MARRAKECH – ccNSO Members Meeting Day 2
Wednesday, March 09, 2016 – 09:00 to 15:30 WET
ICANN55 | Marrakech, Morocco

ANN-CATHRIN MARCUSSEN: So good morning everybody. Please take a seat. Welcome to the legal session.

Good morning everybody. Please take a seat. I'm missing two or three presenters, so I would like to ask them to come up here and join me.

I just had Abibu here, but he should be [inaudible] down there, I think. He disappeared, okay.

Okay, welcome to the legal session. We have three topics on the agenda today. Here he comes. Okay. If this was in supreme court, we would all have a fine.

Okay. At least one. Okay, good. My name is Ann-Cathrin Marcussen from dot NO. I'm the vice chair of the Ellen R group in CENTR. We miss Stefan also, he was the one who was, you know, supposed to sit here but he couldn't make it. So that's why I'm here. We have one hour. The last topic is going to be covered by Peter Van Roste. He says his presentation will be

brief, but we will open for some discussion on the topic of intermediaries in the end.

So I suggest that we just start your presentations, and that we have the questions after each presentation. If you're comfortable with that? Okay.

ABIBU RASHID NTAHIGIYE: Good morning everyone. My name is Abibu Rashid Ntagigiye from dot TZ registry. And before I start, how many lawyers do we have in the room? Oh, a couple of them, wow. Just for your information, I'm not a lawyer. I'm an engineer by profession. And this is basically an informational presentation on what basically we are trying to do in Tanzania.

And with the idea or the aim of providing local dispute resolution services to the registrants. And next slide please. Okay, in brief, TZ NIC is the manager of dot TZ. It's about 10 years old, but about six or seven years old in terms of operation.

It has [inaudible] staff, and yesterday I was really commenting of having three other model, because the number of stuff with the registry. So we have 12 TLDs with about 11,000 domains. So we have a very good contribution to the domain in the African market.

We [inaudible] in 2010, and we are IPv6 ready, DNSSEC ready, and we're hosting to root service [inaudible] and F copies. We have two or three other model operation, basically we are ready. The pending issue is just transferring the ownership of the domain, or the management of the domains to the registrars, especially for those who registered with us previously.

We have more than 45 locally accredited registrars, and one of them is ICANN accredited. Next slide. So talking of this DRS, I thought I should focus on ccTLD management in general. And to my understanding, full recommendation of ccTLDs involves the technical operations with the cc within the country. And also, administrative operations being based on local policies and rules.

This could be in terms of domain registration, could be in terms of pricing, dispute resolution, etc. Now this dispute resolution, the subject matter within this presentation. So the status in Africa, most of the countries are driving for technical operation. We have a few exceptions whereby the ccs are managed out of the continent.

Then we have variant governance models, some by private, some by [inaudible], some by a not for profit companies. In terms of technical capacity is not approving, we can see most of the ccs are managed within the continent.

Marketing is still a problem. That's why we have a few numbers within the continent about 1.5 million. This was shared yesterday. And the capacity in this particular region services is challenging, or there is legal forecast within the continent. Next slide.

So dispute resolution services in Africa. It's basically based on [inaudible], some with variant [inaudible], and I tried to check on the [inaudible] website. We had about 22% of African countries, their dispute resolution services are provided by [inaudible]. And I think this is the [inaudible] direction becoming African DNS study, which ICANN has just signed with one entity from South Africa.

Next slide. So, dispute resolution services within the dot TZ. We have a variant version of UDRP, and basically this was based on three elements related to UDRP, and you know, this three elements, they use the term N O. Now they enter professions with the engineers, like when you say end, it means both whether there are two or three arguments have to be true, for it to be true.

So we thought that we should use the way [inaudible]. And this basically was in terms of registering a domain, and using it in bad faith. Something like that. So we thought this should be registering a domain or using it in bad faith, because someone

might register a domain name and not use it, but it is in bad faith. So we thought we should have a variation in that aspect.

So we sent an argument with [inaudible] in 2014, in 2012 provided dispute resolution services for dot TZ domains. But recently, we signed an agreement with a local entity called resolution experts limited. They do some, they do handle some issues related with the disputes, not on domain side but with other aspects, so we thought that we should consider them so that they could provide us a local dispute resolution services.

And through the agreement which we signed with [wi-po?], they agreed to facilitate capacity building of local experts. So probably in September, October, or November this year, we'll be having a workshop in [inaudible] and we expected to have one expert from [wi-po] to train local experts.

So effective from January this year, we have two entities providing dispute resolution. One is [wi-po] and the other is resolution expert. And I would think this is the best way to do, because people will have, first of all, options. And they will think that with the local dispute resolution services, probably they will be affordable, and for sure they will be affordable.

And by doing so, we hope that we are leading to full management of dot TZ, the ccTLD. I think this is my last slide, if

I'm not…   Did it go to the last one?   Yeah.   So thank you. [APPLAUSE]

ANN-CATHRIN MARCUSSEN: Thank you so much.   That was very interesting.   Any questions from people in here?

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: I can project my voice, but maybe not as well as Bart.   So I just wanted to ask, in terms of your dispute resolution, do you use English? Or do you use local languages? Or do you have options for both, particularly now that you have a local DRS provider?

ABIBU RASHID NTAHIGIYE: That basically is a very good question.   The aim of localizing the solution is basically to give options for entities to use which ever language you are comfortable.   In Tanzania, most people are comfortable in Swahili, but other people are comfortable in English.

And since we don't know whether the dispute will be arising, that's why we decided to keep [wi-po], and the local entity.   So people can lodged their disputes in Swahili as well.   We are giving flexibility to the local people as well.   Thank you.

ANN-CATHRIN MARCUSSEN: That's interesting. Any other questions? I have a question, for myself. The local entity you talked about, does it consist of lawyers basically? Or how is the, who are they?

BIBU RASHID NTAHIGIYE: Yeah. The local entity has a number of lawyers, just to do where you put us. It has a number of panelists with the different experiences. And so we basically recommended them to have some categorization of those panelists in terms of the experience, because some people might not have enough funds for their dispute to be resolved. So they can hope maybe for an experienced one, or the mid-ones, or the [inaudible] ones.

So basically, this is a legal firm with a number of experts.

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: Okay. Until now, how many [inaudible] do you, are with? Do you provide them statistic information?

ABIBU RASHID NTAHIGIYE: Just for a story, when we took over the dot TZ registry, the measurement, we inherited one dispute. This was regarding [inaudible] dot CO dot TZ. And we thought that it might be challenging, that's why we went straight to [wi-po], because they are experienced.

I can't remember the exact number, of this position shall be handled by [wi-po], but I think there are three of them. And recently, there was one dispute. It was on a domain called the TABD, dot CO or dot TZ. And basically the owner of this domain registered it in bad faith, because he meant that TABD stands for Tanzania association of database. Something which is not visible. You don't have an association of databases.

And the real owner of the domain is Tanzania association of, Tanzania agricultural development bank. So you can see. Now we are expecting the local entity to handle this dispute.

ANN-CATHRIN MARCUSSEN: Another question?

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: Thank you, I have a question regarding this last example you said. What kind of disputes can be…? What can be in dispute? A trademark violation or any other [inaudible] for a third party?

ABIBU RASHID NTAHIGIYE: I think from the three factors handled by UDRP, trademark is one of the items, but also you have service marks. Service marks means it's like unregistered trademark. Okay? It's something

common within the territory, that is well known into the public, but it's not registered. That can be handled as well.

But in terms of registration, in bad faith. Means like it's an element of competition. So yeah, it's along these three factors [inaudible].

ANN-CATHRIN MARCUSSEN: Thank you. Yeah.

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: [Inaudible] from dot FI. I would like to know the prices for your dispute resolution. Is there a difference in the price if it's by [wipo]? And what about the price when you are using local services?

ABIBU RASHID NTAHIGIYE: I mentioned it earlier, but we have a variation of UDRP. And specifically, with the third element of domain registration, let me read it here. Sorry.

I say the variation [inaudible] between the use of the two words, oh. The variation, but it is very similar to UDRP. And I give an example. It is registration of domain, and use of domain in bad faith. So with our policy, just registration of a domain or use of a

domain in bad faith. These are two different things because one might register [inaudible], but not use it.

But that can be a dispute in that case. Or he can register a domain, and use it. So those two, if they are two, he just applies for a dispute. In terms of pricing, it's something which you have been negotiating with a local entity, to be affordable comparing to [wi-po]. Okay, but I can't tell the prices.

I don't know if we have reported them on the website, which I mentioned on the slides.   But they should be affordable comparing to [wi-po].

ANN-CATHRIN MARCUSSEN: Thank you. Any other questions from the audience? Okay. Just one quick question from me then.   Do the local entity of remediation of dispute resolutions, or the disputes?

ABIBU RASHID NTAHIGIYE: Yeah. Before the complainant goes to the local frame or to [wi-po], we somehow do some, we do explain about the policies and about the three elements about the disputes. And basically we have a lawyer handling this issues, but not at [inaudible]. But the complainant has a choice to go to [wi-po] or to go to the local experts.   I don't know whether that answered your question.

EN

ANN-CATHRIN MARCUSSEN: Thank you. Then I think we will, no more questions? Then we will move over to the next topic, new legal framework for dot VN. Yes, go ahead.

PHAN THI NHUNG: Good morning everyone. Yeah, within the multi-[lingual?], I oblige to share you all here about legal environment where our ccTLD, dot VN, life and [inaudible]. So yeah, just in I want to offer [inaudible] the document regulate, that regulate dot VN in Vietnam now. So next slide please.

First, the picture show you here the law making body and the legal system in Vietnam. I believe like most of all country, the highest level document that we have, constitution here. Then in the legal system in Vietnam, lower than the constitution, we have the laws. We have [inaudible], that's on the, that's three [inaudible] legal documents, I mention assembly, yeah.

And the second level, the second level we have the [inaudible] decrease regulation of [inaudible] that was issued by prime minister. That's the second level, high level. And the lowest level of the legal document, we have, we call the circulars that was issued by [inaudible], yeah. So that's on the picture you see, the see the law making body and the legal system in Vietnam.

I must talk about that before because… Next slide please, okay? Yeah. In Vietnam, we have the concept of Internet resources. In this we define dot VN country code top level domain name. And as a domain name under country Vietnam law, Internet address, for instance, IPv4, IPv6, an autonomous system number. That's allocated to Vietnam.

And the new ccTLD that lead to Vietnamese company or organization, on that we define the Internet resources in Vietnam. And next slide please.

By the telecom law, that mentioned, like other Internet resources, so dot VN ccTLD is considered as the national telecom resources, and [inaudible] under the government management, the government management here is the ministry of information and communications. I think that may be very interesting for some of you here, because I heard from many of our colleagues here, they said, no, government never mentioned about ccTLD management.

Yeah, sure, I would like to raise a question here. How many of you here, that your ccTLD is under management by government? How many? Okay. So it's a minority. So stay out of [inaudible], okay? Just some… You know MIC is the lowest body that can make the legal document in Vietnam, so are the legal documents that we call circular. And MIC ministry of

information and communications, [inaudible] the circular to [inaudible] registration, and the uses of Vietnam, [inaudible], yeah.

And within the functional structure place, next slide please. Okay. The result of functional organizations structure of the ministry of information and communication in Vietnam, and within structure, MIC [inaudible] is a function to operate dot VN ccTLD to Vietnam Internet network information center. That's my organization.

In other way, we can say that VNIC is a government entity in Vietnam. And we manage the ccTLD for Vietnam. Okay, so next slide please. And here we would like to talk about the new, the newest version of the circular, I mean the legal document that we will list the management and the uses of the dot VN domain name in Vietnam.

By the end of last year, 2015, the ministry of information and communications issue a legal [inaudible] circular number 24. Then the [inaudible] of regulation, this circular rise of register, regulation on the management and the use of Internet resources including the registration, distribution, allocation uses returning with application also lists disputes document, with respect to all organizations and individual involved in the Internet related activity in Vietnam.

Next slide please. Yeah. And this some highlight of the legal document. The first MIC we issue a list of reservation dot VN domain name to protect… The name might include the [inaudible] for the important reason. Name of Iceland, name of [inaudible] water in Vietnam, and name in the list [inaudible] that was agreed by [UNISCO?] in Vietnam.

Also the name of the Communist Party, the state's organization, the [inaudible] political institution that coined the organization inside the political system in Vietnam. Yeah. And the last, the name regarding to the national security with France and diplomatic activity.

[Inaudible] at this moment, the list is under [inaudible], and is issue, not yet finished issue. Yeah. Next slide please. So next, I would like to highlight from the circular number 24, that's the registration and the uses of dot VN domain name. Only [inaudible] organization is eligible to register. That includes the [stranger?] and local space [inaudible].

The government, or people control the community, or people [inaudible], yeah. And we follow a separate registration process and compared to others, that's not follow the first come, first serve registration. We had to [inaudible], we had to pre audit with bot name and the registrant, yeah. To make sure, for the

registrant to make sure they are eligible to register [inaudible] at the end.

And the name, how to pre-audit with the name? That's to prevent some, yeah, in the past, the past year, we sometime, we receive the very… For example, hello dot VN, or flower dot VN. There may be something meaningless, yeah. But we had no reason to reject such application.

So the new version of MIC, if I clearly, that's the name must be the name of the organization, no other, yeah. So we can prevent the other [inaudible] before. And [inaudible] oversee [inaudible] are not allowed to accept the registration of dot VA, dot [inaudible] dot VN. Yeah, next slide please.

One more is the registration and the uses of new TLD in Vietnam, also mention in the new legal document. [Inaudible] and organization and enterprise in Vietnam, must submit requests to MIC before making new registration with ICANN. So it doesn't mean, I would like to explain this. It doesn't mean that the MIC prevent the company enterprise in Vietnam to register the new ccTLD.

It is just left MIC to help fully observation to what's happening in the field of MIC managed. Okay? So next slide please. Yeah, the slide, so you will about the dot VN domain name life cycle. There is also the results of the new version legal document, by the

Vietnam, the dot VN domain name life cycle was a tense longer after expire before 20 days after the domain name is [inaudible] will be [inaudible] to available.

But now, it's extend to at least 45 days, or 50 days, yeah. Okay. Next slide please. Some next slide, I would like to show you about the development, policy development for the dot VN registration, from time to time, and the before the 2003, we applied a very closed policy by the [inaudible] running bot registry and registrar function.

And there is no, there was no [inaudible] registrar access at the time. And before 2003, individuals was not allowed to register the domain name, dot VN domain name. But in 2003, we had the [inaudible] appeal, and we changed the policy to allow individual to, both domestic and overseas, to register dot VN domain name. next slide please.

Then next in, before 2006, the second level domain name, dot VN, will [inaudible] to register only for a local Internet service provider. And in 2006, we opened the public registration, the change with policy to open for public registration for second level domain name under dot VN.

And both organization and individual are [inaudible] register second level dot VN name. Next slide please. And before 2007, you know, we [inaudible] runs the registrar function, that means

we directly receive the registration also renewal requests from registrants. But in November 2007, we fully [inaudible] the registry registrar model with basic [inaudible] first come, first serve. Okay? Next slide please.

[Inaudible] about the relationship between the registrar, registrant and VN NIC, with the registrar, we directly signing the contract. And the registrar follows registrar regulations. At the moment, we have 16, sorry incorrect number in the slide. We have 16 registrar inclusive for oversea and for our domestic.

And between the registry and registrar, we know directly the signing the contract with registrant. And on the registrants we can expect the organization from the both the overseas and domestic, just individual limit to [inaudible] some kind of domain name in the category.

Next slide please. Here is the diagram [inaudible], not the growth over the years. So by the end 2015, we have nearly 350,000 dot VN domain name, but it's very interesting. You can see though [inaudible]… on the diagram, it's so low. It's [inaudible] of dot VN over year to year until now, and this is… How can I say? It's really reflect the, reflect my role, the policy changes for the dot VN.

For example, you see the pick, very high pick, in 2003. That time we change the policy to allow the individual to register domain

name. And next pick is 2006. That time we change the policy to open the public registration for second level of dot VN domain name. Yeah. And from that time until now, we are seeking as a pick again. That is not yes our peer. Okay, next slide please.

This is the last slide of my presentation. I will [inaudible] dot VN at the moment. The first, we are now faced with the ratio between the number of [inaudible] domain name, and number the new registration, it became higher and higher. Yeah. That makes those challenge is how to balance administering the developed [inaudible] and the management [inaudible].

So the second one, we are with first how to improve and make sure, so quality and the accuracy of [inaudible] information. Why keep developing online real time registration network. Okay. That's my presentation. Thank you for your attention. [APPLAUSE]

ANN-CATHRIN MARCUSSEN: Thank you very much. Are there questions?

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: You could go back one slide? One back, yeah. I realize that this is the legal session, but still, going from 300,000 to 340,000 in a year, doesn't seem to me that's 100% growth, as the red line

seems to show. It's more like 13%? The red line would indicate that you're still growing at over 100% a year.

But in the final year, you went from 300,000 to 340,000, probably. That's not 100% growth. Okay. Thank you.

ANN-CATHRIN MARCUSSEN: Any other questions from the audience? Yeah?

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: Thank you. Thank you for the presentation. You accept that registrations from RCs. Which is the way you manage disputes? Two questions. First of all, how many are in percentage? How much are the overseas registrations against the local ones? How do you deal with disputes for domain names with overseas registrants?

PHAN THI NHUNG: Thank you for the question. It's a very nice question, thank you. First is a question about the overseas rates? Right? At the moment, only 5%, 5% is in total market sale is from overseas registration. Yeah. And the to deal with dispute, actually have our own dispute resolution policy for dot VN.

That's basically follow, not fully follows the UDRP, just some basic principle, yeah. But we apply for the local, by the dispute,

domain name dispute resolution policy. We assess that there are three way, three way to deal with the dispute case.

The first way for, negotiation, yeah, two party, okay? The second way we are sent to the administration. And the third way, through the court. Yeah. And the overseas registrant must follow this policy, yeah. Okay.

ANN-CATHRIN MARCUSSEN: Thank you for that. Any other questions? Or I think we will move over to the last topic. Okay. Peter?

PETER VAN ROSTE: Thank you Ann-Cathrin. Good morning everyone. I am Peter Van Roste, the general manager of CENTR. Today I would like to give a short presentation that has only one goal, that is to see if there is an interest in this room, in this topic, and then see if, in the future, there would be a possibility to have a more in-depth agenda item discussing this.

It's a story that has been long in the making. Four years, we've seen discussions in particular with the CENTR legal group, on the role of ccTLDs. We've had, in that discussions on whether ccTLDs are actually really intermediaries, in particular, in the light of the European e-commerce from 2001.

There are all sorts of legal implications on that. You could find a couple of very useful consequences of that for ccTLDs. But it could also lead to a situation where ccTLDs would be grouped with other stakeholders that they have actually hardly anything in common with. For instance, I think it's important to realize that those intermediary provisions at the moment are typically used by social networks, by search engines.

So they are not restricted to the technical, as at least, I think what the intention of the lawmaker in 2001. So there is already a long legal discussion going on this topic. But things are changing, and I want to just share some observations with you, that hopefully, well, definitely within [inaudible], so hopefully within the ccNSO leads to situation where people are happy to share their ideas, views, plans, current practices.

Right from the start, and I will probably repeat that about three times during this presentation, there is no intention whatsoever to talk about best practices. Or to even suggest that there is something, a course of action, or a course of non-action that ccs should be taking.

These are discussions and decisions that you make on your national level. You take into account your local laws. You take into account the interest of your local Internet community. So

this is by no way meant as a presentation that is supposed to steer the discussion in any one direction.

Next slide please. So, I had to cut the list somewhere because otherwise it wouldn't have fit on 10 slides. So I started listing the initiatives for a couple of years now. But my cutoff date was the IGF meeting and the Paris attacks that followed it very shortly after that. And there is good reason, I'll walk you through that. So one of the things that we've seen following this devastating events in Paris, is that European lawmakers wanted to take immediate action.

They wanted a European-wide approach dealing with all sorts of, all aspects of radicalization, from prevention from removing material online. And so they came up with a non-binding resolution. That actually very specifically refers to intermediaries. That very specifically refers to prevention, as in prevent that some material gets online.

On the European Commission Security Agenda, that dates from before October 2015, but has elements that keep on defining and fine-tuning parts of that security agenda, we see pretty much the same reasoning. European fact sheets specifically refer to intermediaries and their role, and how they should be instrumental in removing content that is a threat to public safety.

There is the platform consultations, the online intermediary consultations. Lots of work on cloud computing. Every single one of those initiatives asks questions, in some cases, almost leading questions, I think a US lawyer would call it. So these consultations ask questions on what the European community thinks of the role of intermediaries, whether the e-commerce directive is still relevant to who should be included in its scope of protections that it provides, and who should be excluded.

It's not just regulatory work that we see. We also see events, specific initiatives. Sometimes small groups, sometimes it's open. Obviously I get most worried when it's almost impossible to get an invitation to attend one. In Europe, in Brussels, on a European level, but also on a national level in Paris, we saw closed meetings between intermediaries, law enforcement, government.

Hardly anything came out of that meeting in the form of communication. The only thing that we heard was that there was a very constructive meeting, and everybody agrees that they should stop terrorists. When we talk to some of the participants afterwards, we heard that they had been asked, and actually agreed, to take a very far-reaching measures in the context of removing, or making access to content particularly hard and difficult.

We see the same thing happening in ICANN. Two years ago, there was, and I'm not underestimating their ability to blend in, but I would say that two years ago or three years ago, there weren't that many IP lawyers around at ICANN meetings. Now you walk the corridors and you can see more lawyer cards than at a legal conference.

So there is definitely an increased interest from the legal community. There is an increased interest from their clients to start working on an ICANN level, to help them solve some of the problems, the real world problems, by the way, that they are facing. So we see that this logic is actually, will have an impact on the way that ICANN is prioritizing, I think, the projects. Another nice one, I think, is the healthy domain initiative. How many of you have heard about the healthy domain initiative?

