In the new model,

travel costs will be covered by ICANN much the same way as we do constituency travel within the organization.

So those that might have been interested in this in the past, but the travel aspect of it was a burden, this is an opportunity to volunteer to participate in that process. Really quickly, number five, we're doing security improvements to the key measurement facilities as well, just to you know, do things a little better. Enhance security, make the system work a little smoother.

And then lastly, but definitely not least, [inaudible] development. I've talked to you in the past, in the last few years about some of our ideas about what we want to do next to be responsive to the community concerns. Some of these things are a new authorizer model on how you would approve root zone change requests. Improving how we do technical checks, having an API that lets you do bulk updates, that kind of thing.

A lot of that work has essentially been expended in light of the work that we've needed to do for transition, but once we get through the transition process, we're hopeful we can pick up that work and tackle it again. So with that, these are the participants of the key ceremonies. The last key ceremony we did last month, so just a sampling of the community that comes together to observe us and perform them. Thanks.

BARRACK OTIENO: Thank you, thank you Kim for the update. The floor is open for questions or comments on the update. Anyone?

Seems you are very clear. Moving on, okay. Sorry, there is a question here. [Off Microphone]

KIM DAVIES: Sure. Why not? [Off Microphone]

Apologies to those watching remotely. Andreas Perez, he's one of our DNSSEC experts. Next to him is [inaudible] in the back. She's our business excellence manager. She's responsible for constant improvement within the organization as well as our audits. The next one is Sabrina, who recently joined us as a request manager.

So those of you submitting root zone change requests might have dealt with her recently, if not probably in the future. Let's see. That's me. Punky, he's our other DNSSEC expert. He helps run the key ceremonies. And that's all. There is a few other ICANN staff members there, but the majority of them are third parties.

BARRACK OTIENO: Thank you. [APPLAUSE] Thank you.

Thank you for the interesting presentation. Next we'll be hearing from Don Hollander on universal acceptance.

DON HOLLANDER: Thanks very much. And I'll try not to die until after the presentation. So just a quick show of hands please, how many people speak only American English or only British English. Two, three. So, if most other languages, most other scripts have additional characters besides the 26 A to Z numbers and hyphens, and this is one of the challenges.

And the other challenge that has happened is, as you saw in Kim's presentation, there is a lot of new top level domain names. And as a result of the things that have been going on into the root zone over the past five or six years, the DNS works fine, the names resolve, but they're not particularly welcoming and useful.

So two meetings ago, Dusan from dot RS gave you an introduction to universal acceptance, and so I'm going to provide an update, because we've actually done stuff. And I'm very keen to get you to start thinking about how you're going to address this in your country.

So, three topics. Only six slides. Where we're at, what we're doing, and how you can participate. So, we finally, not finally,

we came up with a definition that universal acceptance is the state where all valid domain names, and email address are treated equally. So there is no difference between a dot [inaudible], or a dot COM.

And that the software accepts, validates, stores, processes, and displays correctly. This is a software challenge. Has nothing to do with networks. It's not a policy issue. It's software. And our goal is to reach out to the mere 34 million software developers that are in the world and get them to realize that the Internet has changed, and their applications need to change with it.

So we've been producing some documentation. We've got eight documents either finished or near finished. So we have a little knowledge base of how to get things addressed in common applications. We have a little web master engagement letter. So if you find a website, for example, that doesn't display correctly, or doesn't accept email address, here is a little couple of paragraphs that you can send to them to say, the world has changed, could you fix things?

And that's in seven languages. We've published a fact sheet. That's aimed at the every man. That has been published, and over the next month or so, we'll translate that into a number of languages. We've got some use cases that are coming up. These

are just examples of domain names and IRIs that people can use to test.

We've produced the UA quick guide. And that's what this little document is. And this just gives some good practice guides for these five verbs. So accepting, validating storing, processing and displaying. We've got a list of relevant RFCs, and UASG 007 is the big mother of a document. And this is very geeky, very technical, and aimed at the system developer system architects.

And we finished on Sunday afternoon, the reading of the current edition. The authors will take that back over the next couple of weeks, and just make those modifications, we'll put it through a copy editor to make sure that we're using language reasonably well. And then we'll put it out to the community for another review.

And then the topic that the document that I'm hoping people here will look at, is UASG 008, which are a guideline on how you can create a local universal acceptance initiative, that you can drive from your ccs in your local community, and reaching out to your local software community.

So some things that we're doing. We're doing a review and measurement of the most popular websites in the world, to see whether they're UA ready. So we're looking to see if we can register on the website with a variety of email addresses. And

there is, of the ones we've looked at so far, there is only one website that accepts everything.

And some of you will be old enough to remember a website called My Space dot COM. Katrina probably still has her account there. So this is a very pervasive problem. The other thing that we're about to start is, we're going to look at the most popular programming languages and frameworks within programming languages, so that are used in Internet development, and we're going to see if they are UA ready.

Their libraries, their modules. And if they're not, we're going to fix them. So that software developers will not have an easy excuse to say, oh I can't do that because my package does that validation for me, and it's not valid. So we're going to fix that for everybody. We're building use cases and test environments.

