EN

HELSINKI – ccNSO Members Meeting Day 1 (Part 1)
Tuesday, June 28, 2016 – 08:30 to 09:15 EEST
ICANN56 | Helsinki, Finland

KATRINA SATAKI: Three minutes. You asked. Three minutes left, so prepare yourselves for [Botox] for someone.

Good morning, dear colleagues. It's 8:30, and we are about to start our ccNSO meeting, here in Helsinki.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: Cheers.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: Cheers.

KATRINA SATAKI: I see that the audience clearly enjoys themselves, and it's very great to see that you are so enthusiastic about our ccNSO – actually, I have to tell you that this is the first time for me, in my capacity as the Chair of the ccNSO. Yes, so I have the honor to open the meeting and welcome you all here.

Second is this is the first time we have policy form, or Meeting B. So please pay attention to the agenda. You know, the main idea of the Meeting B is to break the silos. So we work in silos until

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

3:00 PM, and then we go out to the wild and meet other people, basically. Yes, it might be a little bit scary, but this is an experiment and we hope that it will work.

Yes, well, going out of the silos, it's one thing. But we, together with the Meetings Program Working Group, we do not think that everybody should go into the same door. So we think that it's good to have some options to choose from. Therefore, we tried to select some cross-community sessions that would be interesting for at least most members of our community. Shortly, Alejandra will tell you more about the new format and what to expect from ccNSO meetings here in Helsinki.

Well, it's great to be so close to home, at least for me. Maybe some of you have traveled halfway around the world. But for me, it's the closest ICANN meeting ever, I think. The local hosts, I think they did a lot for us to feel welcome and to feel safe here. And I think it's especially nice that you have the raincoats, because they know what to expect from the weather here. It was really helpful, and therefore I'd like to give the floor to Juhani, the host, to welcome us here in his hometown.

JUHANI JUSELIUS: Well, thank you, Katrina. Actually, we really did all we could for this meeting. For example, I ran the last kilometer here not to be late. So I might look quite warm, and that's true.

So finally, I got you here. So welcome to Helsinki. I think most of you know me by face, maybe by name, like Katrina did. Thank you. So this my 28th ICANN meeting, and finally it's in Helsinki. So I'm really proud host this time. And this year, it's quite remarkable for .fi in two ways. First, it's of course this ICANN meeting. So sometimes small things, like invisible viruses, has a huge impact. And this time it brought ICANN here. And actually, we got this meeting with very short notice and it required a lot from my team, flexibility and hard work.

And a good example is last night, at the city hall, Katrina just mentioned, "Juhani, would you like to have a few words in the opening of the ccNSO day?" And, well, I couldn't refuse that. And of course, I will have. But maybe I looked at bit tired or stressed or whatsoever. So my team members, Sanna and [Ann], are you here? They are not. Actually, they wrote me a speech that I should have here this morning. Well, I have that speech here, but I will skip it this time. Instead, I will read it this evening at the ccNSO cocktail. So if you come there, you will just get the speech that was written for me.

Okay, but the second big thing this year, it's a big change that .fi is about have in two months' time, September 5th, it's going to be a huge change in our policy and in our technical platform. And I'm going to have a presentation about that later today.

So what else I can say? Well, just welcome to Helsinki, and I hope you will find this meeting interesting, like ICANN meetings are always, and you will enjoy your stay here in Helsinki. Welcome.

KATRINA SATAKI: Thank you very much. I can assure you that Juhani's team was really very happy that Juhani was given this opportunity to present, not because of the honor, because now he had to get up earlier than usual, apparently. Thank you very much, and I'll see you all tonight at the cocktail.

Now I'd like to give the floor to Alejandra, the Chair of Meeting Program Working Group. And she will guide you through the two upcoming days.

ALEJANDRA REYNOSO: Thank you very much. Good morning, everyone. First I want to draw your attention to your folders. We now have a very special ccNSO ribbon that you can attach to your badge so people know that you are from the ccNSO.

And now we will walk through the agenda that we have for this meeting. So – oh, clicker maybe? Or next, please. I can't. Oh, there.

This is a policy forum. The Meeting B, as Katrina was saying, has a new format. So next, please, Kim. Thank you.

The new format is that it's only four days. We don't have welcome ceremony, public forums, public Board meeting, or a sponsored exhibition area, as you have noticed for now. And we will be having exclusive ccNSO meeting only from 8:00 to 3:00 PM. After that, it's cross-community work, and we will talk about it in the next slide, please.