Only a handful. It is, I think, a pretty important thing that's going on in our industry. There is a meeting unfortunately clashing with the ccNSO meeting this morning, where they will share some more information publically. It's an initiative that is aimed, at least for some commercial operators, to increase their level of activity in removing content. One of the examples, I think, that perfectly fits into this initiative, is you might have heard of that one, the agreement that Doughnuts has with the Motion Picture Association of America, or at least I think the press releases refer to, Doughnuts has a deal with Hollywood.

I assume it's MPAA. I haven't looked into the details. MPAA would get, or if it's MPAA anyway, the partner, would get a preferred partner status. And so, requests from that trusted partner would immediately lead to take down of domains. I know that some ccTLDs have already been experimenting with similar process, but it is new that it's happening on such a large scale, and it's widely published.

Next slide please and then the next one, because I messed up my slide deck. Thanks. I'll send you a better version later. We also see it, I mean, try to put it a bit broader than Europe, I think there is reference in the dot com act. There is an interesting discussion that developed after the release of the Manella principles on liability, intermediary liability.

We've seen lots of those discussions happening and taking place at IGF. Talking about IGF, those that were there might have been pretty shocked to hear that at the opening session, the Turkish governmental representative basically said that they would be taking care of the content issue. And as we know by now, they walk the talk.

For me, the spectacular thing was not that a representative made those statements because, obviously, they're entitled to. But the fact that the room didn't go booing, which I'm absolutely convinced would have been the case five years ago. I think at

almost session at IGF I attended, obviously following my own interest a bit, but at almost at every session, intermediary liability was discussed in some way or another.

Whether it was on security, whether it was on threat level, on prevention, on collaboration.   But the topic was there, sometimes very much in front, sometimes hiding a bit in the back.   Even at the CENTR workshop, the vice president of the European commission [inaudible], basically told us that the commission would make sure that in the digital single market proposals, they would take care of the content issue.

So it's everywhere.   I mean, we can't put our hands in the sand. Some other work are being done on general data protection regulation.   There is consequences for intermediaries.   If you're interested, CENTR has, well actually we haven't published it, but we will be publishing it very shortly, a brief for ccTLDs on the possible impact.

And then again, it's out of place here, should have been a previous list, but the public safety working group and the work that the IRRs are doing with law enforcement, making sure that they, as intermediaries, are providing IP address blocks, can collaborate to quite a, for example, with law enforcement agencies.

Last point. Court cases. Sweden has these blocking [inaudible]. Germany, a couple of cases by now on access providers. I think, the slide says two where the arrow is, but I think we have four by now. I should check with a German lawyer, but unfortunately Stefan is not here.

And then in the US, there are also a couple of cases that address liability of access providers. Next slide please. So one of the last things I briefly wanted to show you is, at CENTR we took a survey amongst our members, lawyers in particular, asking them on how they've been handling… I'm not going through the list, but it's for your information.

How they've been handling those questions that, whether they come from law enforcement, or private sector, other governmental departments, ombudsman, privacy, privacy authority. There are many channels. And so we asked members how would they treat these cases. Do they treat them differently depending on the nature of the case at hand?

Is child abuse case differently dealt with than a liable or slander case? So how does that work? And so we wanted to see what the commonalities are. But rather than getting what we hoped for, we got what we expected. That is, there is a wide diversity. There is a wide diversity amongst ccTLDs. Again, as I mentioned at the beginning of my presentation, which is pretty logic.

I mean historically, definitely legal frameworks, and different communities to serve, but it's a pretty diverse picture. It also shows that just by running a survey, we only started to understand the complexity of the issue at hand. So, this is for CENTR.

And so we did already a bit of the homework, but we haven't had any in-depth discussions. Those would come at the L&R meeting, which is taking place next week. But I think it would be healthy if this group as well, or it might be a nice exercise in the morning, it might not be extremely useful, to start waiving cards, but it would be good that we discuss, or I would like to hear your views on how we can update each other on what we do.

How we can create more awareness in our industry that if we are not going to be prepared for what's coming, it's going to be a big surprise for some ccTLDs. It could effectively change the way that you're doing your business. The simplest way, I think, the most basic way of looking at it is from a legal risk assessment.

At least, that everybody should do, if only to make sure that it's covered in their strategic plans. But what's the practical approach? How does that link with your overall strategy of your organization? I mean, some ccTLDs have a very clear selling point. They want to be, and I might be referring to the healthy

domain name initiative, it might be the place where you only find clean domains.

No spam, no security issues, no abuse. So where does that lead you as ccTLDs? How do you position yourself? Again, forward thinking, in full respect of everybody's position and take on this matter, but where are we? Are there… That maybe start with the first, well with an opportunity if anybody has questions on what I just said.

ANN-CATHRIN MARCUSSEN: Thank you Peter. Some questions? We have six minutes before the supreme court will fine us all if we are to, over the time. Go ahead.

EDUARDO: Thank you Peter. My name is Eduardo [inaudible], and I'm speaking on behalf of dot [CR?] registry. And I don't have a question, I have a motion to support the idea to think about this, because this is something that we have been thinking since the very beginning of our position as managers at dot [CR].

And [inaudible] something to share, that have been very useful for us, and for the local Internet community, is that registry in this case, we as a company has been really integrated with the local authorities. We discuss with them in order to find with

them things that we can do together in order to prevent the misuse of the dot [CO?] space.

That is something that we have been doing during all of the years, almost six years in operation, and we are very good, we have a very good relationship with our local ministry of defense, our local police force, our local ministry of justice. Because there are really happy having a partner trying to identify joint access.

Pray we are not responsible for the content. We are not responsible for many things that happen within the space of the dot CO. But there are things that we can do. Things… And we are present with them, discussing and finding new ways to proceed, in order to help them, and to help the Internet community to find a way to have a healthy domain space.

And in that order of space, in that order of field, I also, and we also support the idea of the healthy domain initiative, which is something that comes from the industry, out through revelation process, which is a way to identify our responsibility to work in order to find ways to help, and to go [inaudible], and more healthy domain space.

So, this is [inaudible].

PETER VAN ROSTE: Thank you Eduardo.

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: I think it's a very important issue, I'm glad you brought this issue here to discuss. Just to give some examples in Brazil, we have a law, the civil framework law for the Internet that protects, or tries to protect, the intermediary from liability, until the justices come to some kind of decision. But in the first hand, the intermediary are not liable for the content.

And of course, the dot BRs, it's never entering any issue with content. We do not look at content. We don't take any action regarding content. But anyway, I suppose this is a really danger for all of us, it will be important to have research to see what kind of local laws we have [inaudible], and thank you for bringing this issue. Thank you.

PETER VAN ROSTE: Your welcome. One of the, and it's just an example, but I have many discussions with individual ccs, in particular following the CENTR survey. And one of the things we quite often encounter is that there is a very strict principle in which the ccTLD acts, unless for instance, the information that is already, action is requested comes from the local cert.

And the local cert can be part of the ccTLD, so that the logic for the ccTLD still stands. They're not acting on external input. But it makes, for instance, already a difference from where we were five years ago where people consistently kept referring to technical reasons why to do that, whereas ICANN has probably asked half of this room, or 80% of this room, to take down names based on the configure issue, six, seven, eight years ago.

It's pretty hard to maintain that claim. So, it's very important that ccTLDs realize that there is a concern of lack of consistency in their argumentation, and hope that the discussion that we have in this room will help them clarify that and streamline their activities. Thanks.

ANN-CATHRIN MARCUSSEN: So Peter, there is a question from the remote room, from David [inaudible] from VeriSign for you. "What is your sense, Peter, of whether the Manilla principles are gaining traction?"

PETER VAN ROSTE: I think I can be very short. I think they lost a bit of momentum when they failed to attract the larger players following some interventions that the IGF. But to be honest, I haven't been following it the last two months, maybe something might have

changed. But my impression was that they actually lost traction, following IGF.

ANN-CATHRIN MARCUSSEN: Thank you everybody. I think we are right on time. It's 10:00, and it's coffee. I think this could be an issue well debated during coffee break, it's important. And thank you Peter for bringing this up. It will not go away. Thank you. [APPLAUSE]

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: Hello, good morning.

Good morning.

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: Hello everybody. If I could ask everybody to take their seats, take their seats. We're going to get started.

CHRIS: Good morning. My name is Chris [inaudible], I'm the chairman for the registry of Kenya, that's [K-NIC]. Abdalla is our CEO. I just wanted to take literally 60 seconds to say thank you to, well I guess, the body for allowing us to help on the cocktail last night. We do believe in the multistakeholder approach, and that's why [K-NIC], we stepped in.

Secondly to say, we would like to do as much as we can, at least on the African continent, in terms of helping on the exchange program. And thirdly, we're always glad and pleased to be of help to the community and the bodies, and well, I guess I'm happy to be here today, and to help in the deliberations. Thank you and have a great day. [APPLAUSE]

ABDALLA OMARI:
Thank you. I hope we have had our tea and coffee and we are ready for the next session. The current session is the gTLD news session, and I've been informed we'll be lucky, the new CEO may step in when the session goes on. So when he steps in, we'll stop our session to allow him to address us.

So, my presenters, we have Suraj from dot NP. We have Irina from dot RU. And we have Segun from dot NG. Jacques will be joining us from dot CA. He's in another session, but he'll join us as we proceed. Thank you.

I'll ask our presenters to stick to about 10 minutes per presentation, because we also have to squeeze in our ICANN CEO for ICANN, when he steps in. So kindly, Irina, can you start your presentation? Thank you.

IRINA DANELIA:
Thank you. Can I have slides?

ABDALLA OMARI: Sorry, I think slides, document which is on the screen.

SURAJ ADHIKARI: Sorry. Thank you Suraj. Good morning everyone. I am Suraj, from Nepal. I represent dot NP. A registry in Nepal. At the same time, I'm a newcomer. Others they [inaudible] for newcomer, how to talk, how to deal in the newcomers, so this is [inaudible] for me. Even how to [inaudible] there is a [inaudible] for me.

I expect, I'm very sorry if I go outside of track, outside of practices. I'm, and I see a number of prominent participants here. They have already not really presenting their [old medicine?] but leading the whole, or leading the activities and they are even leading the moment of ICT's and ccTLD communities.

So I'm hoping here, not one of them is the questions, but they are ready and I believe they are here to lift the newcomer to [inaudible]… Is that [inaudible]…

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: Yes it is.

SURAJ ADHIKARI: So I want to start my presentation here. The title says, what is dot NP? This is a kind of an interactive type of presentation here. I just want to share what is NP and how it is doing here. So can I go next slide please?

Yes, I just want to… It's not [inaudible] to see about Nepal. This one slide I want to use is opportunity. Nepal is a Southeastern country, and it is again landlocked country. It is in between China and India. You better know China in their [inaudible] emerging economy in the world. And to us, leading not really in the ICT area, politically, everything, culturally, they're leading the world.

And regarding Nepal we have 27 million [inaudible] in the country. And politically, it is [inaudible] democratic republic, and we essentially [inaudible] and introduce new [inaudible] by [inaudible]. And I want to add Nepal is a [inaudible] country. We have multiple [inaudible] there, and several other highest mountains are in Nepal.

And a number of tourists are always interested to go there. And other thing is, Nepal itself is a place of Buddha. Buddha, as you know, he is for peace, and he introduced peace around the world. And I want to add one more identity of Nepal. [Inaudible] is a city of temples. They have too many temples, new temples

in there, [inaudible] for all Hindus. So that's it for Nepal. I don't have much time to talk more. Next slide.

Yeah, coming to dot NP, it is, we have total number is 47,391 is the data taken on February, it's a total number. Next slide.

And talking about history, I think the identity that dot NP on January 25, 1995 is already more than 21 years ago. I think, I hope this is the most of the [inaudible] are started in same time, also. Next slide.

Some [inaudible] I want to metnion here is [inaudible]. I covered here seven years data, from 2010 to 2016. And [inaudible] since the data graphs seems [inaudible]. Next slide.

This is a slide for top extensions, like dot com, dot NP is for commercial purposes, private organizations and public companies are registered [inaudible] dot com dot NP. And second largest extension is dot NP. It is for social organization, NGOs, INGOs, and nongovernmental organizations, this extension gTLD. And third largest one is dot [inaudible] dot NP, it is for private or government, as you get some institutions like schools, boarding schools, colleges and universities.

This is third extension. And fourth extension is [inaudible] dot NP. This is the government of Nepal, of [inaudible] rule, [inaudible] rule to establish websites, to provide public services

through websites, so the [inaudible] dot NP also increasing these days. Next slide.

Yeah, this is the administrative of the building [inaudible], the company who is sponsoring dot NP services. This company, from the beginning, is sponsoring… I mean, this company initiated, from the beginning, and maintaining and providing fee services still now.

This company is an ISP of Nepal. It's a [inaudible] ISP. This ISP is started email services, Internet services, and hardware, software, also which is in Nepal. And this company is still sponsoring until now.

Some of the… Next slide. This are the few days which is not that much important to you. We started the service in 1993, 94, 95. Next slide. And these are the dates, 1995 is the most important date. ICANN delegated dot NP for Nepal. And all of this are not that much important. It is just for reference, like software upgrade, connectivity upgrade, and [inaudible] and software update. Next slide.

Next slide. Yeah, policy. We have very simple policy here that I want to cover in six points. It is fee service. In Nepal, we are providing fee service until now from 20 years. We don't [inaudible] anything to the community. It is because we want to promote, we want to see more online presence for commercial

organizations, non-commercial organzations, and including other government offices.

So this company is sponsoring NP services and they don't ask anything. And second number is, I think, universal norm, is first come, first served based. This is… The third one is [thread?] name. Any claim to [thread] name and are [inaudible] under dot NP domain name is considered valid only. If it registered within officer thread name, [inaudible] office in Nepal.

The number four is [inaudible] private person, can be registered upon providing [inaudible] copy as proof of Nepal identity. Next one is for [inaudible] company, corporations, multinational company, can only register domain that services company or trade name, and cannot register other generic domain name.

However, the applicant must have registered this company, trademark name within Nepal government. But next one, the last one is very interesting policy, there is no [inaudible].

So there is no [expiry] to… The domain name does not expire and will be free as long as the holder remains legally qualified, policy use. That's all for policy. Next slide. Yeah, [inaudible] processes like the [inaudible] want to categorize in one to five. Step one for online, it is everyone go for online.

EN

Step two is for documents submission. We asked their authorized leader and certificates from the company's office. And processes [inaudible], dot NP staff [inaudible] by listened [inaudible] process before sending to the dot NP administration [inaudible]….

And fifth is [notification in the mail?]. Client will notify the [inaudible] registration [inaudible]… with the [inaudible] explain. Next slide.

Yeah, this is, I want to say this is rules. So we have [inaudible] worldwide, to provide faster service of dot NP domains. We have seven slips, service including one any cast server which are hierarchical in nature, and placed in different regions around the world. Next slide.

Yeah, this is development part. I don't have that [inaudible] here. We just made a portal to simply apply, and apply the domain from that portal. And we [inaudible] people, documents. Previously we had [inaudible] system to submit documents, [inaudible] documents in the office.

This is now phased out. And now that portal is locally blocked. And regarding DNSSEC, we are in testing phase, planning to have the best for DNS before implementing in the live server. We recently had organized our training in [inaudible]. The trainer

was [inaudible] from ICANN. And hopefully we'll implement as soon as possible.

Yeah, IDN resource is, it is a steering process. For our system engineers to be implemented in the earliest. This is all for development. Yeah, next slide.

Yeah, this [inaudible] what is, I think, is most common for all organizations [inaudible] smaller or bigger. We have opportunity out there, because we are a rapidly growing market. User friendly technology these days. Localization of local market. And in Nepal, we have local member, and open source, or a corporation like this.

So these are the opportunities for us. Talking about trace, there is a trace of security, investment, technology investment, and political environment, instability, lack of [inaudible] and unfamiliar policies by the government. These are our [tests?], I think. And this is my presentation. Thank you for listening. Thank you. [APPLAUSE]

ABDALLA OMARI: Thank you Suraj. You kept the 10 minutes time. I don't know if there are any questions from the audience to Mr. Suraj. We give the chair the first….

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: Well if there are no others, I'm curious, the domain names are free, from what I understand, or at least free to the end user. What's the business model there? Who is paying to support the registry? How is the registry funded if you're giving away the domain names?

SURAJ ADHIKARI: Yeah. It's mentioned in my slide. Private company named is [inaudible] communications. It is the first ISP of Nepal who runs the Internet service, software service, hardware and some international branding dealers in Nepal.

And that company itself is sponsoring, I mean, he, himself, has initiated for the first time in Nepal, it was in 1995. And he regularly providing that services, and is sponsoring their services. And there are a number of discussions about that [inaudible] this morality in government sectors, private sectors, but no one is coming up with a good package and good solutions besides this, address these services.

And I think there are legal issues raised until now. We don't have any legal issues until now. That's why no one is coming up to change this [model?], and that company itself, is providing, that's happening.

ABDAILA OMARI: I don't know, is there a mic to go down?

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: Thank you.   [Inaudible] is my name, president of dot [NG?] ccTLD.   I wanted to ask, what is the mechanism by which stakeholders can contribute to the issues, management, administration of the dot NP? Or is it granted that he who pays the piper dictates the tune? What's the mechanism?

SURAJ ADHIKARI: Thank you for the questions. You are talking about the issues raised by public, is that?

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: The resource is for the people, the people should have a say as to how the resource is managed.   I'm asking what's the mechanism or…?   Did the community just leave it to this generous ISP to just manage it the way it feels?

SURAJ ADHIKARI: Yeah. Many communities are, these days, maybe arising few questions about this model of free service. And we are also thinking if some good [inaudible], if some initiatives come, we always ready to discuss with them for its betterment, and for the user, and for the other developments as well. Thank you.

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: I think Suraj, what [inaudible] is asking, how does the community participate in the running of dot NP? Does the community participate on the Board or something like that? [Inaudible].

SURAJ ADHIKARI: Yeah. Communities, there is no special kind of communities that is out there. If you are talking about the people, they are always happy, they are getting free of cost. So, I don't [inaudible]…

ABDALLA OMARI: Thank you Suraj.

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: Hello. This is [inaudible] from dot [inaudible]. I wonder how do you keep your data updated, since you don't have an expiry date on your domain names.

SURAJ ADHIKARI: No, but we already have a portal, portal with database, and we keep all records. There is no provision of expiry, but we have already that system of data management. Even it is for WHOIS and we even have the physical documents that's going in that

portal. So anyone can see their data and their expiry date, registration date, etc. They can view through the portal.

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: Okay. But how about the contacts of the domain name? Maybe they change with time? How do you update them?

SURAJ ADHIKARI: No, we'll provide, we'll provide user name and password, and they themselves can edit, modify their administrative contact, technical contact, and other DNS records, they themselves will maintain that by that portal.

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: Okay, thank you.

ABDLLA OMARI: Okay. I see a hand up behind there.

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: Hello. Dot FI, [inaudible]. I would like to ask you have you had any disputes over domain names? And if you have, how have you been handling them?

SURAJ ADHIKARI: Yeah. Very good question. Luckily, when neighbor [inaudible] kind of disputes and neighbor [inaudible] legal issues until now. That's the very positive and good aspect of dot NP. We are giving this free of cost, and there are no legal issues. That is our strong point here.

I want to say this [inaudible] related to this, all right community. In your question, there is no legal disputes until now.

ABDALLA OMARI: Thank you. Thank you Suraj. I hope that I think the questions are over. Which slide is ready?

All right, at last I got it right, isn't it? Okay, take it from there.

IRINA DANEILA: Good morning, once more again. I'm glad to see all of you here. And this time, instead of giving overall description of how our registry operates, which we already have had a chance to do several times, I was asked to focus on one of the projects, and we choose one of our educational projects, which is a game, which has been developed in our registry for already five years.

However, let's go to the first slide. Next slide, yeah. So among several main activities supported and developed in our registry, social and educational activity problems are one of the most

important, since our charter says that we, as a registry, have a task to support and promote Internet development in Russia for the benefit of all of the users.

So the important part of this Internet development is education actually. Next slide please. Here are the examples of the programs and activities we are running this year. And some of them are very new, like these IP and IT [inaudible], which is the contest for the students of the legal university, is [inaudible] initiative, and we do it for the first time.

The others have a long history like our corporation with our law enforcement and courts, where we do seminars, and conference, and educate about how Internet is built, and how it works, and what is the right way for them to achieve, for courts to make right judgment and decisions, and law enforcebements use our tools to achieve their goals and to implement their tasks.

The journalism award is the award for journalists who write about Internet. There is another competition, their best educational that starts for kids and young children, yeah, young people. Next slide please.

But the focus of today's presentation will be the game, the online game, which is called [inaudible] the Internet and govern it. And their goals is to actually educate their young generation, about how Internet is built, how it functions, or what are the

possibilities in the Internet, or what are the Internet. Next slide please.

So the idea of this game came to us in 2011, and actually it was brought to us by the teacher's community. There are organizations in Russia aiming to help, to develop the methodology for school teachers to implement new forms and matters of education. And people from one of such [inaudible] came to us, and said, you know? We have an idea. Why don't we do this project? Why don't we do this game?

And said, okay, good idea. We can probably spend some money on that. And we are had software development, first, and we had people to design and built their content, and we compared this game, and in 2012 the first tournament based on this game took place, which was quite successful. We decided that this initiatives was supporting, was to be supported. So next year, we had a game and a tournament, and next year, again, and in 2014, we analyzing the feedback from the participants of the tournament.

We realized that there is a place for improvement. So we moved actually the project to new software platform, which is more flexible and more scalable. We developed the mobile application for all major mobile platforms. We developed new design, which looks more attractive. And next slide please.

And today, this project has like three main components. And the main one is the web portal, which is actually the entrance door to the project. It also has mobile applications, and it has offline activities around, which is like the yearly tournament, and also this year, last year actually, we started and this year we will keep arranging mini-tournaments, which are like smaller copy of the big tournament.