We're also creating a community of EAI practice [inaudible]. So you probably thought you knew every acronym in the world. EAI is email address internationalization. And this is the hard, really the hard part, other than talking to 34 million people, this is the hard part about universal acceptance. So it's email packages and services, and how do they deal with particularly IDN domain names?

And how do they deal with a local part? They use their mailbox that might use Unicode. And there are challenging questions,

practical questions, how do you deal with a Arabic domain name, where it's Arabic dot Arabic at Arabic dot Arabic? And how that displays and is treated? So those are some of the challenges. So we're just trying to find all the current practitioners of EAI, and get them to talk to another.

So in terms of EAI, people who are actively doing stuff, Google is actively doing stuff. Microsoft is actively doing stuff. Apple is doing stuff. Yahoo is aware, I think they're doing stuff. There are a couple of in production EAI packages, core mail in China has 100,000 accounts which might sound like a lot, but it's 100,000 out of their 700 million email address that they support. But they're in production and commercially. Thailand is working on stuff. Taiwan is working on stuff. Core mail is taking their software and is making it available in other countries, including India, Saudi Arabia, Saudi NIC is doing some good work.

And there is a little company in the middle of nowhere in the US called Horde, and their system is supposed to be EAI ready as well. And we're also doing a, planning a review of looking at browser slash operating systems combinations, to see if they are UA ready or not.

So, last slide, I think, how can you participate? So first of all, when you go back, are your own systems UA ready? Can your demographic information accept an email address that has

Unicode in some part of it? Can you accept it? Can you store it? How do you display it? When do you display it?

When people are registering their name servers, and you're showing it in your DNS records, how are you showing it? Are you showing it in Unicode? That is the native script? Or are you showing it in XN dash script? So that would be really useful if you could all go back and say, all right, this old man said something about this. Could you look into it and shut him up?

That would be very handy. And then start working with your downstream and upstream partners. Mostly registrars, resellers, ask them that same question, because they're the ones that send you that information. Now, we have a little working group underway of the world's largest registry, and the world's largest registrar, who are looking in very minute detail at their system, to see if this will all work for them in terms of supporting things.

And so far the answer is pretty good. This is using EPP. So this is VeriSign and Go Daddy. And the expected report out of that in May, April or May, and then we'll start broadening the circle of participation. All right? And if you're interested or have somebody on your staff who might be interested, let me know.

So accounting systems, newsletter subscription systems, and that whole range. And if you think this is just a Chinese or Hindi or Thai or Arabic issue, I live in New Zealand. I have a small

bookshop. My bookshop is called Book Haven dot co dot NZ. No problems at all. All ASCII, it works very well.

So New Zealand has three official languages: English, New Zealand sign language, and Māori. And Māori has the 26 letters plus the vowels could have macrons. So I want to sell books to the Māori community. So I'm going to create a Māori focused website.

And I've called it [Māori], where there is a bar over the A. [Māori] means book and [Māori] makes it's plural. So there is your little bit of trivia today. So I have an email address called [Māori] at [Māori] dot NZ. [Māori] means shop.

I cannot use… So I can register the name, no problems. It resolves, no problems. But if I want to use that name in New Zealand to engage with my bank, to engage with my airline, to engage with my tax department, to actually engage with the Ministry of Māori Affairs, I can't.

And until last year, I couldn't register as a member of Internet NZ because their systems, which were an off the shelf system, couldn't handle it. Now, I'm grateful of the work that Jordan and his team have done to be accommodating to my peculiarities. But those are issues. It's not just issues in these quite peculiar, not peculiar, but very different scripts.

And my favorite example is café dot whatever. All right? Café dot CA. Perfectly valid word, everybody likes coffee, you can register it but you can't really use it very much. So that's what we're looking to do. What we would like you to do is think about this, go home, talk to your colleagues, and say, this is an issue. How can we get addresses in our communities?

In our software development teams? And the other thing that would be useful is if you could provide advice, governance suggestions, and so forth with the universal acceptance group. Now we have a website-ish sort of thing. We actually have a domain name, that points to a different website because I'm not that clever yet, but we'll get clever.

So it's UASG dot Tech. And that will take you to the UASG Wiki page on the ICANN website, and you can look at the documents there. So UASG dot Tech.

You could also try UASG dot technology, which is of course, a long name, and that also doesn't work in a lot of places, because it's not two, three, four, six or seven characters. So that's my briefing on universal acceptance. Happy to answer questions, either here or elsewhere. Thank you very much for your time. We are making progress, and I'm actually very delighted. Thank you.

BARRACK OTIENO: Thank you Don. [APPLAUSE]

For the [Māori] update. So questions to Don on universal acceptance? I think he was very clear. So with that, I think I would like to hand over the session back to the secretariat. My panelists were straight to the point. Thank you very much for paying attention. [APPLAUSE]

BYRON HOLLAND: All right thank you very much everybody. It's 5:00. We've actually ended the session a little bit earlier, so we've given you back some more free time. Thank you very much. I thought it was a great day, and many interesting sessions as usual, and a great start to the discussion around the work of the CCWG and CWG.

Just to let you know, the new CEO of ICANN, or the soon to be new CEO of ICANN, Göran will be visiting us, come to say hello, at 10:45, 11:45, 10:45 tomorrow morning. So that is now confirmed. And I will see everybody at the cocktail party. Thanks.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]