So in the Hall A, it's where all the general cross-community sessions are taking place. But we felt, at the Program Working Group, that not all of those cross-community sessions were to ccNSO interesting, though they might be. So we thought you should have a choice. So most of them are gTLD-centered cross-community sessions, except those on Wednesday. But for us, we prepare a couple more. So next slide, please.

So on Tuesday – that's today – we will have a joint meeting with the GAC at 3:00 PM in their room. It's Hall A. And after that, we come back here to talk about the operational side of ICANN. These are in parallel with some general cross-community sessions, but we thought that these would be of interest for the community.

And on Wednesday, on Helsinki Hall, we will have the Country and Other Geographic Names Forum. This was prepared for

everyone to attend, but it's special for our community. So we invite you to go to that one. And after that, in the Hall A, there will be a discussion on future cross-community working groups. So this is the suggestions for the meetings after the ccNSO sessions.

Next, please.

In this meeting, we will be discussing, of course, of CWG and CCWG on Tuesday and Wednesday. On Tuesday, the Chair of the meeting will be Lise Furh, and on Wednesday, it will be Mathieu.

Next, please.

We will have, today, soon an update regarding the PDP of the Retirement of ccTLDs and the Review Mechanism for the decisions on delegations, revocations, and retirement of the ccTLDs.

Next, please.

And we will have other sessions, working group updates and IANA updates, and our special ccTLD news session.

Next, please.

And also, we will have legal session, Regional Organizations update, and the marketing session.

Next, please.

And today, we will have the ccNSO cocktail. And it's pretty close to here. It's 15-minute walk. It will be in Café Piritta. If you will take any pictures, and if you want to share them, do it on Twitter on #ccNSOcocktail so we can gather them all.

And next, please.

We want to thank very much to our generous sponsor, .fi. That is the one that made the ccNSO cocktail possible.

So that's it. Next slide, please. And welcome to the ccNSO.

KATRINA SATAKI: Thank you very much, Alejandra. So I hope you got the grasp of what to expect and you're ready for the next session. And the next session, we have updates on working groups. And I'd like to ask Giovanni and Christian to join us here. And we'll start with SOP update from Giovanni and then TLD-OPS update from Christian.

GIOVANNI SEPPIA: Good morning, and thank you for the opportunity to provide you an update on the work of the ccNSO Strategy and Operating Plan Working Group.

Okay, next slide, please. I do like Alejandra. And thank you, Kim.

So we had quite a good meeting yesterday. And we discussed about some work that has been done in the past months by the working group and ICANN. First of all, the ccNSO Strategy and Operating Plan Working Group submitted its input to ICANN on the fiscal year '17 Operating Plan and Budget on the 25th of April. And high level, we stressed the fact that there have been many improvements over the past three, four years in the way ICANN is presenting those plans. Although there is still the big weakness, which is try to have more KPIs and timeframes included in the Operating Plan and Budget.

There's been also the acknowledgement of some inconsistencies in the plan. And that is because the work that is done by Xavier's team, the CFO of ICANN, is still collect and collate all the input received from the different departments of ICANN. So he, himself, told us yesterday that it's true that some departments, they're providing with more information. Some others are a bit less generous in submitting information to him. So at the end, there are some gaps in information within the Operating Plan and Budget. And so what Xavier's team is trying to do is make sure that there is more consistency, in terms of the information that are provided at different levels in the plan, as for the actions, the objectives, the timeframes, and much more.

One important element that I would like to stress, and it was anticipated by Alejandra, is that today at 6:00, there is the very

first new session that is a sort of spinoff of the ccNSO Strategy and Operating Plan Working Group. Because it started with – 5:00, sorry – because it started with a request we had during the Marrakesh meeting. And this request was to try to have a more in-depth presentation about certain areas of ICANN, where the ccNSO SOP, for many years requested more information, clarification. And so today, from 5:00 to 6:30, if I'm not mistaken, in this room – yes – there's going to be Susanna Bennett, COO of ICANN, and Sally Costerton, who is the Senior Advisor to the President, and Senior Vice President Global Stakeholder Engagement. And they will present their plans for their respective areas. And more precisely, they will introduce a bit more details regarding the HR policy of ICANN and also the Global Stakeholder Engagement, with the office and hub strategy of ICANN, with the regional strategies that ICANN has in place for the different worldwide regions. And so it's a good moment to get more information about those two areas, and eventually for the ccNSO SOP and the entire system. So it is a good moment to get those information that we have been looking for, for several years. And so this is today at 5:00, in this room.