Next slide please. This is how the web portal looks like. This is the entrance to the yearly competition, and also the entrance to the educational part of this project, which contains the knowledge base. This is actually explanation and description about different subjects about Internet. And it has this section with exercises, where the user can train, and check his skills. And that definitely has news and secondly ask questions. And it is addressed mostly in our ASCII, addresses both in our ASCII and IDN domain names. Next slide please.

So, what is it actually? What is more probably most interesting to know? So this is the portal for one of the many tournament arranged at their exhibition. You see three participants in front, and the screen was actually the game layout, which looks very similar to American TV show, Jeopardy.

If any of you have chance to see or there is a similar show on Russian TV. So there are topics, and there are questions to

answer. Next slide please. This is how their online page of the knowledge base looks like. And here on the screen, in the left column, actually you see the examples of their topics. For example, how the worldwide web is designed or what is a site address, or how companies find each other.

And each button leads to the particular question. And depending on their difficulty of the question, there are a different number of points. And so the user can actually learn and exercise himself, and getting points, and there is a score. There are bonuses. And next slide please.

And this is the example of particular topic. Here there is, it contains the explanation of what is a DNS system. And there might be one or several screens, with the explanation of what is it, and how it works. Next slide please.

And at the end, there is a small exercise. Like here, the user is asked actually to connect their IP addresses with their websites. To demonstrate that he has understood how this works. Next slide please. Now the example is about passport, which I used in the Internet, how to compile the correct password.

What are the examples? What are the easiest rules to follow? And again, you can learn, you can read, you can [inaudible] and you can practice. Next slide please. This is already the example task from the competition. And again, there is a description of

the task, for example, here this is about terms used in the Internet, and the participant of the competition is asked to read the description of the term, and to answer what actually is it, using this buttons with the letters. And this particular question is quite easy.

You're not able to click buttons, but probably there is somebody in the audience who will be able to answer, to answer the question. So the question is, [inaudible] block containing text or image, let us use, attract the attention of the user and to navigate the user to the webpage containing the description of the goods or services advertised.

Is anybody, you can answer?

Well.

[Advertising?] block containing text or image used to attract the attention of the user and turn to give them to the webpage. Next slide please. This is [inaudible], actually. So, as you have probably noticed, there are a few different scenarios used to compile and to build this tasks.

We actually decided that we would have not more than seven of them, so some, in some tasks we have to like to click letters. In other tasks, you have to move blocks. But seven is actually enough to ensure diversity of the tasks, and you can always add

new contain to the existing layout, and this helps to keep its [inaudible] scalable and makes easier the development and design of new tasks. Next slide please.

Another [inaudible] competition, we are the cloud platforms are discussed. Next slide please. There, but to ensure participant made one mistake, as you can see. Next slide please. Here are the photos of the winners from the previous championship. And so there are school teams from bigger cities, but also from minor villages as you see. Next slide please.

There are a number of participants, girls from year and year, and we are really happy about that. Next slide. And anyway, we still put some efforts to promote this project, and the competition itself, and we do it through several mechanisms, and we are lucky to have the support from ministry of education, which help us also to deliver this information to schools, through the information emails and then conferences.

And this many tournaments arranged, next slide please, arranged at the industry events, also help us to deliver information and to demonstrate this game. And that's actually what I have to say. Thank you for your attention. [APPLAUSE]

ABDALLA OMARI: Thank you Irina. Okay. We will hold our questions to Irina after the CEO has addressed us. The CEO has a question. Okay. I'll pass the chairmanship to [inaudible].

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: Sure. Thank you very much. ICANN's new or very soon to be CEO, has joined us to come down to the ccNSO meeting and say hello and introduce himself.

And of course, we probably all seen him in the public sessions, but now we get to meet him in the ccNSO room, and potentially ask a few questions, see how he is doing so far. So without further ado, I would like to welcome Goran Marby to the ccNSO. Welcome. [APPLAUSE]

GORAN MARBY: Thank you. It's very warm in here. Is that a surprise to you?

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: And it has no windows, something we've been working on. Next meeting.

GORAN MARBY: I just came in here and I said this is really warm. For how long have ou been sitting here today? Forever, okay. Good answer.

All right. You probably know me by now, or at least my face. I'm Goran Marby, I'm the latest intern at ICANN.

I will start in the end of May as CEO, so I hope I will have successful internship. It's a kind of, it's an offical secret, in a way, that I will really start the first of April, but I will spend the first weeks moving to LA. And part of my training. I will move myself and two-thirds of my kids to LA.

I have a 13 year old and a 15 year old who is looking forward to it. I've also got a very angry 24 year old, who is doing her last term at the university, because she says that it should be her that moves to LA, and I should be home pining. But this time it ended up the other way around.

I bet she's going to come as well. You probably know my background. I've been working for the Swedish government the last six years, six and a half years. I've also been very much involved in the telecom regulation of Europe. I've also been a vice-chair of the European partnership, where I worked a lot with the old Eastern European countries. I also have been a part of something called [inaudible], which works with the South American regulators, which meant that I spent a lot of time travelling around the world, which I have a feeling I will do also in the current job, even if I think it's physically impossible to travel as much as Fadi.

I don't know how he actually did that. A lot of people have been asking me, what am I going to do the first 100 days, and I haven't even started yet so I will not answer that question. There has been some questions about how will I be trained? And I will be using a part of this time, really the first six weeks before I go into work to meet a lot of people and to talk to a lot of people, especially compared to staff.

But I will also spend a lot of time after that with the communities. I said something during my presentation, a part from the bad jokes, which some of you actually laughed at, which I'm very grateful. That I see the role of the ICANN CEO to implement policies, that is made by the community. And be able to do that the best possible way. I have to learn as much as I can about what you do and how you do it.

So I will actually end this one towards a question to you. What do you think is the most important task for the new CEO to do when I come in?

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: Well, thank you. And I will put that back to the floor. Would anybody would like to take a stab at answering that question? And/or, of course, we'll have an opportunity to ask a couple of questions, recognizing our time is a little bit limited. Jay, and of course, state your name and affiliation.

JAY DAILY: Jay Daily from dot NZ. Does that work now? There is a phrase…
Well, if you look at RIPE, RIPE is a very good example where they
have, RIPE NCC, the organization, and RIPE the community, and
they make a very clear distinction between the two of them, and
they have a very clear set of principles, and a very clear compact
and interaction between those two.

That's never been so clear within ICANN, so much at all. And
what we've seen over the last few years, is a change in the very
nature of that, which I think you've already understood and
identified when you explained your role and how you see your
role going forward.

But I think that actually very positively stating where you think
that interaction should be in quite a formal way, with a set of
documents or something, principles, would be a very good start,
because many of us here are concerned about scope creep.
We're concerned about the development of a cast of, using
[inaudible] work, if he's here, [inaudible], okay? Special people,
being always at the front in ICANN meetings, always on the same
groups, always those things.

It's a real change in the nature of the relationship between
ICANN, the company and ICANN the community. And so, if you
can address that, roll that back a bit as something that is more

in keeping with the community consensus, and formalize that a bit more so that it has some stakes in the ground around that, I think that would be wonderful.

GORAN MARBY: Thank you. Could I add one thing? There is a personal note. As you probably know, I'm Swedish, which is a minority of itself. I don't see when you tell me I'm wrong, I don't see that as criticism. I see that something that helps me to do my job better. That's the way, because nobody really cares about Sweden anyway.

So we have to… We cannot have to have that attitude. And that means I'm really looking forward to any dialogue. I mostly the kind of person who will talk back when I disagree, but fundamentally I go back to the statement. I just want to share with you also that the statement I made, the statement I did again, is something that's not me. It's the staff at ICANN. It's the Board who says the same thing.

I will not judge history, it's been an evolutionary process. There is a lot of things, we together, have to address. I said, during a meeting, I don't see myself as the center of gravity of Internet. ICANN is not the black hole of Internet. We are a part of this, with you. And we continuously have to work out of [inaudible].

I will come back with more on that later, but that is how much, that's the intention of me coming into this.

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: Thanks. Any other questions or response? Peter and then [inaudible].

PETER VAN ROSTE: Good morning. Peter Van Roste, dot BE. First of all, welcome to our community. I think that one of the most challenging things for the new CEO of ICANN will be, if you look in retrospect, ICANN has significantly grown, both in numbers of staff, both in organizational structure. We have engagement centers, we have [inaudible] now, I think one of the most challenging things will be to keep on top of all activity.

How to manage all of the different projects that are ongoing. How to manage all the different staffs and the different entities, and above all, ICANN has considerable income and considerable costs, and to keep that under control is probably also something that comes very close at heart of this community. Thank you.

GORAN MARBY:	Funnily enough, when I met the Board the first time, they all sounded like it was a piece of cake, but you're making it clear to me. Thank you.
UNKNOWN SPEAKER:	And [inaudible].
[CARLOS]:	Following on the same, sorry. [Carlos?] [inaudible] from Malawi dot MW. And also with Africa top level domains. Following on the same thought, I think one of the things that we have seen in our region, with Fadi, is that he has a greatly elevated participation and attention to African issues.
	And we would like to the same following your term, and hopefully in a better and more elevated forum following on the establishment of the engagement center in Nairobi. Thank you.
GORAN MARBY:	When I did another system, I said I will not do Fadi's mistake, I will do my own, which I heard it has been said many times after that. But I will work with you to make sure… One of the reasons I'm working with the Internet issues since middle of the '90s. I'm basically a routing and switching guy.

And what happened over the last few years is truly remarkable, because we, Fadi has done one thing very, very well. He took this international organization into a global organization, and that's a much bigger task than I think that I actually understood before I came here and understood it.

The Internet is global, which means that a part of the expansion is because Internet has grown not only in the amount of views, but also globally. And we have to continue together, and I emphasize the word together, how do we make sure that we continue this work?

In a way, it's your fault, because you are the ones who made Internet such a success. It's not me. I have always been the user and the buyer of it, but you actually created something that is so, actually wonderful, that people are now using it all over the earth. And we have to think about how that engagement is going to do, but we are going to be transparent.

I am going to be transparent, the Board is going to be transparent, to have that discussion. That not only goes for Africa, that goes for Asia, and we can drill down to countries, because there are differences between the countries in Africa. There are differences between the…

I also think it's very important that we respect the cultures and languages of everywhere, because it was very much easy when

everybody speaks English, or Swe-glish [sic]. My staff thought that was a joke. I don't know why.

But they're all training now. But so we have to be very respectful also, when we do this to make sure that, because two countries can be very different, even if they're in the same region. So we have to adopt that organization, our organization, our community, toward this differences.

I'm not going to stay long on this, because it's very close to my heart. I've been very active in the European community. When you look at it on the outside, you say that's Europe. But I'll tell you, there are some differences between Italy and Sweden. They have a lot of, much better things in Italy. Like wine and food.

Are there any Italians here? Maybe he would agree. But so, and we have to be careful when we also, you know, talk about Africa or Asia or Europe or even the US or North America. There are cultural differences. And being a global organization, we have to learn about that.

We have to talk about that. We have to work with it, and not take any shortcuts in it. And we have to think carefully about the things we do. And the only way, and this is the beautiful setting for this, because here we have all the check and balances in it.

So, I will stop talking about it. Yes, it's very close to my heart. Thank you.

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: Any final comments from the room?

GORAN MARBY: That's him saying I should leave now.

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: Last point to Jay.

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: We discussed this last night, but you can do it if you want.

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: So I'm going to pick up on Jay's comment, but one thing I wanted to share with you about this room is the fact that in some sense, all of the people in this room operate a microcosm of ICANN within our own jurisdictions. We have Internet communities. We run registries. We work with governments, civil society, technical communities, and we…

This room in particular, I would say, has a very clear sense of what their jurisdictions are doing, how they're doing it in terms of Internet civil society, technology, law enforcement,

government, etc. And there is a lot of deep, deep experience in this room.

You'll find too in this community that many or most of the people are CEOs, or managing directors, or whatever their term for being the leader of their organization. And in part, that's why you'll find this community particularly interested in budgets, operating plans, strategy, because we all bring that perspective to it.

So when you hear us speaking from the SOP, strategic and operational planning working group, our interests will often be focused on that, our comments can be sharp, but our comments are always meant in the best interest of ICANN and the community. So we welcome you to the community. Expect to hear from us on a regular basis, and if there is anything we can do to help your journey in the early days, please feel free to come and ask any and all of us. Welcome to ICANN.

GORAN MARBY: Thank you very much, thank you. [APPLAUSE]

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: Thanks for joining us, and thank you everybody, including the panelists on this panel, and the chairman of this panel, for indulging us. As you can imagine, Goran's schedule was a

challenging one this week, so we wanted to fit him in where we could.

And with that, I will hand it back over to you Mr. Chairman.

ABDALLA OMARI: Thank you. Now, because of time, we only have 15 minutes. So I would ask Jacques to take maybe seven minutes so we have another presenter. Jacques.

JACQUES LATOUR: Hi. I'm Jacques with dot CA. I'm a CPO. So what I'll do is, for the next seven minutes, I guess, go quickly about three different initiatives that we've been doing at CA. So next slide please. So talk quickly about ISPs, that's something new we did in the last couple of years.

In Canada, quick overview of our Internet performance tool, and end date on our any cast service infrastructure that we built. So next slide. Next one. So one thing we did in the last three to five years, we develop about seven, or six new ISPs in Canada. That's something we didn't have before.

So [inaudible] was a strong [inaudible] in building ISPs across the country. And small and medium ISPs are now connecting to this. It's growing. It's something new that's really important for

Canada. The way we positioned the Canadian Internet is, we're users of the US Internet. We don't really have our own Internet, so we're kind of working on building our own infrastructure.

Next slide. So the benefits for Canada, there is lots. But the main benefit is for dot CA, in each of these ISPs, we put our dot CA name servers that are directly peering with ISP so we make dot CA better in Canada, something we couldn't do before, so that's a big benefit. And there is more benefits there. Next slide.

So basically, this picture shows... This is a vision for the Canadian Internet. We've been pushing this to people, it's pretty strong statement to tell other people in Canada that we want to, this is the vision for the Canadian Internet, but we're trying to bring the core Internet in Canada.

We're trying to build more ISPs, and we want people to peer locally in Canada. So that's coming along, it's working. We have vision. People understand where we want to be. And then they're starting to see value in the ISP and keeping content local, and having more content available.

So overall, it's a good vision. It's challenging, and it's going to take a couple of years to get there. Next slide.

So IPT, quickly. So next slide. So what we did was we built a portal to measure the state of the Internet in Canada. So if we're

building ISPs, and the ISPs are going to make the Internet better, so we built a tool to measure that. So over time we're trending performance of the Internet in Canada. So end users, they go to a postal code, they go to this website, they put their postal code, and then they run the performance test and we track that.

And we can map that in Canada on the map. It's not speed test, it's all about measuring quality of a TCP connection versus speed test that measures how fast, how much tough you can put on a circuit, so it's different framework.

So the goal is to measure the impact of ISP with this tool, and next slide. It's based on [inaudible], so all of the data is publically available in the Google data platform. So we integrated our system with M Lab, and it has been working out pretty well so far. Next slide.

So what we did, so for this to work, we put M lab nodes inside the ISPs that we built. So we actually measure how fast your performance is to the core of the Internet in Canada, and that's what the tool is. So again, we build ISP as a core infrastructure, for Canada, and then we measure, using this platform. The portal, if you're interested, that's something that can be rescanned, rebuilt, by country.

So the backend is a project, it's some work, but that's something that can be available. Next slide. So Internet performance tool

is about quality of connection. It measures congestion, it checks for connection, restart. It's not how much bits you can run through a pipe, it's the quality. It's [inaudible], it's measuring if the connection is stalled, can you…

If it's parsed data or if it's real, there is no in line device, so it's really… It provides a little bit different result than other real speed test, but it actually represent what an end user seek. The other thing is that IPT measures the speed from a user all the way to the Internet. It's not measuring the speed a user can have at home. It's, when you go out on the Internet, how much speed you get outside. So it's interesting results. Next slide.

So I got one minute left. So [d-zone?]. Next one. So what we did is now that we have any cast, now that we have ISPs across Canada, we develop our own any cast for dot CA. We call it [d-zone]. And we have global node, we have TLD on it, dot QA and dot CA. And it's running. Next slide.

So, the big nodes that we have, they have 10 gig transit, 10 gig peering connection to the peer at all of the ISPs. We have okay, good infrastructure for our any cast architecture, and lots of bandwidth. Next slide. There is, yeah.

So we have two clouds. So the first cloud has got nodes across the US, a couple of nodes in the US, [inaudible] in Asia, so we have good connectivity there. Plus we have local any cast nodes

in Canada. That means if we're under DDOS, we can still serve Canadian people at Internet exchange point with our local any cast nodes. So it's a good setup.

We're open. If we do another TLD and you want node in your country, we can add more nodes, that's part of the arrangement we have. And cloud two is small, that's a reason that tech day we did an any cast, a DNS any cast panel to figure out what's the best practice to build this, so we're going to grow the second cloud.

And next slide. That's it. So we're leveraging ISP in Canada to build a better Internet. We can monitor the Internet, better dot CA services. Six minutes, 40 seconds. [APPLAUSE]

ABDALLA OMARI: Thank you Jacques. I'll request we take note of the questions. We allow Segun to do then, we ask all the questions because of time. Segun, please do the presentation. We'll ask all of the questions after his presentation. Thank you.

SEGUN AKANO: Yeah, good morning. Segun Akano is my name. I'm representing the Nigeria Internet Registration Association. Please permit me to recognize the presence of our president, [inaudible], and the other Board members, me and [inaudible] here.

Before I present this slide, something is phenomenal about Nigeria. Prior to 2000, we had just half a million density out of a population of 150 million. But today, we have 154 million telephone users, out of a population of about [inaudible] million. That shows that, on the average, every person in Nigeria has a phone.

And about the Internet usage, we have 100 million users as of today. That shows that two out of three people use the Internet. So what I'm going to show you, next slide please, is about the message of hope.

Because the figures we have as per domain names, do not justify the users in Nigeria. We are really [inaudible] dot com, dot [inaudible] and all the other gTLDs. So what we are getting nearer, is to address on the fastest [inaudible]. We are looking at marketing or communication, at [inaudible] and technical as our [inaudible] to bring the millions of Nigerians to be able to use dot NG.

Next slide. So we want to create the awareness about the danger in the market. Confer the idea of dot NG from being [inaudible] to becoming necessity to the market. Promote the active uses of dot NG, and identify what sector the most potential in the market, generate new market approach. You

need this [inaudible] at least 60% of the market for domain name services originating from Nigeria.

Next slide please. So, what our strategy focus? We want to ask the corporate image of dot NG. Because before, from 2003 we had all of the teleco come to Nigeria. This teleco brought a geometric increase in the number of telephone users, from point five million to 105 million today. And we want to also look at dot NG as a product that can enjoy that geometric increase.

So want to advocate or promote the adoption of dot NG. Yesterday, the [inaudible] was telling us, how they have failed, gone so far.   But we have not been able to get our own government to legislate the use of dot NG for companies, and we have started engaging the government. At least we have been able to convince all government private sectors, to use dot GOV dot NG. That we started in 2014. We want to leverage our partnership with registrars. Currently we have 40 registrants, and one of them, two of them are accredited ICANN registrants.

What [inaudible]… Next slide. So we have made a strategy to improve the image of dot NG, because you may be aware of what we call [inaudible]. Many people in the past, have thought dot NG was fraudulent. I want to correct that image. Next slide.

So, this are the objectives, bring the awareness, put visibility, publicity, and knowledge. Next slide please. Okay, so we have a

lot of media outreach in terms of print, digital marketing, new local [inaudible], and the website, we redesigned our website, and we are suggesting marketing communication with a lot of promotional bodies, for publicity. Next slide.

Okay.   These are part of our media campaign in terms of communication with the public, claiming identity for schools, are you organized for organizations? Next slide please.

So, advocate and promote the adoption of dot NG. Next slide. That's the media strategy again. Becoming [inaudible] that the market strategy adopted must focus on increase the number of dot NG domain names, which we are doing. Next slide.

Okay. So we have established [inaudible] in the past, we add the switch to dot NG campaign. That's what brought all government status to use dot GOV dot NG. And today now, it's important the email of all government workers, must bear the domain name of the [inaudible] status. Next slide.

Okay, we want to strengthen the [inaudible] integrity of dot NG. Next slide please. Okay. Next slide again. Okay we have [inaudible] academy. And that academy is in line with what the dot Russia, does share with us. We want to go to schools, because we find out that before dot NG was given back to, many companies had signed up for dot COM, and they find it very difficult to change the dot NG.

And so, now we [inaudible] school children, graduates, undergraduates who are future leaders, who will be able to say next website should be dot NG, and not dot COM. Next slide. Okay, leveraging a partnership with registrars. We have 40 registrars, I've said. Next slide please because of our time. Okay, next slide.

Okay, this, the figures. Initially I said Nigeria is a phenomena. You see this slide. In January 2015, we had 1,500 new domain names registration. And 1,029 renewals for [inaudible] transfer. But if you see below it, we are comparing with 2016, a year after. A year after, we had 2,023 domain names new, 1,035 renewal, and 80 transfers.

So it shows it's doubling. So this what we want to work on. That you geometric progression, we want to reach it, because Nigeria has a lot of population, Internet [inaudible] increasing, Internet usage is also increasing. So it should not be difficult for us to come back here, maybe in the next two years, and say, Nigeria has five million dot NG domain names.

And that's what I want to be our story. Thank you. [APPLAUSE]

ABDALLA OMARI: Thank you Segun. I would like to, thank you Segun. I would like to [inaudible] was left for rushing them through, but these are

the new sessions so everything have to be put in [inaudible] and so on. Now we are out of time, but maybe few minutes, we take questions, although Jacques has already left.

I can see hands, let me start here.

FRANCIS: Okay, thank you for the opportunity. I'm Frances from Ghana dot GH. It's a wonderful presentation. I think the growth rate is very good. Can you please help us? Yesterday [inaudible] was able to tell us, marketers tried to [inaudible] caused the tremendous growth. What is your secret? Why that fantastic growth? Because one problem with many ccTLDs is under-renewal.

People come to register, they don't come back to renew. But I think your registration and renewal growth is okay. So what is your secret? How do you get people to register? How do you get people to renew? Any why? Thank you.

SURAJ ADHIKARI: Should I answer that? Okay, what we have achieved so far is to induce their usage.   We have new online platforms, just [inaudible], and they use dot COM dot NG. So that is creating a bandwagon effect, that certainly dot NG is a good brand. So

we've seen that the people signing up now, are real and attentive users.

And once your business is [inaudible], you won't have to forsake that domain name. So we've seen an increase in performance on online business in Nigeria, and that's a [inaudible]. Seen the stories of Conga [inaudible], they have done exceedingly well. Within three years, that explosion is there. That is why I said there are something [inaudible] with Nigeria, which we are trying to study and we're trying to explore.

ABDALLA OMARI: Thank you. I think the gentlemen behind there.

CRAIG [NG]:   Hello. My name is Craig [Ng], actually Craig NG. I'm from Asia-Pacific Network Information Center, APNIC. This is unrelated to my work. Do you know how many people there are in Malaysia or in Hong Kong with the survey NG? I have been trying to register Craig dot NG for a while, and I might come and see you after this.

This is a big marketing opportunity. [LAUGHTER AND APPLAUSE]

SEGUN AKANO: Thank you so much for that. And it's so interesting that we have people from [inaudible], from India, from Asia, who are registering dot NG. It's so amazing. And that's why we have that story of hope, that fairly soon we'll be talking of [inaudible], that would not just be 60,000 or so today, but like in millions. Thank you so much. Continue [inaudible]. Thank you.

ABDALLA OMARI: Any last question to… I think Irina has questions? Dot RU. Okay. Irina, you're lucky. Oh, no you're not.

SEGUN AKANO: Okay, I just wanted to…. Segun from dot NG ccTLD. I just wanted to add a word to what Craig said, that there are opportunities for every ccTLD when you look at the market internationally. I was just sharing with some colleagues yesterday, that practically all of [inaudible] names, I am [inaudible] from Nigeria. For practically all of [inaudible] names end with K, Adhikari, [inaudible]… Which is dot KE. So dot KE has a huge market in Nigeria. And I think we should explore subcultures in each countries of the world, we might find such [inaudible] there. Thank you.

ABDALLA OMARI: Thank you for the highlights on the market in Nigeria for the [LAUGHTER].

Okay. I can't see any questions. We've got a request for participants to clap for the panel. [APPLAUSE]

And thank you.

BARRACK OTIENO: Thank you Abdalla. Moving on swiftly, we are having the regional organizations update. So I request the regional managers for LACTLD, APTLD, and CENTR to join me on the stage.

If we can have the slides up.

Okay. So we're going to start with an update from CENTR. Peter, you have the floor.

PETER VAN ROSTE: Hi again everyone. Quick update on CENTR. I selected three topics that I just wanted to share with you, based on the fact that they might be interesting for your region, for the CENTR members I hope they do not come as a surprise or anything new.

First thing I want to talk about is we're stepping up our interaction cooperation with registrars. For years, we've had, I think within CENTR, the idea that within our regional

organization, we could discuss registrar issues, sporadically inviting them to some of our working groups. But we've never had, on an equal basis, an interaction with them.

And for the last two years, we've had registrar days. The first one was very nice, but I think most of us got the idea that we travel back home, and we probably extend a bit the number of registrars in our address books, but that was about it. Last year, we were committed before the meeting to make sure that we would come out with tangible results from that meeting, and making sure that we come up with a couple of proposals that make life, both for registrars and ccTLDs much easier.

A quick check with registrars revealed that they have a couple of priority issues on their frustration list. And the first one was the confusion on EPP. Most of the ccTLD registries have implemented EPP, but they've always a flavor that suits their own policy. Obviously because the policy requires specific elements to be added to the information that is shared with the registrars during the registration process, etc.

So we started creating a table. We're currently working, both from a technical perspective and also from an administrative perspective, on that table. And the group that is doing the work consists of both registries and registrars. So that's pretty new.

I'll keep you posted on how this work develops, but it will… The first results should be available somewhere mid-this year. Second thing, similar approach, similar problem. Registrars find it incredible difficult to understand with which registries they can get accreditations. That information is available, but it's available in different languages, it's all over the place, there is no consistency where they find it in terms of addressing, etc.

So we are building a matrix where every single registry will, and has already, most of the work has already been done. Is completing a list of questions. On the models, on the pre-payment, on the nationality of the registrar, etc. This is about the registrar accreditation. It does not go into detail on the registrant aspects of the ccTLD policy.

These are two examples. The third one, which I don't have any visuals, is that we're looking at the data sets that we can share between registries and registrars to better understand market and market potential. Which brings me to the second point that I wanted to share. We are running a market study. It's based on existing studies of members.

Most of our members had done some sort of market study, and there is not that much consistency between those studies. And by pulling them together, analyzing them, and identifying gaps, we're actually pretty confident that the end result will be

something that, those that contribute because it's a contributors based only project, those that will contribute will benefit significantly.

My last point on my updates, we have a new Board. At least three of the five CENTR member, CENTR Board members are new to the Board. Both [inaudible] and [inaudible], are not new faces to you. They've been around in this community for a while. [Inaudible] who is here, present in the ccNSO, is also a familiar face. Elizabeth is a lawyer from Sweden who is going into her second year at the CENTR Board.

And Pierre [inaudible] from AFNIC joined us just now as a council member. And they still look very happy on the picture, so I'll make sure that it stays like that. Thank you.

BARRACK OTIENO: Thank you Peter. Any questions to Peter? There is one question at the back, if we may please have the microphone.

ANDREAS: Andreas from dot [TE?]. Peter, so just a quick remark to the EPP group, which was formed. So we brought this topic up with our technical advisory board, and they were very neutral to this thing. They said, we have implemented already a couple of, or most of the EPP protocols already. So they were not such in

favor. But I know on the other hand we have two big registrars who joined the group. So, basically we don't know if it's a good step or not. So I think there is a 50/50 view on this in our registrar base. Just as a remark.

PETER VAN ROSTE: Thanks Andreas. That reminds me of something very important actually in this exercise. This is… The intention is not to harmonize the EPP implementations across all CENTR members. It's to provide the registrars with an interpretation tool that will help them actually identify how and if they should comply with which EPP extensions in case they want to engage in EPP relations with a specific registry.

So it will translate, it will translate some of the EPP codes into, well, probably clear text, in this matrix. So that helps them to interpret whether through similarities with what they're doing with those registries. It's a tool that should help remove the friction from the EPP platform, rather than any intent to harmonize.

In case registries would review their EPP implementation, or there is a next version, their moving, they might find it helpful in finding out what the most common interpretation is of those EPP extensions. So it could be used in the long term for

synchronization purposes by individual ccs, but at the moment, that is definitely not part of the plan. Thanks.

BARRACK OTIENO: Thank you. Any other question? No question? Moving on. Next presentation. Thank you. The next presentation is from the African region. Next slide please.

So that's just a brief introduction on AFTLD, the association of country code top level domains organization from the African continent, of which I am the manager. Next slide please.

So if you could blow it up a bit. Oh okay. That's fine. Seems we can't have a better picture than that. So we have our Board members in the midst of us. We have [inaudible], the Chairman, I think he's just stepped out briefly. We have [inaudible], whom I can see right in the mists there.

We have Abibu Rashid Ntahigiye from TZ NIC, who was doing the presentation early in the morning. We have Tarek [inaudible] and Alex [inaudible] as well. I think Tarek was somewhere in the room in the morning. Next. So some key projects in 2016, from fourth to sixth March, just before the ICANN meeting, we have the fourth African domain name system forum.

The theme was strengthening partnerships for the development of the African domain name industry. So basically this is a forum

that we've been running for the last three years, starting with the ICANN meeting that was in Durban. And we try to bring together registries, registrars, registrants, and basically all the stakeholders in the DNS ecosystem in Africa to forge a common way of building the industry, or developing the industry.

So we had 100 participants from 28 countries. And I'm happy to report that my colleagues from the regional organizations formed part of the panel, because we discussed some issues that were cross cutting, as I am going to show in my next slides, across the various regions.

The forum was hosted by dot [MA], that is the Moroccan registry, and it was organized in partnership with the Internet Society and in ICANN. Going forward, we have the African Internet summit that is coming up towards the end of May and the beginning of June 2016, in [inaudible] Botswana.

And I would like to take this opportunity to invite you to participate in the African Internet Summit. Basically it brings together all of the key [inaudible] organization that is African organizations that have interest in the Internet ecosystem, to look at how we can build the Internet industry on the African continent.

So AFTLD is going to be running an advanced registry operator's course from May 30th to 6th June, just before the African Internet

Summit. Later on in the year, we shall be having an initial and secure registry operator's course, to be held in Senegal at the end of the year.

We're also planning to have a trainer program. We have had a lot of capacity building challenges, which we are slowly resolving. And part of the approach we've used is to develop a critical mass of trainers within the continent, so that we don't rely so much on ICANN for expertise.

And I'm happy that the better part of last year, most of our trainings have been done by trainers from the region. And ICANN in partnership with some of the other regional organizations, we are working on training the trainers program, that will help to transform more of this knowledge and capacity within our regions.

Next. So some observations. From the African region, I just split them up into three areas. One of them is governance. I think we are seeing an increasing interest in governments in ccTLD business. And by that, I mean regulators seeking to play a more prominent role within the ccTLD ecosystem. I suppose this is not very strange in the other regions.

In terms of technology, we've seen tremendous adoption of technology in various countries on the African continent. Majority of the registries are now automated, and they're

running systems that support EPP. One of the challenges we are facing, which has been alluded to by previous presenters from the region, is the issue of numbers.

Most of the registries are still small, but we are working towards building a critical mass. And these are some of the issues that are discussing in the DNS forum. And then, very few registries have deployed DNSSEC. If you go to that link, DNSSEC Africa dot ORG, you'll be able to see statistics on DNSSEC implementation, and adoption on the African continent. And just to note that some of the registries that have implemented DNSSEC, have had quite a bit of challenges, we're the same.

Which is something, again, we are trying to address within the community forums. So if you go to that website, you'll see that the unassigned ccTLDs are 41. The signed ccTLDs without a DS in the root zone are three, and then the signed ccTLDs with the DS in the root zone are 14.

The statistics are on that website that is maintained by ICANN. And during the African DNS forum, we received requests from the community to set up a registrar gateway and a payment gateway, because if you go to West Africa, you find a totally different payment regime from Southern Africa, and the same case applies to East Africa.

So it's difficult for the ICANN accredited registrars to buy domains across the region because of the different payment regimes. So we welcome any contribution from experts from the other regions who may have an idea on how to go about this issue. I'm sure this may not be an issue in other regions.

And then we still have an issue with data, collection of data statistics, but I'm working together with my colleagues in the regional organizations, to see how we can address this matter. Next.

Those are some of our partners including the Internet Society. That's it from me. And I open the floor, wearing the hat of the chair, to any questions if you may have or comments.

It seems I was clear. Moving on, next slide. Next presentation. Leonid.

LEONID TODOROV: Yes, hello, I swear I just wanted to, you know, to thank you. I just wanted to [inaudible] to follow up, but somehow that's my presentation. Sorry. No discrimination. Well hello everyone, I'm Leonid Todorov. I'm general manager of APTLD, Asian Pacific Top Level Domain Association, since February last year.

It was back in Singapore that they said it would be the most exciting journey for me, as for example, I took a special pride in

realizing that it takes four ICANN regional VPs to run these area, well I'm just by myself there, and I still take that pride.

I mean, I'm taking this seriously and when people back home ask me what I'm doing for life, I'm telling them, well just call me the emperor of the Asia Pacific Internet, just like that. And Mathieu Weill, by the way, he broke new ground. That's just for you to realize, by saluting me as your majesty.

Anyway, so just a very brief update on where we are, because that was quite a setting here for me and hopefully for the community. So where are we now? So we add five members, and the sixth one was added in January 2016. Again, I'm particularly proud that we've taken onboard such great Asia Pacific nations, as Ukraine and Belarus.

So as we see, we are approaching that milestone figure of 30 million domains in the region, and most members, although there is that further [inaudible] sensation that the region is pretty much about governments taking a leading role in whatever concerns the Internet, but still, most of our members are non for profits and nongovernmental organizations.

I must say that a very interesting aspect of our operation is that some nations and some ccTLDs are less exposed to, let's say, the Internet governance ecosystem and so much for ICANN, and those are in the central Asia. We do have and promote very

robust partnership with APNIC, which has been a very good, traditional partner for us, and we hold many events back to back with them.

We intensified, I hope so, be promoted corporation with the regional organizations, and I'm happy to let you know, I mean those of you who are in the rare, shall I say, in that ICANN initial language, cognizant of the fact that actually the four ROs have just entered, have just signed a memorandum of understanding to promote our corporation.

We also corporate intensively with ISOC Europe and ISOC Asia Pacific, and we have some fellows. I mean, we cosponsor some fellows to come for our meetings. And a very special project which we have just undertaken was actually a very long chain of communication.

So the government of [inaudible], who are not our member, so they communicated their request to ITU, to send an expert, to deploy an expert to deal with the local ccTLD, how to better structure and revamp its operations. So ITU suggested ICANN take that job, and ICANN delegated that mission to us, so it was a very interesting call for us.

And there were five experts surrounding, I mean, competing for that. You would imagine this is a very tough job. One had to stay 21 day in the [inaudible], sacrificing himself basically in very

severe conditions. You know? Just to work with the government of [inaudible] on this project.

So we hope that we would be able to replicate it because we have quite a number of the so-called land locked and least developed Pacific nations in the region, which are eligible for such kind of technical assistance sponsored by ITU.

Growth. Well we do understand that we all face these grim realities that the growth has slowed down, decelerated recently, and the median growth is, let's say, within the range of statistical adjustments. We do understand which factors can, well, might have contributed to that.

And we can see that basically that, well, with regard to China, especially, China's boon, on the domain market, it's hard to bring it to the common denominator in the region. Of course you can see, we have of 16 respondents, and you can see that figures vary dramatically from ccTLD, from one ccTLD to another.

A breakdown by the, let's say, types of ccTLDs. You can see that still new gTLDs account for a very small share of the market with, let's say, national, I mean country codes and legacy TLDs still holding nearly equal proportions of that, which is not accidental because we do understand that it's mostly China and India which gave rise to a number of new gTLDs.

So we don't see… So we haven't seen so far, any figures, competition on the part of new gTLDs. Price wise, of course, prices vary quite significantly, but the median price, it's slightly over 11 US dollars. We can see that, well, new gTLDs, as I said, are not that significant so far.

Their presence is not as significant, but we can still that pressure is mounting slowly. IDN and the universal acceptance are still very, very relevant issues because we do have a great number of small nations which face this challenge of being, let's say, illiterate, if I may so, or having a poor command of any foreign language.

For example, for China, and Russia, and the former Soviet space, Baltic states aside, I would say that the rate of the population, I mean the proportion of the population, that doesn't speak any foreign language is about 86%. So that's quite a number. So we have quite rigorous requirements in the number of, for a number of members as far as registrants are concerned.

So they should be local residence, like in the case of Nepal, this is an imperative. Of course, we have great disparity when it comes to capacity, whether technological or human, or even funding, you know. There are a lot of different ccTLDs, some very, very small, and some with very unique, as our friends presented here, with very unique, let's say, operational patterns.

That is it. Any questions?

BARRACK OTIENO: Thank you. Questions to Leonid? We're short on time, so going once. No. Moving on.

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: Thank you, I promise I'll be brief.   Thank you Leonid for providing an update on the Asia Pacific Top Level Domain market, that was very interesting. So I'm going to focus on some ongoing developments that LACTLD is currently undertaking. One of the most significant projects that we have at hand now is the implementation of the working groups.

This is a strategy that was… I mean, this was a project that was, is part of the current LACTLD strategy approved by at the last GA in October, that will run until 2018. And I know that this is, for example, a working practice in CENTR, but it really makes so much sense in a region as big and as expensive to travel as is Latin America, that we think that this is the way to go forward in terms of building internal capacity and engagement with our members, in significant work for the ccTLD community in the region.

So we developed tools for the working groups, terms of reference of how these working groups should consolidate and

work together. We call for chairs and vice-chairs, and then this is the current composition of the working groups we currently have in LACTLD. There is a legal working group, a marketing, a policy and a tech working group.

This reflects the kind of meetings and the topics of meetings we are, LACTLD has historically and still embarks on an annual basis. And as I said before, the fact that we, many members only just meet with their peers once a year, it means that the opportunities for actually sort of cooperation and collaboration in significant work is limited, and we don't want to think of a LACTLD just as a place where meetings are held.

So the working group proposals have a framework of two years. This means that in 2018 the working group chairs and their mission and objectives will be renewed or revised.   And currently, they have to propose, the working groups are all working on the definition of their proposals.   They have to submit them next Friday.

But the technical working group is actually sort of making a good progress in terms of defining what its objectives are, and this is, for example, this is how it looks, this is how the working group spaces have been setup for these different, these four working groups to engage with.

This is the Wiki group setup for the technical working group, and so it's following, I mean, the other practices in other organizations, preferably even the GAC, etc. where they all engage in kind of Wiki kind of environments. Here we have kind of the, a very collaborative space, which is restricted to this working groups.

We are talking about working groups that have six to nine members, at the most. So we are talking about reduced numbers of people, but who are engaging on significant work that shows outputs, concrete outputs and outcomes for the other, the larger LACTLD community.

The other piece of news is that in January, after four months of work, we finally got the proposal signed with ICANN between these four organizations that you see here, LACTLD is one, [inaudible] is another, inter communications and [inaudible], to conduct DNS marketplace study in Latin America and the Caribbean.

This study is very much part of the legacy of what was accomplished with the Middle East report, which was presented yesterday. And we are working on collecting data and the first draft for public comments will come out approximately late June, probably, and the final report will be submitted around September.

So we hope to show some of these advances and progress in the coming months. And of course, the final reports and we welcome any comments from this community when the drafts are setup for public comments. And this is what our meeting calendar looks like for 2016. This will be available also at the ccNSO website.

I mean, if you want to have more information about this, but we are meeting in… LACTLD is having its first policy meeting in GA in Havana, in the first week of May. We wanted Goran and Fadi to come to this meeting because it's also part of a LACNIC 25 meeting, etc., but apparently it's not very politically correct for the ICANN CEO to come to the Latin American region in the first country… To arrive to is Cuba these days, so yeah. This is [inaudible].

It would have been nice, but we understand that this is very difficult. And so we're having a tech meeting on the third edition of the LAC DNS forum, which LACTLD is a co-organizer on the week of, the last week of August. We're organizing a joint meeting with CENTR and PIR in DC, and finally, well, a GA and marketing meeting in Puerto Rico.

And the final piece of news is that we are having a new general manager in LACTLD, from the first of April. I will be in LACTLD until the end of this month, and this is [inaudible]. Some of you

might know him. He usually comes to ICANN meetings. He works for, he used to work for LACNIC until yesterday.

He was external relations manager. He's very much involved in Internet governance issues, so maybe you know him. He will be joining this community next week. And I will be stepping down at the end of the month.

It has been wonderful working with you and I hope to see you around. Thank you.

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: I must say that [APPLAUSE]. Thank you. I must say that we are devastated. I mean, [inaudible] was our star, and now we're left, I mean, [inaudible] I mean, of course, it's good to be like four Musketeers, but at the same time, what about gender balance? So I mean, you know, this is terrible.

BARRACK OTIENO: Thank you. Any question or comment from the floor? Going once. Okay. So I think on behalf of my colleagues, I'll just request that we give a standing ovation to [inaudible]. [APPLAUSE]

Thank you very much. And with that, I bring a close to this panel so that we may move on to the next item. Thank you for paying attention to us.

BECKY BURR: Okay. Welcome. I know this is the PDP you've all been waiting for. As you know, the ccNSO has done incredible work on understanding exactly where we are with respect to policy and implementing rules for RFC 15 91. Our work commenced, I think, in 2006, 2009, with a delegation and re-delegation working group, that did an exhaustive study of incidents of transfers and changes in delegations of ccTLDs.

And really thoroughly analyzed that work to understand where we needed clearer procedures, the extent of which IANA was complying with RFC 15 91, which of course is the policy that governs this process. That was followed in 2011, was that right? With the framework of interpretation working group, which resulted in the framework of interpretation, which was designed to breathe depth into RFC 15 91 and help IANA understand how to give life to that policy.

The framework of interpretation report was adopted by the ccNSO. It was also adopted by the ICANN Board. And we are in implementation on the framework of interpretation at this time working with IANA. But we did identify a couple of issues for

further policy development work. One, the framework of interpretation working group report acknowledged that there is really nothing in RFC 15 91 that helps us understand what to do with regard to retirement of ccTLDs when ISOC 31 66 dash one codes become obsoleted when new and/or are changed.

And that has been an issue that cries out for work and understanding from the ccNSO, which was the source of policy in this area for the ICANN, in the ICANN context. We also noted that RFC 15 91 describes a dispute resolution mechanism, but that dispute resolution mechanism has never existed, and so, and the working group report agreed that such an appeal mechanism needed to be in place, but that policy would need to be developed by the ccNSO, again, to address that issue.

The issue also came up in the context of the cross community working group on accountability, which did address issues of independent review and appeal through the enhanced IRP. And when we as a group came together, we elected to say that issues relating to the delegation, revocation and transfer of ccTLDs would not be within the remit of the enhanced IRP, at least or unless this community, through policy development, determined that some form of IRP should be available.

So we have these two policy development areas that are squarely within our remit as the policy development

organization for ccNSOs, and with a huge amount of really helpful background, I'm sure that we have no ever been, no organization has been more prepared in terms of understanding what the environment looks like out there, as we move into the policy development phase of this.