We also, in the feedback that we provided and submitted to ICANN on the fiscal year '17 Operating Plan and Budget, we recommended a more prudent approach to certain expenses.

And also, we invited ICANN to have an eventually even more careful assessment of the impact on ICANN's structure and on ICANN's finances of the IANA transition and the accountability processes.

Next, please.

However, what we also highlighted is that we are generally satisfied with the progress that we have seen over the years in the plan. And we have very much welcomed the fact that the structure of the plan is the same, or at least it's been kept the same for the past three years. So it's much easier for this working group, for any stakeholder, to get, to read the plan, and make comments. Because in the past, this structure of the plan was changing quite often.

It was also very welcome, the fact that ICANN not only elaborated on the feedback received on the plan, but also organized several calls with the different stakeholder groups to get clarification on some of the points that were expressed by the different stakeholders. And this is something that was done immediately after we submitted our comments. So participated in a couple of calls with ICANN staff to clarify some of the, let's say, points we raised in our feedback. And as I said, we very much welcome this expansion and also availability of ICANN to have this constituency liaise with specific departments. And that

is also, again, a good effort made by ICANN to show that there are processes in place.

Next, please.

What we highlighted, there were some elements that we highlighted and we wanted to have more, let's say, information from ICANN. The first one is the reserve fund. The reserve fund, there's been quite a discussion, for those of you who are not part of the finance mailing list of ICANN. There's been quite a discussion lately about the reserve fund and the fact that the reserve fund has been used quite extensively to cover the expenses of the IANA transition and the entire accountability processes. And so this reserve fund is now quite in its low mode, and there is an effort and an exercise of the ICANN Board to think how to replenish the fund in the coming weeks. And it is a process that yesterday Xavier said to us that is expected to be over in the next couple of months. So it's going to be in the next couple of months that the Board of ICANN will decide how to replenish the fund.

Again, the elements we highlighted in our comment were the ICANN office and hub strategy, which we will hear about later today; the staffing and remuneration policy; and some monitoring tools and indexes. A couple of them are the Technical Reputation Index and the Domain Market Place Health

Index. And ICANN has referred to them in the Operating Plan and Budget and stated that they're still working to refine those indexes, and especially for the second one. If you read the feedback of ICANN to the comment of the ccNSO SOP, there is an indication that ICANN would welcome closer interaction with this constituency, the ccNSO, to get more details about the domain name market in the different worldwide regions, to make sure that this so-called Health Index is a true health index and contains some benchmarks that can help ICANN staff to populate the future Operating Plan and Budget with even better figures.

Next, please.

If we look at the ICANN feedback to the ccNSO Strategy and Operating Plan Working Group comments, I must say that most of the responses of the ICANN staff to our comments were okay, but some of them, they were just going around the answer. So they were not providing a clear answer to our comments. And some of them, they were also saying that ICANN committed to provide certain kind of information again, like the Domain Market Health Index, in the future, but without a precise specification when this future is. And as a friend of mine, who's a UK lawyer, said to me, "When UK lawyers say, 'in the future,' it could be even 2050." And that's not what we want to wait for.

There is also a commitment of ICANN staff to refine the plan on the basis of the input provided by the different stakeholder groups. Now, yesterday, we were informed by Xavier that the final version of the fiscal year '17 Operating Plan and Budget has been approved by the ICANN Board a couple of days ago. And our remark to Xavier was that we would have appreciated if the community was presented so that if the consolidated version of the fiscal year Operating Plan and Budget was published on the ICANN site before being approved by the Board, not for a second round of comment, but as a matter to say to the community, "This is the final version." As currently on the ICANN site, there is only commitment to refine the plan. And we have not seen yet the final version of the plan. And Xavier took this as a good point, and in the future he said the will try to make sure that the plan is posted, again not to have a second round of comments, but again as a matter of saying, "Thank you again for your comments. This is the final version which we have worked on."

Next slide, please.

Also during yesterday meeting with Xavier and his team, he highlighted, himself, as well the need to have internal guidelines for multiyear project, to make sure that there are precise benchmarks and precise guidelines to be followed by those project managers at ICANN that are managing projects that are running over several years. Because apparently, it's going to be

a bit different for them to report on the status of those projects. And these guidelines have still to be developed by ICANN.

There is also the need to introduce in the plan a better assessment of risk and opportunities. And there is one element that has been commented by ICANN staff, which is the balance between to what extent risk and opportunity should be assessed against the benefit of assessing so much in-depth risk and opportunities, as there is also the risk that, by assessing too much risk and opportunities, at the end any project or some project may not take off.

And there is one comment that was made by another constituency, the Registry Stakeholder Group, which is the fact that there are some expenses listed in the Operating Plan and Budget. And some of them are probably more important and valuable for the community than others. And this constituency has highlighted which expenses are deemed to be more valuable for the community. And there were some references to expenses in the work that ICANN is having and is developing in the cyber-crime area. And what I did yesterday is to invite this working group to do the same in the future. It means that we should not only say, "Okay, this expense is too high," but we should at some point say, "We like this expense to be higher than in the past, because we believe that your work needs more investment, not

only from an organizational perspective, but also from an investment/financial resources perspective."

Next slide, please.

And those are the working group members, which I would like to thank. And I have to acknowledge their hard work to meet the deadlines to provide and submit comments to the different ICANN Operating Plan and Budget Strategy Plan reviews and much more. Thank you so much. They've been always on time. We divide ourselves in sub-working groups. And then, together with Bart and the Secretariat, with Kimberly, is helping us to put up together all the work. We, at the end, submit our final production to ICANN.

I must say that the cooperation with the ICANN staff has improved greatly. There is much more interaction and much more cooperation, and there is a clear intention of ICANN staff, especially Xavier's team, to share as much as possible, to show transparency, to show commitment to the community. So I'm quite happy of the relation that we have been developing so far and the status of the relation at this point.

Thank you, and I remain available for any further questions.

KATRINA SATAKI: Thank you very much, Giovanni, for this great update. So are there any questions? Ching?

CHING CHIAO: Okay, good morning, Giovanni. Maybe just a short question, because I have number of question marks in my mind. But excellent work here. And you correctly point out about risk for the opportunity. The way I see, the risk part could be lying within. And maybe let's take one step back, is we have a new CEO coming in who took the office approximately 1 ½ months. So do you envision that this plan will go along, will tag along, with his overall strategy for the organization, let's say, in the next 12 months? Or do we have similar comments that say we categorize this maybe could be a potential risk because of the new management and this budget is from the past?

GIOVANNI SEPPIA: Thank you, Ching. I think it's not entirely to me to answer this question. What I can tell you is that we, as the ccNSO Strategy and Operating Plan Working Group, we produced a comment saying that it's a special year for ICANN because of the IANA transition, because of the accountability process, and because of the new CEO. And the response of ICANN has been that there is a certain level of flexibility in the plan, to accommodate changes on the [go]. And at the same time, we learned yesterday

that the plan has been approved, as it has been consolidated by ICANN staff.

What the main weakness at present I see, and according to what I read and what I heard from Xavier, is regarding the reserve fund and the need to get resources to complete the IANA transition and the accountability process. And those resources currently are still taken from the reserve. But again, there is a commitment of the Board to find a way to replenish the fund and to establish how much should be in the fund to allow ICANN to cope with the operation expenses for a certain number of months.

At the same time yesterday, during the talks, we understood that – and that was thanks to a comment made by [Rolof], was very much to the point that ICANN is not only having the reserve fund, but also has other side reserves that, at some point, can be used. But it's still up to ICANN do decide how to manage those reserves. But it's not that we should only look at the reserve fund.

CHING CHIAO: Yeah, with the rapid growth of the TLDs and New gTLD marketplace, maybe the reserve fund may not be an issue, but it's good to point out. Thanks.

GIOVANNI SEPPIA: Welcome.

KATRINA SATAKI: Thank you very much. Anymore questions in the audience? If no, thank you very much, Giovanni.

                          And now an update from our TLD-OPS.

CHRISTIAN HESSELMAN: So thank you. So this is an update of the TLD-OPS Working Group, made by the TLD-OPS Standing Committee.

                          Next slide, please.

                          So just a quick summary of what TLD-OPS is. TLD-OPS is the – sorry – technical incident response community for and by ccTLDs, as [we log] it. And it basically brings those of us together who are responsible for the security and stability of their ccTLD. And our goal is to increase the security and stability of ccTLD services, as well as of the Internet infrastructure as a whole.