We wanted to raise, come to you to talk about commencing the policy development process. There are several important questions that we bring to the community to answer as we begin to launch this. So I'm going to turn over the presentation to Bart, who is going to walk us through sort of the steps and the issues that we need to decide as a preliminary matter.

BART: Thank you Becky. And you haven't fallen asleep during this part, the previous part of the presentation, you will definitely do now. Let me first…

BECK BURR: At your peril.

BART: Let me first go back and give you a very, very high level overview of the policy development process itself. Until now, as you know, we've only run two policy development processes. One was in

2005, and the other one was started in 2007 and is still ongoing, because we are waiting a Board vote, but that's deliberate. So from that there is a little institutional knowledge about the policy development process itself.

So, effectively you could stage a policy development process in three different stages. So it's more or less the start, and it starts with a ccNSO council decision to appoint an election manager, and to effectively initiate the process. And as part of the initial phase, you could say there needs to be a description of issues, assessment of timelines.

A formal assessment whether the issues are in the scope of the ccNSO, etc. And based on that, there will be an issues report, and the council will decide whether or not to launch a ccNSO PDP. The second stage, and with this is the real stage what matters, is where the policy recommendations will be developed.

And it starts with an interim report which builds on the issues report, with some preliminary recommendations, analysis of issues, etc. and this will be put to a public comment. This is no big deal. And then it ends with a final report. That is the most minimal way of doing it. And then the third phase, is effectively the decision making phase of a ccNSO PDP. And it starts again with the final report that comes out and is proposed in that,

from coming out of the stage two, and then the first to raise a council adoption. What makes a ccNSO PDP very particular is, after the council has adopted the final report, then it is the members of the ccNSO members, who will vote on this final report.

And that in itself, as you will see, maybe a bit of an issue, and then you end with the submission of the Board report. Now in the rest of this presentation, I will go into different ways of organizing the two topics, or the PDPs for the two topics, and how to set it up.

As you will see, a PDP is, and these are just assumptions, the main, the duration of a PDP is mainly determined what I've just called stage two. At its minimum, at its real bare minimum, it will take six months.   But this is, given the topics, it is very unrealistic.   It includes two rounds of public comments of 40 days, analysis of issues and development of recommendations. So if you do the calculations, it means you've got 80 days to do the analysis, and develop the recommendations.

The longer that part takes, the longer stage two will take, the longer the whole PDP will take. The second, or the third stage, includes the member's vote, as I said. And this, again, can take three to four months depending on how much members will vote in the initial voting round.

We have the, unfortunately the experience that, on the IDN PDP, the member's vote was not quorum, meaning that less than half of the membership did not vote, did not do anything. That meant that there needed to be a second round of voting, which and with, again, a minimum period in between.

So you can see, even if the members or the decision making process, and that's why I called it a stage three, can take two to four months in itself, just the decision making. Okay. The assumptions. Before I go into the working method, the review mechanism, as Becky just mentioned, is partly dependent upon the output of the second topic, because as you, Becky mentioned it, the review mechanism as included in the CCWG, is on decisions around delegation, replication, and transfer, but I think it is not logical to exclude retirement, because these decisions need to be, on the whole, set of decisions around ccTLDs.

If you start including retirement, it means the second topic, the review mechanism, is dependent on the outcome of the recommendations on retirement, because you want to know what is the recommendation, or the review mechanism about. Okay. So that's the first assumption.

The second assumption is that the PDP will be organized using working groups, that is the regular method that the ccNSO

undertakes its work. According to the bylaws, there is an alternative setting up a taskforce, but that comes, nobody has experiences with taskforce, etc. but this comes with certain requirements, etc., but it's the most flexible way of doing it.

So we will be using working groups as Becky said. And another assumption, and I think that's something for the community to take, it's a concern in that sense, in a very, I think for the community, very relevant, the pool of volunteers with the expertise knowledge, availability, etc. is very limited, especially now into the implementation phase, etc. of the two processes again.

And you should, if you want to participate, I think one of the requirements is at least a deep understanding of the delegation and re-delegation working group activities and reports, but also of the FOY and what it contains, in RFC 50 92. So this is, as Becky said, I think this is the final building block for all of the policies, and therefore of huge relevancy of all four ccTLDs.

So it's not a frivolous activity. So based on these assumptions, based on what we know around the PDPs, I will put two different methods in front of you, and this is where we want to seek your feedback. Effectively, what we've been discussing at the council level is either organize it as a single PDP, or organizing as two separate PDPs.

There are advantages and disadvantages to both methods, but if you organize it as a single PDP, it means you need to charge two working groups, one for the retirement and the other one to do the review, to develop the review mechanism. The working groups will develop the recommendations and that will, etc. Working group one is around retirement, working group two is about the development of the review mechanism, as I said.

And the total package will be subject to member's vote. Now what is important to understand, I think is working group two, the one on the review mechanism is dependent on the output of working group one. So effectively you will gain maybe one or two or three months, but that's it. It will be around the time of the final report that you can kick off with working group two to start working and develop the review mechanism.

The second method is two PDPs, so launch two PDPs, PDP on retirement, one working group. Launch this one first again for the same reason, the output of this one needs to be incorporated and needs to be a starting point for the review mechanism, in order to understand it.

And so and the second PDP on the review mechanism, yeah, will start at the adoption of the final report because… And the reason for including it as adoption of the final report by the members is at that time, you will have a stable document.

I think you don't want to go through the exercise. That stuff can still change, and that was the reason for the interdependency, you do not want to start discussing matters if there are still issues on the table. So that is, more or less, the two methods that were deliberated and represented to the council. And for the first time this week, it is time to show your cards.

BECKY BURR: Can I say just, if we have time, just have a brief discussion about whether people think one or two… Yeah. So I think, rather than hitting you cold because I think the implications are little complicated, let's just have a little discussion about what people think is the best way to proceed, and what order we would use also, because we do have some choices.

Do we do retirement first? Do we do the dispute resolution first? What's the best way to go?

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: Thank you. Okay. Sorry Alan. Okay, I miss something. I don't have very clear the differences between the two matters that are in the proposal, or it could be important if your remark the most important differences between one and the second matter, please, thank you.

BART: I think, ultimately, the real difference is the members vote on a package of the retirement, and the review mechanism, or they felt on one of the two. And you gain time if you would use method two. So the disadvantage of method one, is that you vote on a total package. And the second one is, you lose time. Because you have to wait longer. You have to charter again and you start a little bit later, but there is overlap a little bit.

You can play around with it in time, but that's the major, major difference, and another one, and that's another reason for doing it sequentially, is as I said, the limited pool of people available for doing this. You need to have in-depth knowledge of what you are doing.

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: Okay, maybe I can go now. Becky, as we all know, the CCWG is developing an IRP for ICANN At-Large, and certainly hopefully there will be a considerable amount of learning through that process, which may be transferable to what we may be doing. Could you remind me of what the timing is of that? And when that is expected to be completed? Because I think that could impact our decision. Thank you.

BECKY BURR: So, very shortly, we have an IRP implementation working group in the CCWG, which will begin very shortly, working on the bylaws for that, and then turn to the operating principles and procedures and look at the tender for panelists for it. I would expect that bylaws will be done quite soon, but that the full implementation could take, certainly, through the rest of this year.

The ccNSO certainly has the option to use that standing panel, but I don't think that the standard of review that's available through the ccNSO, which is about bylaws violation, I'm not sure. We would have to have a substantive discussion, whether that is the standard of review. And so, you know, there is work that that would, even if we elected to use that panel for it, we still have to do the work to figure out what the standard of review against that is.

But realistically, when would it be available in its fully formed capacity? Not until next year, probably. Although, either of these PDPs will take longer than that.

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: There is a remote question.

EN

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: Does this work? Yeah. So there is a question from David [inaudible] from VeriSign. "Becky, Bart, could you just give a bit more information on dependency of review process on retirement issue?"

BECKY BURR: Well, I don't… The policy work is clearly not dependent. We could come up with policy for retirement, so we could clearly do the retirement PDP first. The question that we have with respect to the retirement, is the same question that we would have with respect to delegation, revocation, and transfer. Was it done properly? And if somebody wants to contest that, where do they go? So, we would not be in a change position, because right now, we know what the policy on delegation, revocation, and transfer is.

But we don't have an independent review mechanism, although there may be, you know, regular review mechanisms out there available. We don't have a sort of fit for purpose, or single purpose, review process. So I do not, ultimately, the full implementation might, of a retirement policy, might need an independent review process to enforce it, but that independent review process doesn't have to be in place to develop the policy.

So I think we could go in, I think we could do it in either order. You have a view?

BART: I'm more that you want to have, say, one building block in place, especially if you want to include it as part of the review mechanism. You don't need to wait, in my view, until it's concluded, but you want to know what the policy around retirement looks like before you start developing the review mechanism.

You could argue, okay, we could start with the review mechanism around the delegation, revocation, transfer first because we know how it looks, although say, the FOI is not implemented yet, but that will be a starting point. But then you have to start partway through because you need to pull in the retirement bit.

BECKY BURR: Okay, so Bart has persuaded me. Before we finalize our review mechanism, we need a policy on retirement, because otherwise we will not know what the standard that the independent review is going to apply. He just got his law degree. Jordyn.

JORDAN: I didn't just get my law degree.

BECKY BURR: No, I was talking about Bart.

JORDAN: Jordan [inaudible] dot NZ. Becky, what's your advice to us on this? What do you think we should do?

BECKY BURR: So my advice is that we should do the retirement first and then move to the review. I'm not sure that it's necessary to have two PDPs to do it. My guess is that we will have the usual suspects who have devoted the last six years, eight years, of their life. I'm sorry, Bernie, I'm not looking at you. Really.

Deeply committed to this, and so whether we had one PDP, and then in the middle we called for, you know, if there are any additional volunteers who want to come in or whatever, we could do it that way.

So we could certainly… Having one PDP simply provides efficiencies in terms… One PDP in which the issues are addressed sequentially, give us some efficiencies in terms of the chartering work, the issues development work. And there are some synergies there. So I think that's the easiest way to proceed.

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: My question was mostly answered already, but just to summarize. If the option of having two separate PDPs was chosen, theoretically we could start with a second PDP even before the first one is finished. But of course, second one can, I understand second one cannot be finished before the first one is.

BECKY BURR: Correct.

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: I'm not all that convinced that we have to know every detail of how retirements will be done before we can design a review mechanism. I feel that the issue that's being reviewed should be like a parameter for that. And say, there is a review panel, that review panel will be, for instance, checking that the process has been followed.

Whatever that process is, it doesn't need to be known in advance before we can say that it will reveal if the policies have been followed. Okay? And if that is true, that gives us more freedom in the order.

We can do them in parallel, or one before the other, and if it is one before the other, I would recommend that we do review first. I feel it is much more urgent. We need to have a

mechanism for there to be due process, so the positions about revocation, for instance, are half an instance where they can be reviewed.

We don't have that now, it's something that we need urgently. I don't think retirement is all that urgent. We can live for some time without retirement policy. But I feel that we do need now a policy for reviewing decisions on ccTLD delegations.

BECKY BURR: Okay. So that's an alternative view, and I think that [inaudible] is right. It is almost certainly true that what will be reviewed is whether, whatever happened was faithful, both to that policy and the processes that are developed, whatever those are. So at some sense, when you're developing, you're designing, you know, a test for that, you don't have to know exactly what the policies and processes are, although there are some standing issues that the margins, that I think, and some other issues that can't be finally resolved until you have it in place.

So it's not 100% dependency, that is clearly right. And I guess the question is, there is a question about urgency in the community. RFC 51 91 has provided for an appeals mechanism, for a really long time, that hasn't existed and so the question is, how urgent is it that we have it? There is also, you know, there are also some questions about, or some considerations that I

would think is about, what's going to be harder? Where do we get momentum?

Is the retirement policy something that we can make some headway in while the CCWG IRP is moving along? And then we can see as we get further down that road, whether that's going to be a vehicle that, with our own, you know, standing we can use that, or whether we need a separate vehicle, I certainly hope that at least there will be a choice for us to use something that's existing, but it may not be but for purpose.

So again, these are hard questions. They are very hard questions. I do think that probably retirement is going to be easier. Do I think that's right? I think that the retirement… Building on all of the work that we've done on delegation, revocation, transfer, that that piece of the puzzle is going to be a little easier. But I agree, it's not, you could do it the other way around.

BART: Maybe in addition to what [inaudible] said, one of the reasons also, and that's the risk of doing it in parallel, is there is a limited number of people within our community, who are able and willing, and available to do this, also given the other workload. And say, being one of the main staff support people, that's a

major concern I have, because that will drag out the whole process for quite some time.

So that's also something that needs to be taken into consideration.

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: So [inaudible], dot NZ. I just want to loan my support to [inaudible] comments. I think we are discussing accountability in everything at the moment, and I think having a review process, and finalizing and finishing the work of the [inaudible] is absolutely key and a key priority.

And I recognize what you're saying but about work load in two parallel streams, but I would like to think that the work on the retirements could be done complimentary in parallel to the work on the review, but I would hate to defer and delay starting the review process until that's all done and dusted.

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: So maybe based on what you just said, maybe there is an alternative, but then it's getting really into the weeds. You should do the review mechanism first on delegation, revocation, and transfer, stop. Pass that through, and then revisit it once you've done the retirement.

That's the whole thing. You expect, but that's the assumption, and you don't know. Retirement has some really weird issues.

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: I have some concerns about setting up two different groups as outlined in method one, because in the FOI, we set off in one direction, and shortly into the process, basically how we thought we were going to proceed, we basically turned that out on its head. And if you've got two different groups working on this, this could cause some problems.

Whereas with method two, if you have one group within that group, you have the flexibility to go, well what we thought the way we were going to go isn't going to work, so let's do this other way.

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: Maybe just for clarity, I fully agree. And the reason for creating working group one, working group two, was the assumption it would be sequential. So you charter the two working groups, you do not start work on say working group one could be developing the review mechanism. And that will develop its own methodology, etc. and these people are in working group one, could also be on working group two, and this charter, etc. would be instructed in the same way.

But if you really, if you run in parallel, then you run that risk. If you do it sequentially, that this, that risk is less. If not completely null, because then it's completely focused on either retirement or on review.

BECKY BURR: The other issue about this is, the people who are going to care about one of these issues are going to care about both of these issues. So, you know, we have to facilitate participation in both of these. And having two separate parallel working groups, I think, would really strain volunteer resources.

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: So I would just like to… I want to acknowledge what [inaudible] said that if we were looking at this solely on the basis of urgency, then I would agree with him doing the review mechanism should be done first, but I think at the same time, we have to look at the longer term. And to the extent that we can have an opportunity to see what the more general mechanism looks like, and if there is an opportunity for us to effectively take that and abridge it, I think in the long run we as community will be better served, because there is a likelihood to be more use of the general community one before our own, so that will allow people to understand how it works.

So from that point view, and certainly it might save us a bit of work. So from that point of view of practicality, I would favor starting with retirement. Thanks.

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: [Inaudible]. Starting with the review, I suppose part of it is what exactly do you actually want from this meeting? Are you after the meeting to try to come up… Because from what [inaudible] that's going to be quite complex. I actually don't mind the sequential thing, but I would probably almost start with the review, you see [inaudible] and then go back after you've done the retirements, kind of review where that mechanism is appropriate for that as well.

I just say, if you look at volumes and where the most likely impact is what the community really needs by way of what's most likely will be used, I would have thought it would be the review going through.

BECKY BURR: So here is what I think we want a sense of from the room, is a sense of whether there should be one or two PDPs, and if two, whether they should be parallel or sequential. And then a sense of sequencing which one first. Now these will be just a sense of the room to inform the work, because as the slide that Bart put

up, there are a whole bunches of steps that have to be gone through in terms of issue reports and all of that kind of stuff.

And so this sense of where the community is would feed into that, but it may be as staff is developing the issue report, that it becomes clear that there is a reason to do one or the other. But this is basically an advisory sense of the room to go back to staff to think about and counsel as they're putting together the next steps, which is the issues report and the like.

Starting the whole process. So let's… Can I see… Let's see green cards for one PDP and yellow cards for two PDPs. Are you color blind [inaudible]?

Red yellow color blind.

Okay, it seems to be one and then we've got a joker in the back.

Okay, another green card. So the general sense is one, but there is some support for two. Okay. If it's two, should it be parallel or sequential? Green for parallel, no I'm going to take that back because I think that doesn't make sense. Green for sequential and yellow for parallel.

Okay, pretty strong support for sequential, and some views on parallel. Okay. People who are voting for parallel, have just volunteered to give up their nights and weekends for the next three years.

Okay. And then…

Right, and so now the next question is sequencing. Review versus retirement first. Let's do retirement as green and review as yellow.

We can do it in parallel, because you know, I can see the difference between yellow and green Bernie. Woah, this is really interesting because there is like, it's pretty, you know, we flipped.

No, no, wait. I said retirement is green and review is yellow. And so I think that there are more yellows here. Okay, okay.

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: …a small minority for review first.

BECKY BURR: A small majority, okay. Yeah, okay. He has confused me. But yes [inaudible]…

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: The model you mentioned, Bart, about the third method. I think that the question we asked here, I'm not sure if we weren't quite confused, a lot of us. So it's kind of difficult, but you said, and a follow up on what Debbie said, that to start with review of the

thing we already had worked with on delegation, re-delegation, all of these things, that's so important for us.

And then go to the retirement, and then if we miss something in the review, we have to go back again afterwards to amend it. Then perhaps that will be the right way to go through it.

BECKY BURR: Great. I think that was the question I was asking and my sense is that that was, there was more support for that approach.

BART: This makes life a bit easier to see where the support of the community is for launching the whole PDP process. So thank you very much.

I think we have run into your lunchtime. It's 10 minutes until one. So you have 40 minutes before the really interesting part starts. Love to all the transition process. So you back at 1:30. Thank you.

BECKY BURR: Thank you.

LISE FUHR: Okay, hello everyone. Let's get started. It's actually 35 minutes past the hour. This is going to be a session about the IANA stewardship transition. And actually that's not the correct way to describe it, because the last presenters are going to talk about the accountability part. So it's going to be both the IANA stewardship transition, but also a little review of the accountability time plan.

And well, with this session we would like to provide you an overview of the different faces in the actual implementation of the IANA stewardship transition. We have ICANN staff with us. I know Akram is on his way. And Mathieu is also on his way, I hope, or he's here already, we'll see.

And we also have the two members of our group that have been working on service level agreements, Jay and Patricio. So, well, the CWG co-chairs, we have as a part of the IANA stewardship transition actually, proposed a way to work with the implementation. I like just to give you a brief update on this, it's not planned for this session, but just to keep you in the loop.

In the CWG, we propose to have a small group that's actually working closely with the implementation team, and also with the ICANN Board on the implementation. And we propose this team to consist of the two co-chairs, and also of the design team leads. We had design teams in the CWG that were looking at

different issues, and those leads we would like to have as part of the implementation group that we will have.

This doesn't mean that we don't go back to the CWG with the proposals, but we just want to ensure that we're not delaying anything. So we have formed this group to work with Trang and Akram on this, and other good folks, in order to ensure that we have a close coordination of the implementation.

But you know the next coming months will be very, very busy working on the bylaws. So that's a lot of work that's going to be done there. But on the other side, we also need to be ready for all the other things that needs to happen and this is actually what this session is about. This is about, what do we need to do in relation to the different working groups?

So, well, I'll hand it over to Trang, and Akram when he gets here. And we also have David who will help us go through the different phases. The first one is going to be the actual implementation of the proposal, it's a process. And Trang asked me, should I be very detailed in this session? Or should I only give a brief overview?

And I actually chose a middle way, being Danish, so we're really pragmatic. So I ask for a semi-detailed presentation on the actual implementation. Thank you.

TRANG NGUYEN: Thank you Lise for the invitation to join you today, to give you an update on the various implementation planning work. In terms of implementation, from the very beginning when we started to look at what we're going to have to do, one of the things that we recognized was that we're going to have to do very regular reporting out of the community.

And so it was very important for us to understand what the reporting needs, what the community wanted to see, you know, from us, from a reporting perspective. So the materials that I'm sharing with you today is actually the materials that we have worked with the CWG on creating their input throughout the process help us to refine these documents over time to meet their reporting needs.

So this is the [inaudible] that we typically present to the CWG on their biweekly calls. And so that's what I will be going over today. The one thing, before we go into these materials, the one thing that I do want to note is that, in planning our implementation work, the one thing that we have to be very mindful of is our obligations under the current IANA contract.

And so to avoid any issues there, we do need to coordinate very closely with NTIA, in planning our work. So there is a constant balancing act of, you know, how much can we try to get done as

early as possible? And how much can we actually get done when? So that's a constant balancing act that we have to do, and to help with that, we do have regular check in with the NTIA to make sure that we're in synch with them and coordinate with them.

And we do share the same materials with the NTIA, when we have our regular check-ins with them.

So these are the dashboards that we typically use to present to the CWG on the biweekly calls. For those not familiar with these dashboards, what we have is the name of the project, in the table at the top, the name of the project, a brief description of the project, a planned completion date. A signal light status of red, yellow, or green.

And then the percentage completion. The middle part of the slide shows some select key dates for each of the projects. And the color coding for each of the bubbled that you see corresponds to the project that is on the table above. And then typically on the CWG calls, we would provide a project update, which covers activities that we've completed within the last two weeks.

And then upcoming activities, what we'll be working on in the next two weeks, and then any open items. So for the RZM [inaudible] project, what that project is, is the work relating to

updating the code changes in the RZMS in order to remove the NTIA authorization role, and to support parallel testing.

ICANN has deployed these codes changes on March 2nd. We're currently waiting for VeriSign to complete the changes to its system. Once VeriSign is done with those changes, the two parties will be doing integration testing, and then upon successful completion of integration testing, then we start parallel testing.

Parallel testing will be a 90 day period where the change requests will be processed in both the production system and the parallel system, and then comparisons will be posted on a daily basis. If there are no issues during the 90 day testing period, then parallel testing will have deemed to be have been completed successfully at the end of the 90 day. If there are issues that are identified during the 90 day testing, the testing will stop.