                          We accomplish this actually in two ways. One is to improve the reachability of incident response, context of the various ccTLDs, and also to increase the level of shared knowledge, in terms of security and stability incidents that might take place at various ccTLDs or elsewhere.

So it's important to emphasize that TLD-OPS is open to every ccTLD. It doesn't matter if you're a ccNSO member or not. And the people who kind of – the oversight body for the community is the TLD-OPS Standing Committee, which consists of representatives of the various ccTLDs from the different regions, plus people from SSAC, IANA, and ICANN's security team.

Next slide, please.

So the TLD-OPS community basically revolves around the TLD-OPS mailing list, which is a very basic incident response facility in our case. So we use it in two ways. One is as a contact repository. And this means that we have an automated script running on the mail server that sends out mail messages every month that contain the contact information of all subscribers of the TLD-OPS mailing list. So these are the security and stability contacts of the various ccTLDs. And the information includes first name, last name, phone number, and e-mail address. So the advantage of this approach is that you, as a subscriber, have all the contact information of your peers in one e-mail. And it even works in offline situations. So if you're being DDoS-ed and you can no longer reach the outside world, you can still check with your local inbox to look up the contact information of your peers.

We're not using any vetting model, which is typical for the security industry. But we have adopted a low-entry membership model, in which your IANA admin contact has to appoint a certain person as their security and stability contact for the ccTLD.

The second use of the mailing list is to actually exchange information on security incidents and can be on basically anything: attacks, malware. And the goal is to share that information within a group of trusted peers, which are the members of the TLD-OPS community. And folks who share that kind of information need to flag the information with what we call a TLP protocol, traffic light protocol. So you indicate whether information can be shared outside of the group or not. That's basically what's it about.

We have a leaflet. The English version is in the packet on your desk. And since a few weeks, we also have versions in Arabic, Chinese, French, Russian, Spanish. Ah, it's in Russian twice.

Okay, next slide, please.

So this is the current TLD-OPS membership status. We have 61% of all ccTLDs on the planet on the list, so that's quite good. As you can see, that's quite a good score. But there's still quite a few ccTLDs missing, in particular from the African region and also from the LAC region. So we're working hard to change that.

Next slide, please. Excuse me? I thought there was a question.

Okay. So what did we do since ICANN 55? There were reports for three security incidents on the list. So one about spear-phishing, one about a malvertising campaign in the Netherlands, and one about ransomware that used domain names from various ccTLDs. We had four new members: San Marino, Vanuatu, Faroe Islands, and Morocco. And we also noticed that the list is being actively used by our members, because we regularly receive requests to update contact information. So this suggests that the TLD-OPS is being integrated into the operational processes of the various members.

In terms of outreach, we had the leaflet translated in various languages. We met with the APTLD manager at the CENTR Jamboree. At least people from the TLD-OPS Standing Committee went to the African Internet Summit. And we are actively engaging with the managers of the Regional Organizations and the ICANN regional VPs to get more members on the list. This is a bit of a challenge for the group, because we have some contacts, of course, with ccTLDs, and we try to get folks on board individually. But in the end, we very much depend on the collaboration with the regional organization managers and also with the ICANN regional VPs.

Okay, next slide, please.

So we set a few targets for this ICANN meeting. The first two are kind of red, because we didn't make them. The first goal was to get 185 members on the list. We got to 178. So it's an increase, but not as much as we hoped. And the other thing that didn't really materialize yet is the collaboration with ICANN's security team. They offered to package security information that they see from their perspective and share that on the mailing list, also to stimulate the members to share security incidents that they see in their respective countries. So this didn't materialize yet, and we're working with the ICANN security team to make this happen for the next ICANN meeting.

Then we had a goal to set up a simple procedure to update the contact information of the members. But this turned out not to be necessary, because it already work. So no need to do anything there.

And the other thing was to get somebody from the Asia-Pacific region on the Standing Committee. And that's Jay Daley from .nz. So we managed to check that off.

Next slide, please.

So our objectives for ICANN 57, well, at least one of the important things is to actually grow. So we're aiming for 187 at the next ICANN meeting. Of course, like I said, we will need the help from the community and the Regional Organization

managers and ICANN regional vice presidents to actually make that happen.

And we actually want to implement that collaboration with ICANN security team so we can get that security information that they promised.