We'll investigate and fix the issue, and then the 90 day clock will start again. So we're currently on track to have, to start parallel testing in early April. The next projects is a names SLEs, and that has to do with the surface level expectations that the CWG has defined. And we're going to go into that a bit more later. So I just sort of give a high level overview in terms of timing and the work that's been done there.

In order to accommodate these new SLEs, we had to make code changes to the RZMS, and that has been done and deployed on March 2nd. So the next phase of the project will include starting to collect metric, now that we can collect them by the new SLEs [inaudible] some period of metric collection, and then using those metrics in order to set the service, the performance targets for PTI.

And then those performance targets will be incorporated into the ICANN PTI contract. Regarding RZM A which stands for root zone maintainer agreement, we are currently working with VeriSign to finalize that agreement. As you can see there, the signal light is red. And you see two dates provided up there. The top one was end of January, which was crossed out and then a new day was end of February.

For transparency purposes, you know, if we missed a date, a planned completion date, we do cross it out and then provide a new target date. So we actually now need to cross out that date, I just don't have a new date yet, because we've been in regular discussions with VeriSign this week.

So things are changing very rapidly. This next slide is on PTI. As you know, PTI is a new legal entity that will be formed to perform the naming functions. We had a discussion that we presented some materials, and the PTI have heard some

feedback from you on that. So this is part of the coordination effort that Lise mentioned earlier today, and that we're going to be trying to work with the CWG more closely in terms of planning the implementation of the PTI through this taskforce.

This slide shows four projects the IANA IPR [inaudible] and escalation processes. IANA IPR relates to the trademark, the IANA trademark as well as the IANA dot ORG domain. We have not started work on this project because we are still awaiting implementation requirements from the community. The three operational communities are working together to define, you know, what to do with the IANA IPR.

The current direction is that it will be moved to the IETF trust, and I believe the operational details are being worked out. [RZERC] stand for root zone evolution review committee. This is a new body that the CWG recommended be form to advise the ICANN Board on architectural and operational changes to the root zone.

And we've started very preliminary work on looking at what the charter for this [RZERC] would look like. So again, through this taskforce, that's been set up, we'll be working closely with the CWG on the details of that charter, and how to go ahead and get this committee formed.

CSC stands for customer standing committee. It is also another new body that the CWG had recommended be formed in order to monitor the performance of PTI. As opposed to the [RZERC], there is a fairly detailed charter for the CSC already included in the CWG proposal. So we're working off of that. And we'll also be coordinating with this, with the CWG taskforce to work out the details, implementation details.

Escalation processes refer to all of the operational IANA escalation processes such as the customer complaint process, and the problem resolution process. There are some updates to the documentation and tools that may be required in order to implement what's in the CWG proposal, but we expect that to be minor.

This slide shows four projects that we anticipate coming out of the CCWG proposal. The first one is the ICANN bylaws drafting. And let me see, one of the bubbles is not showing up correctly. But we're, just at the high level, showing that there is essentially a 90 day period whereby the bylaws have to be drafted, and adopted, and transmitted to NTIA, and it's essentially the 90 day review period that NTIA anticipates it will need to review the proposals. So that's what this is reflecting.

The other three projects, we will be… We have not blown out detailed project plans yet. We're waiting final language for the

CCWG proposal, as well as, I know we're going to have a discussion with Mathieu later on this session, with regards to how we will be working together doing implementation.

I think that's it for the update Lise.

LISE FUHR: Thank you Trang. It's really very detailed and I'd like this slide deck, because I think it's very informative. Any questions for Trang and the implementation?

They're all too tired after lunch. We have one. Thank you.

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: I notice that your planned completion dates for most of these items are the 15th of August, which suggests you're kind of running right up against the bitter end, so to speak. Can you comment on that?

TRANG NGUYEN: Yes, sorry about that. We initially had a 9/30 date because, that's because that's the day that the IANA contract is expected to be expired. We have to move that up to August 15th because NTIA has informed us that they need a final implementation report by the middle of August in order to review and get

confirmed around letting the IANA contract lapse at the end of September.

And many of our implementation side, even though it has a 8/15 date, we do try to get things done as early as possible, but there are some items that will probably be, you know, some minor items that will probably require us to go all the way to 8/15. So.

LISE FUHR: Any other questions? Go ahead, Akram.

AKRAM ATALLAH: A point of clarification. The 8/15. NTIA expects them to provide them an implementation report, saying that we finalize everything by 8/15. If things are not finalized, but we need a week or two, we could also put that in the report, but they wanted to have a guidance and have some time to review where we're going to be finished, and see if they can expect the contract to lapse on 9/30, or there needs to be an extension.

And that's why they need to have some time to make these decisions.

LISE FUHR:	Any other? No. We'll just move on to the next, and that's actually progress on the service level expectations. And that's not an agreement, because there is no agreement.
JAY DAILY:	Thank you Lise. So I'm Jay Daily from dot NZ. And along with Patricio here from [inaudible], the two of us were the ccNSO representatives on the design team set up to look at the SLEs. The other members of that were Elaine [inaudible] from Doughnut, Jeffrey [inaudible] from Right Side, Jeff Newman, now with [inaudible]. I think he changed jobs three times in the process or something. And Paul Caine from non-affiliated ccTLDs, who occasionally come to ccNSO meetings.

I believe that's your generic title. So, a brief outline of the SLA. There is already a SLA in place, for IANA, which was consulted and agreed with the department of US, with the NTIA. We have rewritten that to an entirely new way of measurement. The previous one had an end to end timing expectation for a change to take place, and that included within it the time it might take a ccTLD to do their element of the work.

We felt that there are two problems with that. Firstly, that it didn't reflect IANA performance. It reflected ccTLD performance as much as anything else. And secondly, it distorted the times there, because there can be notable delays caused by TLDs

taking a while to do their element of it. So we created a very different SLA, much more detailed than previous SLA.

It's still, in my view, a very light SLA compared to ones that I've worked with in the past, but it's now much more detailed. And then having agreed that, we've got to a stage where we understood the measures that we wanted to put in, but didn't have the data for those particular measures.

LISE FUHR: I don't think the presentation is… It's done, okay? No. You take it after the presentation, okay?

PATRICIO POBLETE: So as Jay was saying, part of the work of the [SOE?], we defined a number of metrics that were to be applied, but since those metrics are different from the ones that IANA was collecting before, although some were similar but it wasn't obvious how to translate from one to the other, and perhaps it wasn't even possible in some cases.

So to have the data at hand, to be able to set realistic targets, and which could be changed later, okay? But we decided that we should start with what's happening right now. And so we needed data to be collected, and that required IANA to make changes in their software, because they were collecting data

was not totally sufficient for these new metrics. So that's a process that took some time, and I understand that that's now finished. And in place, and that collection has began, okay?

When there is a sufficient amount of data, that will allow for some conclusions to be drawn, like averages, and medians, and 95%. So the report that we wrote, that has a number of blank spaces, now those blank spaces will be able to filled, and that will be the basis for the SLEs that will be in place at the beginning of this new period.

Later on, those could be refined and changed by the CSE, but this will give a starting point.

JAY DAILY: So just to finish off then, from the perspective of Patricio and I, there is no problem here. We have worked through a lot of issues. There are still some minor disagreements, but those are minor. And so we are pleased with the progress. We think there is a plan in place that will deliver this for transition, and we are comfortable with the progress that has taken place so far.

LISE FUHR: Thank you Jay. There is a question from, yeah, go ahead.

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: So it's a question for Lise. I see that the CCWG bylaws drafting is 10% along. Can you describe current state of bylaw drafting for the CWG required bylaws? That's a question from David [inaudible] from VeriSign.

LISE FUHR: Oh. That's on a little different issue then, okay. We'll just take a slight step on this. Well the bylaws drafting within the CWG is that we've had recently do a draft that was quite long and quite complex. The draft had a lot of questions that were in a long table. The CWG has answered all of those questions.

They have been sent to the implementation team to look at. Those, both the bylaws and the questions. And we're now in a process of actually finding out how to proceed, because we need to coordinate this with the bylaw drafting that's been done in the accountability group. Thank you.

Are there any questions regarding the service level agreements? Byron? I don't know… Anyone get a mic to Byron?

BYRON HOLLAND: Just picking up on Jay's comment. You said that the SLE was a lot thinner than you're typically used to. Anything you worried about in there? Anything you think is missing or should be

added in the not too distant future? Any concerns given the statement you made?

JAY DALEY: No. I think that there is, this is sufficient for what we need now. And as we learn with this, CSC can make a decision if they think it needs to go further, or needs to be tighter. But this is something new, and this is an unique area, and I think it would be a mistake to try to go further than this until we have evidence that this is needed.

LISE FUHR: I see [inaudible] has a question.

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: Thanks. To Jay, concerning the SLEs. How do we make sure that we could rise the SLE current state that has been agreed on, to probably a state which we seek or feel we would need in the forthcoming future?

JAY DALEY: Okay, so if you remember, there is a mechanism now. The customer standing committee, which is going to be formed of customers only. And I am basically, my view is that the problem is then pushed to them. They are the people who would have to,

through their own communities, assess whether the performance is satisfactory, whether there are further measures needed, and then take the responsibility for pushing those changes through on the SLE.

I think it's a good mechanism, it's well defined, and I'm happy to leave it to those people to do it.

LISE FUHR: Byron did you have a question or a comment?

BYRON HOLLAND: A question, either Jay or Patricio. On a design team, over the period of its work, there was certainly considerable discussion about the quality of data, the access to data, whether you had enough data. In fact, I gather a consultant was engaged to validate or audit the data. Are you satisfied with the outcome of that audit report and what you were provided with there?

PATRICIO POBLETE: Personally I just learned recently about that report that was commissioned, and we, well first of all I think this was a really good report. What was possible to do with the data, that was, that is available right now to the IANA, with their current procedures for collecting data.

It was also an exercise into seeing that using that all data, we could generate the necessary metrics for the new system. And in some cases it was possible, and in some cases it was not. Basically, that made it more evident that there was to be a face, totally new face of data collection, for the new metrics to be defined in their initial value. So as I understand it, no all data will be used for setting the values for the metrics, or it is going to be done with the new data collection, that just started. And with that, we run into timing issues, whether, one would want to have data running for a long time, so the numbers would be reliable.

And also, in case there are some events that occur not very often, have a sufficient number of those events happening, so you could draw solid conclusions. But on the other hand, there are deadlines approaching. So it seems that it will be possible to have three full months of data collected, and that's not ideal, but it seems that it's reasonable to define the initial values for the metrics.

LISE FUHR: Okay. Any other questions to the group in relation to service level expectations? No? Actually, I think we should thank this group because they have been doing a great job, and they've been working a lot. We look, tend to look at the CWG work, but

this is a piece of work that has taken many hours. And it's good, and I think we should applause them. [APPLAUSE]

Thank you. Okay. Well that went quick. We're proceeding very fast, but that's fine. The next is actually about what we, as ccNSO, need to do.

Yeah, sorry.

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: No, I think we covered it quite well. So there isn't a need for me to comment unless you have specific questions that I can answer.

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: Sorry. Could you explain about the ammonization? We left that off because we thought we would leave that to you.

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: Okay, sure, if you like. So, one of the issues that sort of, I guess, remains a bit outstanding is the question of the ammonization of the data. With the new SLEs, we're actually collecting very fine grained information. And in order to ensure that there is no leakage of information about TLD activities, external to IANA, which would be sort of in [inaudible] of traditional behaviors,

will be ammonizing the information that we receive, or that we generate within the logs.

That will obviously make it a bit more challenging for third parties to come in and sort of regenerate the same sort of statistics that we're gathering, but we felt that it was the most appropriate course of action because doing otherwise would sort of imply us doing policy on the fly instead of implementation.

It is probably a fair statement that if the community would like to have that data un-ammonized, if that's a word, that they'll probably need to do sort of a joint working group between the ccNSO and the GNSO, or something like that, to sort of identify the policy by which the data would be made available.

That's sort of the ground summary of the ammonization issue, unless you wanted to comment further.

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: If I could add to that then. We have two different sets of metrics within the SLA, one for gTLDs and one for ccTLDs. So we would be able to clearly see if there is any difference in the way that those two groups are handled. What we won't be able to see is whether ccTLDs that pay get a better or a different service from ccTLDs that do not pay.

Now, I do not believe that there is any evidence of that at all, but it has been said, and I personally feel that it would be useful to have the evidence to prove that that is not the case.

LISE FUHR: Okay. Any questions in relation to this? Because that's been quite an issue that's been discussed very much in the working group.

No? It doesn't look like it. Okay. Okay, well thank you for taking up the last issue too. Then we'll move on to the implementation that, or the preparations that the ccNSO needs to do. And Trang has also prepared a slide deck for this, so our presentation of this. So Trang, go ahead.

Sorry before we proceed, this is actually the table of the different committees that Bart sent out to you yesterday. So that was just to give you the full picture of this, and as it was said in the email, this has not been discussed with the CWG, but we found that it was good to give you the table to look at, to see the details. And now Trang will give you even more of a view presentation of the table. Thank you.

TRANG NGUYEN: Thank you Lise. So what we've tried to do here is summarize the various parts of the CWG proposal as it relates to action that the

ccNSO may have to take. And as Lise said, the document is a more detailed summary of this.

So this first table that we have for you here, basically lists all of the entities and reviews that are specified in the CWG proposal, that references participation from the ccNSO in some way, shape or form. So I just walk through these real quick at the high level, real quick, just to give you a description of what they are, and then we can go through each of them in more detail as it relates to what role the ccNSO may have.

The first thing that you see listed there is something that I mentioned before, is the customer standing committee. It's [inaudible] to monitor the performance of PTI, it is a standing committee. So that work will be ongoing. The second thing you see listed there is the root zone evolution review committee. That committee would advise the ICANN Board on architectural and operational changes to the root zone.

It's also a standing committee, so their work will be ongoing. And then the rest of the things on this slide are essentially reviews. The IANA function review will essentially be reviewing PTI's SOW and PTI's performance against that SOW, and could recommend changes to the SOW.

The review is periodic. The first review is to take place no later than two years after the date of the transition. And then, after

that, every five years. Next is a special IANA function review. As opposed to the last one, which is a scheduled periodic review, a special IANA function review is one that can be trigged under special circumstances, essentially it can be trigged when the CFC, through the normal processes, identified an issue that cannot be resolved through the normal escalation processes.

They can escalate that to the ccNSO and GNSO. And if the GNSO and ccNSO decide that they want to investigate that issue further, they triggering a special IANA function review, they can do that. The next item is a separation cross community working group. So through that process that I just mentioned, if the special IANA function review team, if their finding is that they want to recommend a separation, what they can recommend is that a separation cross community working group be formed in order to investigate that further.

And then the last three items under their reviews relating to the CFC. There is an envision that there will be a review of the CFC charter, that will be done one year after the first CFC meeting, and then after that, as needed. There is also a CFC effectiveness review that is planned two years after the first CFC meeting, and then every three years after that.

And that is to review the effectiveness of the CFC. And then lastly, as Jay mentioned earlier, the CFC can also opt to review

the performance target of PTI and change them as needed. So from everything that I just mentioned on the other slide, there are some items from those entities and reviews that needs to be done, for the transition. And there are some things that were ccNSO involvement is required on an ongoing basis.

So the way we structured this presentation is to show you what work is required for the transition, and then we'll go through and present to you what work would be required on an ongoing basis. So the work required for the transition is essentially three things. The initial appointment of the CFC members, approval of the entire composition of the CFC membership with the GNSO, and then also appointment of [RSARC] members. So those are the three things that the ccNSO would have to do for the transition.

And now I'm going to go through, sort of on an ongoing basis, where at the touch points with the ccNSO. As it relates to the customer standing committee, the touch points with the ccNSO would be around reappointment of memberships, of members due to either recall or expiration of a member's term.

It would also involve reviewing of CFC escalated issues on an ongoing basis, and decide whether to take further action in conjunction with the GNSO. And then as well as… The CFC will be briefing the GNSO and the ccNSO three times a year. It's sort

of envisioned that that could be at three ICANN meetings, but is expected that the ccNSO will be receiving regular briefings from the CFC.

I should have moved this slide up to the transition period, because this timing is essentially relevant to the initial appointment of the CFC membership. As you can see here, so you know what? I'm going to skip over and then I'm going to come back to these timing slides at the end.

For the [inaudible] evolution review committee, the touchpoints that the ccNSO is envisioned to have there is again, reappointment of members due to recall or expiration of term. And then may be other touchpoints as well based on what the charter of the [RSARC] will be, and that hasn't been drafted yet.

The IANA function review team is also, this is a review and it's a periodic review, so for the first one, it would occur no later than two years after the transition, and then after that every five years. It would involve appointment of members from the ccNSO, as well as non-ccNSO ccTLDs. And ultimately, approving whatever recommendation comes out of that review.

Same for special IFR. Also the appointment, the initial appointment of members from the ccNSO as well as non-ccNSO ccTLDs. And approving whatever recommendations come out of that review. And then, on the front end of that, obviously

reviewing the escalations from the CFC to determine whether or not a special IFR should be triggered.

Cross community working group is again just around the appointment of membership if there is a recommendation for a separation cross community working group to be formed. With regards to the CFC charter review, again it's the appointment of members to perform the review, and then approval of any recommended changes based on the review.

CFC effectiveness is well. This slightly differs from what there was not much detail in the CWG proposal with regards to what this review would look like. So the initial action from the ccNSO is anticipated to be determining maintenance for review, in conjunction of the GNSO. What kind of review would this be? What would it look like? Frequency, etc.

Service level targets. So for this one, at any point in time, the CFC may choose to review the service level targets, and make any changes as necessary. So if that decision is made, then it would be to ratify whatever changes that are proposed as part of that review process.

And then there is one more thing that we wanted to flag for you, which is paragraph 1106 of the CWG proposal. That paragraph talks about various accountability mechanisms. And item number six, in particular, of that paragraph talks about an

appeal mechanism, like a IRP that would be available to the direct customers of the naming functions.

And what it notes there is you can see highlighted in orange in the last sentence of this paragraph it says that an appeal mechanism will not cover, which is the IRP, will not cover issues relating to ccTLD delegation and re-delegation, which mechanism is to be developed by the ccTLD community post-transition. So that's another item that we wanted to flag for you.

LISE FUHR: Thank you Trang. I just want to say that in this table that was sent to you, under the CFC there were some minor glitch or mistake, because it's actually saying it's under the customer standing committee. It's page three. It says that it's two ccNSO ROs, and it's supposed to be two ccTLD ROs. Just to mention those because Paul Cain contacted me and made me aware of this.

But it is important because if we want to not be specific on the ccNSO on this, we need to have that, the correct wording.

TRANG NGUYEN: If I may, we can make that correction and send it back out to you.

LISE FUHR: That's good. Thank you. It's nothing serious. It's just to, it's in the proposal, it stands differently. Okay, any question to all of this? Because actually what we do need is to get started, I believe. Peter, you have a question? Peter Van Roste?

PETER VAN ROSTE: It's more of a comment. I saw the timeline, very briefly. And I noticed something that I think is really positive. During the session on Monday, one of the slides, for instance, said that ICANN appoints the candidates to the CFC, and I'm very happy to see that you took note and changed that to SOs and ACs appoint candidates, which was the whole point.

                       So thank you very much for that, and I really appreciate all of the work you're doing on this. This is pretty enormous.

TRANG NGUYEN: Thank you.

LISE FUHR: Yeah, Jay.

JAY DALEY:	If we could go back a slide? Sorry, I'm not familiar with this, but as far as I can see the members there includes PTI. So does post-transition IANA have a seat on its own customer services? Customer standing committee?
TRANG NGUYEN:	Yes, that's what the CWG proposal is recommending as the composition of the membership.
JAY DALEY:	Okay. Anybody who proposed that, like to explain the logic of the operator sitting on its own management, not management, monitoring committee? As a voting member?
LISE FEHUR:	I'm just checking the proposal now, but actually what could explain it is that you have a liaison who is actually listening in to whatever is being discussed.
UNKNOWN SPEAKER:	I guess I was the only one on that design team. It's a non-voting position.
JAY DALEY:	But it's still on, okay.

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: Well, the notion was that IANA should be present to its performance and get feedback on the CFC.

JAY DALEY: That's as an attendee rather than a member, but okay.

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: Yeah, I'm not sure how it has been classified, but it's…

JAY DALEY: Okay, thank you.

LISE FUHR: Okay. Well, yeah. Nigel.

NIGEL: I'd just like to underline the rather shocked and surprised look that I see on Jay's face here. Is it the case that the CFC is not going to be a watchdog or review committee of the IANA? I think it's entirely inappropriate that the subject of the watchdog has even, should we see, a non-voting liaison member of it, because that just completely prejudices the freedom of the discussion here. Certainly invite them to present from time to time when

you have questions, but this completely removes any effectiveness of this body as a watchdog.

And I certainly wouldn't support that.

LISE FUHR: I'm not sure I agree, but I will let Rolof speak first. Rolof, go ahead.

ROLOF: I completely agree with it. I think it's good. I think we should also avoid calling it a watchdog, because as a starting point, I think, there has to position that something has gone terribly wrong already, and I think IANA is doing very well. And in that situation, I think it's not more than logic that you have IANA people, on the group of customers discussing the performance.

Who of you talks to…? Has only external parties talk to your customers and report back to you what they thing? Thank you.

LISE FUHR: I have another point and that's actually, any way the cc is meant as an open and transparent group that you will have members. So for me, the transparency is very important in this, and so I agree with Rolof. It's, why not have the conversation in this group with the PTI?

Okay, yeah. Another question or comment?

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: This is [inaudible] from Pakistan. There is a question about the schedule slide, which is the first item is managing the ICANN outreach. My question is, what is the strategy of the ICANN outreach in developing countries? Because in the last exercise, in the TLDs, particularly the gTLDs, in developing countries, there is less application.

So what will the strategy in this regard?

LISE FUHR: if I understand your question correctly, it's about the outreach in order to find candidates for the CFC. Actually, we haven't decided the procedure yet on this, but it's an important point on how to actually ensure that as many ccTLDs as possible are contacted in relation to this.

So that's a good point to bring to this group because it's the ccNSO itself that's making the procedure on how to elect the two members for the CFC. Thank you.

Any other questions or comments? Actually I would like to go back to the first slide you had on the groups. We need to establish before we go on, because yes, if we look at this…

Trang told us, we have some groups that we need to establish before the transition.

But if you look at the IANA functions review, and actually also the special IANA functions review team, I think it's important that this group finds a way to, or a procedure on how to elect the members this beforehand, because some of this, the IANA functions review is, of course, on a yearly, a bi-yearly and then four yearly basis, but the special IANA functions review team can suddenly come up as an issue that needs to be looked at.

So having a procedure in place before the problem arise, would be wise. And Katrina you…? Go ahead.

KATRINA: Yes, thank you very much. Katrina [inaudible] ccNSO. I just wanted to say that, well in the council, we already discussed this issue, and we discussed it yesterday with the community. Our guidelines review committee, which is working on the current documents, current guidelines, revisiting them, is ready to and willing to step up and start working on the new process and procedures, and of course, the need to invite more representatives from the community who were actively involved in the development of the proposal. Thank you.

LISE FUHR:

And with… In relation to the CFC, I must agree with the gentleman from Pakistan. It's very important that the outreach is done very thoroughly and actually try to get as many ccTLD managers to express a view on this, because this is going to be important for us, the ccTLDs.

Any other questions or comments? No. Okay. Thank you Trang, that was really helpful. We have a last… Now it's actually that we switch to the accountability group. And we're looking at Mathieu who is looking very concentrated on his computer. But the next is about implementation of work stream one, who will do it. The role of the CCWG, timeline, a lot of question marks. So I hope you can help us on this Mathieu and Akram.

MATHIEU WEILL:

Maybe I can start and then I'll turn it over to you Akram. So assuming that the remaining two chartering organizations, mainly the GNSO and the ccNSO approve the work stream one proposals from the working group, which is due to take place in the next few hours. And assuming that the Board approves tomorrow, during its Board meeting, which is scheduled for the afternoon.

The challenge that is ahead of us, and which has been very well summarized on the slide from Trang, and maybe we could get the slide back on the accountability track, that's perfect.

Excellent. So the challenge of implementing the work stream one recommendations is number one, draft the bylaws. There are a number of, a very significant number of the recommendations that translate into bylaw changes for ICANN, even articles of incorporation actually.

And this has started a bit already. We have received from the lawyer's advising the CCWG set of bylaw drafts for enhancing the independent review process, the IRP, and we've also received a set of bylaw drafts for incorporating the affirmation of commitment reviews into the ICANN bylaws, which are two of the recommendations.

This effort to draft the bylaws is going to be taking place in a very constrained timeframe, as highlighted by Trang earlier. The ICANN has to approve any change of the bylaws, and they need to prove them after public comment. And the NTIA needs the bylaws approved before they can start, they can publish their report and send it over to Congress.

So basically, we understand that given that the US Congress is going into recess on 15th of July, it will not be appropriate for the NTIA to hand over to Congress after mid-June. Just checking with Trang because she's the master of this, so I'm making sure I've got my facts right.

If we want the bylaws approved by mid-June, with a 30 day public comment period, you have what you have on the screen here, and we have basically eight months to issue a public comment on a draft set of bylaws that meet the requirements set out by the CCWG, and the CWG by the way, and have been certified as compliant with this requirement by number one, our independent council. Number two, agreed to by the CCWG, and number three, certified as okay by ICANN Legal. Because obviously it's the ICANN Board doing this public comment.

So we are actually, this week, working at organizing a collaborative effort of lawyers, I'm sorry, I have said collaborative and lawyers in the same sentence. That might seem odd. But I mean, we've done really, really odd things, so I think no challenge is impossible now. So we're trying to organize, and that's really a matter of day to day planning.

The production of the bylaws, the finalization of the drafting, so that's probably going to involve several days of lawyer workshops, getting into probably one of our lawyer's office, getting together and finalizing the draft. Then some review time for the CCWG, certainly going to be short. So there is also work going to be done on actually doing a checklist of what needs to be checked to make sure we are meeting each and every recommendations requirements.

That we are doing, we are meeting, we are translating the report, and no more, no less. So that's what we are organizing in some sort of bylaw drafting. So actually on this slide, we are barely starting, but I would put status in orange already, because it's really, really tight.

And we don't have a lot of room for back and forth, and that's why we are bringing everybody in the same room to work collaboratively at producing this, because we know that's where we minimize the risk of further back and forth, later on in the process.

So that's the bylaw draft, and it's really the critical path. We have other aspects of implementation for work stream one. The IRP is not only bylaws, it's also rules of procedure. It's also seating a future panel for the IRP in selecting them. So we have a group of highly skilled people, which was announced in the CCWG who was going to oversee these discussions.

And it is not expected that the IRP panel will be seated before the transition takes place. However, it's going to be important by mid-August, to demonstrate that the selection process is up and running, that the rules of procedures are agreed. So there is plenty of work on that as well.

This recommendation eight in our report deals with the reconsideration request enhancements. There is also an area

where there is some viral drafting, but not only viral drafting. You need to update a certain number of things, maybe bring more resources into the ombudsman who is consider as a way to provide mediation before actually going into this, before the Board committee.

So that's a number of things that might not be totally completed, but at least the principles need to be agreed and we need serious commitment, because the definition of work stream one was enhancements that must be in place or committed to before the transition can take place.

And finally, the empowered community, there are some aspects of the empowered community and the processes that are not necessarily going to be in the bylaws, with maybe the SO and AC's procedures. We were discussing one of them yesterday, about the Board removal.

And so that also needs to be engaged and actually hopefully completed by mid-August. The final point which is not on the slide because as Trang was saying, we are only initiating the dialogue on this, is there is a small group that is going to be working on the budget enhancements. I know budget strategies a core aspect of ccNSO's contribution to the wider community through the SOP, whereas the philosopher chair, he's here.

EN

He's the perfect chair, by the way. So we'll have also, probably in line to add on budget. It's a joint CWG, CCWG effort, to finalize what the caretaker concepts are, finalize how the budgets are separated and so on. The level of details. And that is also something that we need to deliver by mid-August. So as you see, plenty of work ahead.

And certainly the need for the ccNSO to review some of its operating principles or procedures by ICANN 56, wherever it is in Northern Europe, and because that's going to probably be on the agenda of the next meeting. And I hope that was a good first introduction.

I don't know, Akram, maybe you can explain more about how you are getting organized for that?

AKRAM ATALLAH: Thank you Mathieu. So I think from the staff perspective, we have organized all of our tracks. And we have, as you see from Trang, schedules and commitments to deadlines and all of this. Our biggest concern right now is that we don't have time to redo things if the outcome is not what we wanted. So, it's important for all of us to be very engaged, very closely with the development process, with the implementation process, so that we can do what our current software is, you know, rapid development and quick checks on the progress, and the plans,

and how we are doing, so that we continue to go in lockstep, so at the end of the project we have an outcome that we all wanted in the first place.

So that's very important. We're trying to put a lot of mechanisms to stay in lockstep with you as well as the CWG, as well as the CCWG, across the board. We have a lot of reporting. We're trying to be as transparent throughout this as possible.

If you have any recommendations on anything that we're doing that can be approved, please talk soon so that we can actually update these processes. And you know, help us get there by staying engaged.

Don't assume that the fact that the proposal is approved that our work is done, because I think the work is just starting now, also for all of us to finish this implementation and get through all of this by August 15th. So looking forward to working with you, and you know, I'm always a phone call away or an email away if there is anything we can do better.

So I hope you engage with me if there is anything that I can help with. Thank you.

MATHIEU WEILL: Thank you Akram. Maybe we should take questions from the room.

ELISE FUHR: Peter Van Roste.

Yeah, yeah, I'll chair. Thank you Mathieu for letting me chair. Okay, sorry.

PETER VAN ROSTE: Peter Van Roste from CENTR. Sorry if I missed it, but the live version of these tables, this dashboard, is that available on the CWG side? The CCWG side?

TRANG NGUYEN: These dashboards are published every two weeks, and they're available on our implementation, on the implementation page of the ICANN website. And I also think that [inaudible] post them on the CWG Wiki.

PETER VAN ROSTE: And the current version is already on there or that's the plan?

TRANG NGUYEN: You know, I'm not certain what the latest version is. I know the last CWG call was February 25th, so there is that, definitely that version and I'll check with the team as to when the next version is posted. We update these every two weeks for the CWG calls,

and I think the schedule update was Monday of this week, but since we're here I'm not sure if that got posted or not, so I will check.

PETER VAN ROSTE: Great, thank you.

LISE FUHR: Any other questions to Mathieu, Akram, or Trang? Yeah? Jordan. Yeah, a newcomer, yeah.

JORDAN: Yeah, I haven't really been following this in any detail. Jordan [inaudible] dot NZ, CCWG [inaudible]. But I just want… Mathieu, could you… ICANN's standard process on public comments for bylaws is 42 days. That time table doesn't contemplate a 42 day public comment period for the bylaw changes. Do you want to make any comment about the timeline to meet that?

So I'm talking about the date in the box at the third column at the top, finishing the ICANN bylaws updates by the 27th of May.

MATHIEU WEILL: Okay. So I have an even nicer display here. So yes, the standard public comment period is 42 days, or 45 or 42 days within ICANN. And our understanding based on the conversations we've had

with the ICANN Board is that there would consider restricting it to 30 days, given that it is a bylaw set that follows a very through process with already three public comments and so on and so forth.

And that would be accompanied by a statement from the independent lawyers, that it's consistent with the CCWG report. So the question of the public comment would not be whether these proposals are appropriate or not, but whether they comply with the requirements set out by the CCWG and the CWG and the ICG reports.

LISE FUHR: And I would like to add that the CWG is working very closely together with the CCWG on this bylaw drafting, because we have started the part that relates to the CWG, but we actually need to coordinate from now on very, very closely on the timing, because we don't want to delay anything.

Any other questions, comments? Anyone want to sing a song? We need a coffee break, I can see that. Okay, well thank you for listening and thank you to the panel for giving us an update. And I'll conclude this session. [APPLAUSE]

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: Thank you very much to the panel and of course to the co-chairs. Just from a logistics perspective, this session has ended a little early, which is going to give us a few extra minutes for coffee break. We will come back at the scheduled time, since we want to make sure that everybody who wants to come to the final session can come to it, and therefore I don't want to change the times at the last minute, by surprise.

So we will come back for our final session, block three on IANA stewardship and transition for 3:30. So be back here for 3:30 please.

BYRON HOLLAND: Before we get going, I just want to make sure every ccTLD representative has their voting cards. So if you are the rep, make sure you have your voting cards available please. Thank you.

And we're going to get going in a couple of minutes. People are just filtering in now.

Okay, just a final reminder. Everybody who is a ccTLD rep, make sure you have your voting cards please. I'm sure we'll have the opportunity to try them out, over the course of the next hour.

Okay, we're going to get going with our final session of ICANN 55, and our final session on the topics of IANA stewardship

transition and accountability, at least for this meeting. In this session, the final hour has been designed primarily to foster an environment where everybody here has the opportunity to ask their final questions, at this stage of the game at least.

As well as voice their opinions. It's really geared to be an open session for the members here in the room and online. So that's the real focus on it. This is definitely the time to make your thoughts known. Peter is going to moderate it, I'm just acting as the chair, and will provide some summing up remarks at the end. And we will have the opportunity, as I've said, at the outset to use our cards.

We'll probably save that until right near the end, unless there is an obvious moment along the way that that, that they would be helpful. So we will get the opportunity to do that, but it would likely be towards the end of the session.

And just again, a couple of moments before Peter starts with the session proper, you know this has been quite a long journey. And we can all observe the same set of facts and have different opinions. Some folks think it's not enough. We haven't talked enough. There hasn't been enough opportunity. Some folks think we've been beaten over the head with this, and when will it end? Can't end soon enough.

And there are many positions along that spectrum. But I would say the objective facts are, we have spent a lot of time, no matter whether you think it's too much or too little, much time has been devoted to this topic. And there is a couple of slides, the one you'll see before me that I thought it was worth at least reminding ourselves of the time we spent on this subject, albeit, briefly. Because we really have to go back, I feel like I'm telling a story, but we have to go back in time to Singapore 2014, just after the NTIA had made the initial announcement.

And that is where this community actually really came together for the first time on this subject. And had some significant discussion and also some ad hoc session time. At the Singapore 2014 meeting where we came up with our statement. Many of you will remember that. And in fact, as a council, based on the input, we passed a resolution that we would set up a team to start working on this, and that team in fact was Becky and Keith and myself, just in the very, very early days to get it going.

Before this process became known as CWG stewardship, and during the course of that, and in fact, even in the Singapore meeting in 2014, we were talking about the elements and the threads of accountability that were going to be required, as part of any IANA oversight transition.

So even before there was any stewardship or accountability working groups, we were already saying, any part of a transition had to include some enhanced levels of accountability. And when you go back in time and look at the statement that we wrote at the time, and that the resolution of the time, you'll see that we already talking about those things.

And while initially, it was all about the stewardship oversight transition, accountability really fell out of that and one large project to some degree, effectively became the two legs of this much bigger project. So it has been something of an evolution from the announcement from NTIA, to those early days in Singapore 2014, the statement that very early team that started to try to unpack it for us, into the CWG stewardship, which of course we passed in Buenos Aries a couple of meetings ago, a few meetings ago now.

But of course, we only passed it based on the conditionality of the other leg, which was accountability. So while these have been two very large blocks of work, they are, of course, intrinsically linked and to a great degree, all part of one broader whole.

So every single meeting since then, we've devoted significant time. You know, when I look at this room, 110, 120 seats in this room, we've spent five and a half hours just in this meeting, you

know, that's 550 hours of our time collectively engaged in this. And we did it in Dublin, and we did it in BA, and we did it in Singapore and a couple of other places along the way.

We have spent a lot of time and effort on this subject. And I just wanted to remind us of how much collective energy has been expended on this. And I think, you know, personally having been involved in way or the other in all of the threads here, this community has done great work. Done hard work. Had a lot of tough discussions, made some significant compromises, but also you know, been very, very important contributors to the broader ICANN ecosystem on this subject.

Really important contributors there. And this is the final hour, Marrakech, and discussion on this subject. And with that, I would like to pass it over to Peter, who will act as our moderator.

PETER VIERGOTE: Thank you Byron. Is this working? Okay, thanks. All right. The final session for today, before the ccNSO two day session comes to an end, and then we hand over to the ccNSO Council. Like Byron said, this is a moderated session. So I have prepared a quick number of questions to get us kick started, but the flow of this session entirely lays in your hands, of the ccTLD managers.

It's your opportunity to speak up and have your final say regarding the proposal of the CCWG. And well, I don't know whether we are going to pose questions, or if there are already persons that say no, let's get into the flow straight away, I have a statement to make or I have an intervention planned.

If that's the case please, raise your hand so that I can bring the mic to you. No immediate takers for the moment. Okay. Then I'll try to kick start it with a question. And before handing over the mic to the ccTLD managers themselves, I would like to offer opportunity to give the regional organizations, their insight, their point of view, their take on what has been proposed on the table before us.

Because the regional organization, just as the ccNSO itself, have gone to a very great length in getting their members up to speed. And so I think it's worthwhile that we give them the opportunity to give the first, to give the first impression, to give the first feedback, and then we will take it from there.

So I don't know from the regional organizations who wants to go in the lead? Peter?

PETER VAN ROSTE: Thank you Peter. Peter Van Roste from CENTR. I think if we would have drafted a list like the one on the screen, it would

EN

have looked pretty similar, definitely in times of discussions that we had at CENTR, we would probably have added a couple of CENTR comments and positions along the road.

It would be less formal, but it would also reach out to ccs that are not part of the ccNSO, and I think that's an important point also to underline maybe, in any communication about this. In general, comments on the proposal, we've been following this proposal as it developed, one, two, three additional proposals.

Every single time we've commented and we've seen that in the incremental updates, those comments from the ccTLD community have been reflected. For the last one, all of our comments have been reflected as well in the final proposal, with two exceptions, and there is a good reason actually for that.

They fit into work stream two and not work stream one. So but from the CENTR community, without giving any sort of approval that I'm not in a position to, I can share that the sense of the members is in favor, and probably quite appreciative of the way that the CCWG has taken onboard our comments. Thanks.

PETER VERGOTE: Okay, thank you very much Peter. Do we have people from the other regional organizations? [Inaudible].

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: So in the case of LACTLD, we didn't comment on the first draft, but we did comments at the Board level on the second and third drafts. We have had an immense amount of difficulty to engage the community, particularly in the CCWG accountability document and the rolling comments, and the different… Particularly in the last five weeks, it has been very challenging for myself and the LACTLD community I would say to understand all of the nuances coming into the different recommendations and the different proposals, being taken by particular leaders.

Some of them in the region. Let's say in the case of the Brazilians who have been very active in taking up some of these recommendations, and this has sort of transpired into sort of a regional approach to it. But in general, I would say that the ccTLD community in Latin America and the Caribbean is very grateful for all of the work put in there, and it wants the proposal to go forward.

PETER VERGOTE: Okay, thank you very much. That was a very straightforward point of view, and also something that I have been hearing that comes back, that it's a lot of detail. A lot of material. A lot of documents to read. Not everybody among us is able to grasp that amount of information, and it is certainly a factor to take into mind. Barrack, are you able to say something?

BARRACK OTIENO: Yes Peter, thank you. Yeah, for AFTLD as well, we've participated in the process, largely through our representative Mary [Uduma]. Just to reiterate on what my colleagues have said, I think there was too much information, and we had to make decisions very fast, which meant that involving the community was not always very easy.

There was always a question of looking at it and saying yes or no, and moving to the next step. That said, we submitted our comments during the public comment period, most of which have been taken into consideration. We've discussed it also in our joint regional organizations meeting, and I think we support that it proceeds as it currently is.

Of course, with the other observations that are being made, I know that the minority steps have been made, but nonetheless, it is a rough consensus, which we say we can be able to live with. Thank you.

PETER VERGOTE: Okay. Thank you very much Barrack. I'm looking, if Leonid is in the room, but I don't see him for the moment. So let me fire another question to the members, if I may, and it is actually an

open question, so feel free to pick any kind of element that comes to your mind, that is of any particular relevance to you.

And this time I would like to hear from the ccTLD managers. And it's, what is according to you, what are the specific strengths or weaknesses of the proposal as we have been, as it is put on the table right now? Who wants to take the first shot?

No specific weaknesses to be identified in the proposal then?

No specific strengths? Neither? Eduardo.

EDUARDO: Thank you Peter for the opportunity to address to the community, to talk about the process, and to talk about the specific questions you did. But perhaps, I have to start saying that since 1998, when the international Internet community decided to create ICANN, and to follow the processing or to make the US government, make at one side of the administration of these resources, which is protocols, IP numbers and names.

And we decided then to, going to the ICANN figure in an ICANN proposal, after that, I've been participating in many ICANN meetings, and seeing how we are building these new community? This environment to discuss and to coordinate how

the critical Internet resources has to be managed, put different ways.

And I've been present also, I've been present at the constitutional, the ccNSO years ago, that was an utter transformation of these communities, an utter transformation of ICANN. That in general [inaudible] and to see a more mature organization as we see now, ICANN is. I mean, it's mature at the level that [inaudible] allows to continue the process and finally finish the stewardship of the US government, and about the activities that we do here in ICANN.

And I guess, that we finally agreed in some specific proposal, that in general terms have caused a lot of weakness, a lot of things that can be improved. But it is another proposal that meets the agreement, that can have the agreement of most of the people on the Internet community, most of the stakeholders of the grow Internet community, and also could be acceptable for the US government, as a proposal complete in order to complete the process of the transition of the stewardship of the IANA functions.

So I'm not going to refer about the specific weaknesses, so the specific things that could be the strengths of the proposal. I really believe that we have now a proposal that could be addressed, that should be and necessary shall be, improved in

the future, not in the implementation process, and working that have to come on.

But as [inaudible] also mentioned, I'm also grateful because the work of many people on this, allows us to have and to be present today, to pronounce tomorrow to see how [inaudible] mostly sure, will be approved. The initiation process, in order to finish this stewardship of some government, some specific government, in this case US government, from the ICANN step. So, nothing else to say about that.

PETER VERGOTE: Thank you very much.

MARY: Thank you. Mary from Nigeria dot NG. To go straight to specific, I think the issue of carving out the PDP process in ccNSO, is strong one. That the ccNSO can continue with its PDP, and none of the constituencies, or ACs, or SOs can block whatever proposal that is brought to the table.

And again, the fact that it has nothing to do with the delegation and re-delegation, is specific in strength and something we should hold onto. And in terms of weakness, specifically information of our [inaudible], so some of us, we're now about to follow.

Most people will tell you that they can't follow the volume of materials that have been produced. But to the credit to those that devoted their time to do all of that, sometimes when I joined the calls, I said, oh, do these people sleep at all?

So a lot of work went into it. It cannot be a perfect… There is no perfect document. So we could live with some of the imperfection, and allow the process to go forward. And I will also encourage ccTLD managers to also allow the process to go forward. Thank you.

PETER VERGOTE: Thank you very much Mary. Rolof, you had a comment or a question as well?

ROLOF: Well, I was a bit hesitant about this, because yes, I had my time yesterday with this nice diagram, but then I was wearing my hat as a CCWG member, on behalf of the ccNSO, so now I'm talking as the manager of a registry, a cc registry. Surprisingly, I have more or less the same opinion.

I think the strength of the proposal is that this is as good as we can get it. It does everything that it should do. I talked yesterday about the big stick. The big stick is there. There is an empowered community that provides a good safety net in case

ICANN or the ICANN organization, I should say, or any other ICANN part of the community, wants to do something that we all, or most of the community doesn't agree with.

So there is an effective takeover of the supervisory role that the US has been playing until, up until today. It's enforceable. It incorporates the outcomes of the affirmation of commitments. The previous ATRTs that we have had. We are getting a really good IRP, and the whole thing, let's say, chained into the ecosystem through fundamental bylaws, so that part is pretty good. And I'm convinced we can't get it any better.

There are a few weaknesses, and I mentioned them yesterday, but I think they are minor as compared to the overall goodness of the proposal. And the weakness that worries me most is that many parts of the structure are based on SOs and ACs, and SOs and ACs together, not trusting each other. And in my opinion and my experience, this trust is always a very bad start for collaboration.

And in the end, that is what we are doing here. So somehow we have… And that distrust has had a lot of attention during this process. A lot of opportunities to grow, and to develop. And we have to get it back into its cage and make sure that we continue on the way we've been working for over the last few years.

So I think the weakness of the process, is that it polarized us more or less. And like I said yesterday, it didn't bring us closer, but it caused some divisions every, well, here and there. What I'm also a bit worried about is the participation of all of the constituencies in the really important parts of our processes.

We know that the GAC finds it very difficult to have a consensus opinion on this whole thing. In fact, they don't have, well they have the consensus opinion that they're not going to block it, and that it can proceed. But I think it will work best if all the SOs and ACs participate when the going gets rough.

And I'm a bit worried about what might happen if some of the organization that can have a say choose not to exercise their power. There are some safety measures, but they're not completely full-proof I think. I think it will serve the big opportunity that we have to serve the global Internet, and that's why, I would say, that we have to go on with this. I don't think we have any other viable option, and this one is good.

PETER VERGOTE: Thank you very much Rolof. That was very detailed and concise at the same time. So lovely. Jordan, you had a comment as well.

JORDAN: Hi, I'm Jordan [inaudible], dot NZ. I just want to add one little angle, compared to what I said yesterday. Trust between the ICANN community and ICANN the cooperation, the ICANN Board, is something that is easier to build where there are normal conventional accountability tools in place.

It's much easier to build a healthier relationship when the foundations of that relationship are healthy and strong. And to me, this proposal can deliver that. But it just delivers the start of that. And there is another angle to this process that has helped, which has been the interactions between the SOs and ACCs, that have been part of considering these proposals and building them together.

If we as a community are going to stand up and take responsibility for the stewardship of the IANA functions through ICANN, we have to be a community. We can't be seven silos. We can't be 50 stakeholder groups. And so the next challenge for us is going to be build our links for the other SOs and ACs, and to use this as a reset almost, a re-founding of the relationship between the ICANN community and the organization, and to make sure it is accountable and to make sure it does the job we all need it to do.

And I think this, along with the stewardship proposal, helps with that. So that's a fundamental underpinning of why we support it.

PETER VERGOTE: Okay. Thank you very much. Hiro.

HIRO: Thank you. I'm Hiro from dot [JP?]. So I'm going to make a general statement, not on specific points, if that's okay?

PETER VERGOTE: You may, absolutely.

HIRO: Okay. So as a dot [JP] manager, first of all, I appreciate the long and [inaudible] of the CCWG members and those who contribute to the discussion. Regarding the process, I respect the result of the discussion in CCWG, that includes the reintegrated, or interacted with the community, including the ccTLD managers.

And CCWG members from ccTLD community have made a very, various opportunities of discussion with ccTLDs from time to time. To inject ccTLD views to the CCWG proposal. And regarding the content of the proposal, I find that multistakeholder cooperation model, is a well embed in the

proposal, proposed framework, which I believe, should be qualified to replace NTIA's role. So therefore, I think the proposal has come to the level of qualifying point, and it's time to move to implementation.

Again with outreach and inclusiveness of the community. So I support that ccNSO approves that CCWG proposal is sent to the Board. Thank you.

PETER VERGOTE: Thank you very much Hiro. David?

DAVID ABRAHAM: Thank you. David Abraham from dot UK. And if I can ask you all to forgive the hubris of someone who is coming into this much newer than so many of you in commenting on this, because I'm aware of the level of expertise in the room. I think that, from a relative newcomer's perspective, what I've heard in the discussions is that nothing is going to be perfect. And we've got to remember that that is true of every international organization.

ICANN is not unique in that respect, and there is no perfectly inclusive, accountable, and efficient body that actually exists in the world today. So we have to embrace the compromises that are embedded in the CCWG report.

But I would do though, is that I would echo Peter Van Roste's comment earlier, that from [inaudible] experience, what we found is when we have, throughout this process, raised issues, where we have raised concerns, these have been, on behalf of the community, these have been taken account of.

The proposals have gradually got better in the iterations, and a number of people have already pointed out, the strengths of the latest proposals and what they give to the cc community. I think ultimately, our responsibility as a ccTLD manager is to run a stable and secure dot UK. To do that, we need IANA to be run, and we need it to be managed in a stable, predictable, and responsive manner.

And we do believe that these proposals would allow us to do that. So, clearly, on balance, we support the proposals, but I think that the one thing I would say, we have all commented on the amazing work that's been done by the dedicated volunteers of all of these different, of both the CWG, and the CCWG.

But it's clear, from our previous discussion, just in the earlier session, that there is an enormous work to do still, and that this is an ongoing process, and that we are all going to need to dedicate resources to doing that. And that is a really big change for the community.

So I think that, with that knowledge, and with some trepidation, we can go forward.

PETER VERGOTE: Thank you very much David. You had a comment as well?

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: Yes, thank you. [Inaudible] dot KR. I think I share a lot of the sentiment that has been expressed today, in terms of the appreciation for the tremendous amount of work, which actually was in large part, very voluntary. And although there have been disagreements, and in the end, they were, I mean, as Rolof has said, there was, there seemed to be a polarization, but actually what, I think what drove this was the strong trust actually of this multistakeholder community that we had faith in.

And so, although it is not complete, I would like to have this positive hope that during the implementation phase, although the devil is in the details, that the trust that we not just this community, but the ICANN community as a whole, has will move things more in a positive light.

And I would also like to point out that this was not just an exercise within the ICANN community itself. During this process, the Korea Internet community was able to strengthen the multistakeholder of its own community, because when we were

submitting our comments, our comments were gathered and collated and summarized after a series of meetings and discussions about this process.

And so, it actually has helped not just the ICANN community, but the individual Internet communities themselves. So, for that I would like to express my appreciation as well. Thank you.

PETER VERGOTE: Thank you very much. Over to [inaudible] and then [inaudible].

[ANABETTE LANGE]: [Annabette Lange] dot NO. It has been said a lot here in I can appreciate what's been said. And I would like to repeat what David said, that it wasn't perfect. Of course it was not perfect, but it hasn't been perfect before either.

And then we have had a lot of problems earlier, and now we gain some, and we perhaps lose some, but together with all we have done in all of these communities together, I think it's made us feel closer to each other, compared with what I experienced her in something.

It's amazing what's been happening in all these years, and especially since this process started, I can't really understand as someone had said, that they have a right, those who have been

active in this, it's an immense effort with a lot of emails, all the time.

At all times of the day and night and whatever. It's really, really appreciated. And I think, especially that's been mentioned also, that we got the thing with the view of the delegation and re-delegation, which is really important for us, that's taken out. And that's a really plus.

Perhaps a negative thing that it has been possible for everyone to really, really read everything. So there might be things that we haven't noticed, but still, we trust who we have chosen to do the work. And we should appreciate it very much. So we stand behind it. Thank you.

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: So this is [inaudible] with dot DE. Along the way, I almost feared that to my taste, we would be designing something that was even too democratic for me.

[LAUGHTER]

In a way that it would harm our ability to get things done, or ICANN to get things done. But as we do still have so many complaints and so many stakeholders complaining, I'm feeling quite confident that what is currently on the table, must be balanced, because well, everybody has to give something of

their thoughts. And I pretty much think we came up to a solution that really is something extraordinary and I just want to join what has already been said.

A) I really support it; and B) everybody who has spent so much time and effort to reach that final goal, it was just amazing. Thanks.

PETER VERGOTE: Thank you very much. I have seen somebody, oh, we are going to a registry that I vaguely know. Over to you.

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: [Inaudible] making a statement about this whole effort on behalf of DNS Belgium. First of all, I would like to really thank all of the members of the CCWG for their hard work, their efforts, but also their endurance to keep on going. And we especially would like to thank, of course, about people that represent the ccTLD community.

We have, of course, full confidence in their capacities. Again, would like to thank them especially for their effort. And we do believe that they came to their best possible proposal for this whole community for us, the ccTLDs.

EN

So for that reason, we think that's everything that has been put on the table is the best possible outcome, that has been confirmed already by a number of speakers. The result will be that ICANN will be more accountable to the ccTLDs than it was before, and for that reason, we would also vote in favor of this statement.

PETER VERGOTE: Thank you. [Inaudible], you wanted to say something as well?

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: Yeah, very, very briefly. I was not part of the CWG or even the CCWG. I was in the ICG, but anyway, I saw this from the ccTLD perspective. And as said, dot DE, [inaudible] the art of making all of the stakeholders slightly dissatisfied. And I witnessed it with this satisfaction, the uniform dissatisfaction, when we tried to assembly the contributions to the NetMundial, for example.

Another multistakeholder process that delivered two documents. We have here again, two documents. So, of course, there are some points can be dealing in other way, but this is a consensus though, a document then we have to accept that all of us have something to comment and something to prove, but have to accept it.

Just to finish. My answer to the document is not [inaudible] yes, like Giovanni said yesterday [inaudible]. It's not the ideal, yes, but this is the yes that we can do in the real world. I think we can go for it.

PETER VERGOTE: Thank you very much. I take this opportunity because I saw Leonid entering the room, and Leonid will kick start this session by offering the regional organizations to give their point of view. So if you would like to speak on behalf of APTLD, I will gladly give you the mic.

LEONID: Thank you. Well, first of all, I must say that APTLD, although from some perspective, maybe might have us underrepresented, in the process, but I must, well first of all, commend all of those who are actively engaged in this process, and there are so many of them here in this room, and outside.

I must say that I have… I've been one of those skeptics who did not believe that the ultimate positive outcome of the process, seriously. And I was very vocal about certain bureaucratic hurdles, and delays and setbacks, which I envisioned from the very beginning. And some, indeed, came through, but overall, I

must say that, I mean I would echo so many of those who have already spoken before me.

You know, that was a tremendous effort. That was a collective effort. That was effort guided by good spirits, and good intensions. And with all of those visible, I wouldn't say drawbacks, but some shortcomings, this proposal of course will lead its way, I'm sure of that. Through all of those instances, which it, I mean as a Russian, I wouldn't name them.

Anyway, so what I mean was that was one of those very rare, successful efforts in which I didn't believe from the very beginning. I'm very happy that my skepticism right now is, well it has vanished, I would say. It's vanished, seriously. I'm just back from the GAC session because I spoke also to some GAC members who are very much interested in how it's going here in ccNSO room.

So I must say that I can feel that spirit of collaboration of that effort, which is so rarely seen these days. And although there are some minority opinions, which is absolutely understandable and legitimate within such a process, I still believe that overall, it's, yeah indeed, it's a very good proposal.

I'm really happy to be beaten in my skepticism. Let me put it in such a way. Thank you.

PETER VERGOTE: Thank you very much Leonid. That was a nice phrasing to be beaten in your own skepticism. I have to remember that. Nigel and Patricio. Nigel first, okay.

NIGEL HICKSON: I thought there was a bit more of a queue before me. As some of you probably know from speaking privately, I have some reservations, particularly in view of some of the process that we have seen. As a participant in the CCWG, perhaps I've seen a little bit more of this sausage making than everybody else would like to have seen, and maybe I've got a bit of a jaundice view of.

It's particularly strange to me that we're being asked to approve a document that was only published in final form in translation in major languages, two or three days ago. Notwithstanding, it seems clear to me that in order to have the opportunity to work on the development of this process in work stream two, and get exactly what we need as ccNSO and ccTLD managers, now is not the time to raise objections or even to set out dissenting or minority reports.

So this leaves me with a choice to decide whether to oppose this or not. And I choose not to.

PETER VERGOTE: Thank you very much Nigel. [APPLAUSE] Patricio.

PATRICIO POBLETE: Yeah. I think Giovanni did a very good job of teaching us about what Plato had to say about this. And I understand why I would like to quote Voltaire. [LAUGHTER]

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: You are taking the ccNSO to a whole new level now, aren't we? [LAUGHTER]

PATRICIO POBLETE: Excuse my poor French pronunciations [French]. The perfect is the enemy of the good. And I think that very much applies to this, probably we all would have wanted something or other to be different. Myself, I would have preferred this to be much simpler, and a shorter document, but I think that's perhaps unavoidable when you design by committee.

And there are sayings about that too. So is this good enough? Is the question of the day, and for us, I think the answer is certainly yes.

PETER VERGOTE: Thank you very much Patricio. And it's fairly remarkable how this ICANN accountability all brings a philosophical flare to this whole community. [Inaudible] you wanted to intervene?

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: Just a small edition to what Patricio said. Yeah, I agree that the document is too long, but to make it shorter, it would need much more time. [LAUGHTER]

PETER VERGOTE: Thank you very much. Any more members that wish to address certain issues or want to speak up? Russell.

RUSSELL: I just want to say a couple of words, which, because I'm leaving fairly shortly. My last contribution in this session of ICANN, but I think we've got to a place where obviously there is a lot of contribution gone in, but not least, I think a lot of collaboration and a lot of the collaboration comes from the leadership of this.

So for my final kind of passing comment would be to thank Byron as chair, to get us as a community this far, recognizing that it is his last rodeo as the ICANN, the cc chair. But from [inaudible] perspective, I would just like to thank his contribution. [APPLAUSE]

PETER VERGOTE: Thank you very much Russell. Well, Mr. Chairman I see no waiving movements. Okay, sorry Steven, I missed you.

STEVEN: That's not a problem. The proposal is not everything I would like in a lot of levels. You can look at the elevation of the GAC and some other things, but along the way we got some things. We can't get PDP spilled by other SOs, ACs, for example, and at one point in the process that looked like a possibility. I am, however, extremely disappointed in the failure to adhere to accepted procedures and rules with respect to public comment on this document, and the fact is Nigel alluded to the translations came so late.

And basically, we have excluded from participation in this process at the end of the day, the billions of people who are not English speakers. And I am saddened and disappointed by that. When I got up this morning, I was thinking to myself, that the council, when we finally get around to it, I would say no to it. I am now going to let it pass.

PETER VERGOTE: Thank you very much Steven. Well, I think that it's somehow brings us to a close of this session. If I can, before giving it back

to you Byron, if I could just recollect the things that I have gained from this session. It's first of all, massive appreciation from this community for all of the work that has been done by all the people who have contributed to this proposal, and to all of the people who have engaged in the work of the CWG.

So regardless of the positions of the people, how they feel towards the proposal, I think that this show of respect, this show of appreciation, should be duly noted. Second thing, what keeps coming back, it's not the most refined, the most excellent proposal.

That would, according to Plato, exist somewhere, but for a very large majority of us, it seems to be workable. It seems to be something, a bit of a price that we pay in this global stakeholdership. It's that we all have to convene, we have to make some sacrifices in order to have something that is agreeable to most.

So that's what I take back, and with that I would gladly refer back to you Mr. Chairman.

BYRON HOLLAND: Thank you Peter. And thank you everybody. Peter stole many of my words in terms of doing a summary. I would say he did a very fine summary on the fly, as a moderator, which for anybody

who has done that, is always a challenge. So thank you very much Peter.

Well done. I did want to pick up on a couple of extra points. But I would entirely concur with the general summary that we heard there. It was interesting to me, and we thought about should the ROs… Do we want to hear as individuals? Or do we want to bring the ROs in?

And I think it was important to us to bring in the ROs in because that helps inform our view from those who are not able to be here, whether they are ccNSO members or not. And informs our view of non ccNSO members who are part of the RO community. So I think, you know, that was a value, and hearing from all of them, they all generally supportive. We did hear a lot about the process, the level of effort, the ability to actually pay attention to all of the details. And that in part, is why we delegated, in a sense, that responsibility or that authority to people that we trusted, who were going to be able to devote the time and expertise to do it.

And I think that they have served us very well. All of them. All five of our members have served us very well. And I want to make that very, very clear, on the CCWG. And I'm referring more to the CCWG because we've spoken about CWG in previous

meetings, but those five members deserve an incredible amount of respect for what they've delivered to this community.

And I would say that the whole broader ICANN ecosystem does as well, because our folks added significant value to the final, complete proposal. So while recognizing that there were some shortcomings and challenges in the process, that there was without a doubt document and information overload, both our members and the broader CCWG membership, I think, have in four versions, with a lot of input, come to an acceptable, at least this is what I heard the community here say, they've come to an acceptable balance.

A good balance, obviously, from everything we've heard, likely not a perfect balance or a perfect outcome, but an outcome, and I thought this was an important point that I heard, an outcome that's better than what we have now. Let's not forget what we have now and how far that document takes us in terms of making ICANN accountable to our community and the other communities, and the broader ecosystem.

And it has to serve the broader ecosystem. We need to remember that too, that as a cc community we are participants in a broader multistakeholder community, and there is a give and a get to be a fair and participatory member of a broader community, there is a give and a get.

And I think that's what we heard today, that there is a balance drawn here, and it's a reasonable balance. It was also interesting to note that, as we as individual operators or managers have gone through this process, many of us have also engaged our own local communities. And as a collateral benefit to this exercise, has brought in our own communities into our space or our world.

I think, you know, generally, loud and clear, we heard finally that this is not a perfect balance, but it's a good balance. And it certainly workable and solid balance for us going forward, and will significantly improve the relationship that ICANN the company, and ICANN the community, and ICANN the Board, have the potential to have based on better and clearer structures.

But of course, it's also up to us as participants in that relationship to make sure that that happens. So those are…

Okay. We ran out of…

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: I know we're running out of time, but because we do have remote participants, and they need to recognize their effort to follow this process as well. So this is the remark from [inaudible] from the dot IT, the Italian registry.

[Inaudible] dot IT gives greenlight to the CCWG proposal, and is thankful for the enormous amount of work which has been done by all of the communities, and in particular by the ccTLD community.

BYRON HOLLAND: Okay, thank you. We'll now officially cut the queue off. Anyway, those generally summarize what I heard us saying. And I do want to, of course, pay special note to clearly this is a special and unique community. Any community that can bring Plato and Voltaire into a discussion of an accountability proposal is a special community.

And an informed, educated, yes, wonderful, wonderful community. So with that, we do as promised, as advertised, we do want to take the opportunity to have a show of cards. And I believe we're going to bring out a question.

So you'll have the opportunity to get your cards ready.

Get your cards ready. We'll give you a moment.

The tension is building.

So, this is the question… The question we are going to ask is, do you agree that the final CCWG accountability proposal should be forwarded to the ICANN Board for its consideration? If you agree

with that statement, please hold up your green card. Your green card.

Thank you. To be fair, if you would like to abstain from that, could you hold up your yellow card?

Okay. And if you do not agree with this statement, could you please hold up your red card?

Okay. Thank you very much everybody. That's been very helpful. [APPLAUSE AND CHEERS]

Can I just say? It has come to my attention because I can actually see them, that we have the three CCW co-chairs themselves here in the room. And we know how much our members did, and other members did. I can't even imagine how much the three of you did. Thank you on behalf of the ccNSO for your work. [APPLAUSE]

MATHIEU WEILL: Will you give me an opportunity for a word?

BYRON HOLLAND: As our co-chair and member, absolutely. Final word.

EN

MATHIEU WEILL: Final word. It's quite a moving moment, but I want to thank all of the ccTLDs who got involved to this process. Thank you for the words you've had for the work we've been doing. It was a very collective effort. The co-chairs get a lot of credit, but behind us, there is [inaudible], there is staff, there are members, participants, who spent an incredible amount of time, an incredible amount in good face efforts, in finding a way forward.

I was quite skeptical as well when this process started. But I figured we had an unique chance, and I think that's really what this process was about, and that the pride that we can collectively share, that we've moved it forward. And on the way, we gained experience, we learned a number of things including a lot of things about California legal system.

And but we also grew closer. Grew closer within the ccTLD community, grew closer with the rest of the ICANN community, and I think that's something we're going to take away from this. This relationships, the hard moments, the funny ones, which you may not perceive from the outside but were quite intense. And I think that's really the kind of experience that I encourage everyone to live and that ICANN can offer two volunteers, and will continue to offer.

Now, of course this is an exemplary moment for the multistakeholder model, but I would like to take just a moment

ICANN|55
MARRAKECH
5 – 10 MARCH 2016

to reflect that this opportunity was granted thanks to the stewardship of the NTIA. If you think of it, it's quite amazing the leap of faith that the initiation of the transition was. And I think we need to be grateful for that, because that's an amazing opportunity for a community such as ours.

Now, if I can get my text back. We are all going to go back home and be speaking about Marrakech, and the mountains of Atlas, that are looking upon us. And if you climb for a moment on top of these mountains, and look back, and see, try and summarize what we've been doing, and it's a moving moment, so I have a right to be sort of lyrical or emphatic about it.

So I call it the pact of Marrakech. And there is only two things in this. The first one is, the community, the multistakeholder model, and the ICANN Board get a shared responsibility, they hold each other accountable, for the purpose of serving the global public interest.

And, and I think that was an achievement this week, that within ICANN, we each have our roles and responsibilities, we ccTLDs have very specific roles and responsibilities, that are recognized and respected by everyone. And we work on an equal footing with all of the stakeholders. And I think if we just hold this principles to heart, and make them become reality, because obviously they're still changes ahead, then we're going to get

much stronger out of this transition, and for the benefit of the Internet and everyone that's using it. Thank you very much, and I hope we can make this even more a reality in the next few months. Thank you. [APPLAUSE]

BYRON HOLLAND: Thank you very much. And that wraps up the official Marrakech 55 ccNSO member's session. Just to remind you that at 5:00 we actually have our council session, where we will be voting on this issue, among other topics on the agenda. So just a reminder for our council members to be back up here at 5:00. Thank you.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]