And finally, we're drafting a TLD-OPS terms of use, which we found necessary because we had one occasion where people used the contact information for a purpose that it was not intended for. Let's put it that way.

Okay, next slide, please. Oh, that was my last slide. So these are the folks on the working group that make this work happen. And if you have any questions, then I'll be available to answer them.

KATRINA SATAKI: Thank you very much, Christian. So are there any questions in the audience? Yes, Hiro, please come to the mic.

HIROFUMI HOTTA: Thank you, Christian. I have a question about you told that three real incidents was reported to the mailing list. And I'd like to know a little bit more, how the mailing list worked for the incidents, for example, spear-phishing.

CHRISTIAN HESSELMAN: Sorry. It worked, actually, pretty straightforward. The person that reported this basically flagged the information with the traffic light protocol code – I think it was red or amber in this case – and just sent it off. And we don't have a back channel to check what happened to this alert, if that's what you mean. So it's informing the members, and they have to then respond to it. Yeah.

KATRINA SATAKI: Okay, thank you very much. Do we have more questions in the audience? If no, then thank you very much, Christian.

And I think we're moving forward very smoothly. By the way, please do not forget that, as always, we have our satisfaction survey sent out after the meeting. So if you liked these particular presentations, please do not forget to note it in your survey. So now we are moving to – yeah, the survey also included in the packet. This time, we decided to have a paper survey as well. Probably, it will be easier for you to fill in, because we really need your feedback to improve and to make these presentations more interesting.

So Bart and Becky, may I ask you to join me here? Now we're moving to the next session. It's PDP and retirement of ccTLDs and review mechanism for decisions on delegation, revocation, and retirement of ccTLDs.

Who will start? Okay, Becky will start.

BECKY BURR: Good morning, everyone. It's nice that the sun is shining today and we're in this room, so maybe later we can open the curtains. As I'm sure you all recall in painful detail, we have been working on issues related to delegation, transfer, and revocation of ccTLDs here for many years. A group of us spent time looking at IANA's history of delegations and what we were then calling redelegations in the Delegation and Redelegation Working Group, and made a very comprehensive study and identified some problems and inconsistencies in the way that was proceeding. The Framework of Interpretation Working Group followed on and tried to provide clarity, to bring consistencies to IANA's application of RFC 1591 in this context.

As part of that process – and this has all been really terrific progress that I think is going to help us bring some consistency and predictability to how IANA processes these changes. But there are two things that we did identify. First of all, RFC 1591 itself articulates or is based on the premise that ccTLD managers should have a mechanism to appeal delegations/revocations by IANA and that there should be some mechanism for that to happen, which, as we all know, doesn't really exist outside of an external judicial process.

And the other thing is that there is, RFC 1591 refers to explicitly and embraces the ISO 3166-1 list as the authoritative source of ccTLD codes. But it does not address the issue of what happens when a country code is removed from the ISO 3166-1 list for when countries change names and the like. And as we know, that's happened in several cases. So those were two places where we identified the need for policy development by the ccNSO.

In addition, of course, as part of the IANA transition and the CCWG Accountability work, as a group we looked at the independent review mechanism and elected, as a group, to say that the issue of ccTLD delegation, revocation, and transfer should not be subject to review through an IRP unless and until the ccNSO develops policy. That's [inaudible] what the standard would be, how those rules would be applied, and the like.

So we now find ourselves at the place where the implementation, the transition is hopefully going to go forward. And we have these two pieces of policy work to do. So as we discussed in Marrakesh, we want to start the process by asking for an Issues Report on retirement of ccTLD codes and on dispute resolution mechanisms, and appoint an Issues Manager and sort of kick off the process. So that's what we're here to talk about today.

And, Bart, you're going to take us through the process.

BART BOSWINKEL: Yeah, it will be a little bit repetitive of what I presented in Marrakesh, but includes an update.

Kim, could you put on the next slide, please?

So again, if you look at the policy development process, in principle you could identify three stages. One is the launch of a PDP. That includes, as Becky already alluded to, it starts with the request for an Issue Report, description of issues, assessment of timelines, etc. So it's very procedural. And based on that document, the ccNSO Council needs to decide whether or not to initiate a ccNSO policy development process. That really kicks it off. There is some voting, etc., involved and mechanism, but that's not relevant at this date.

So then you go into, I would say, stage 2, which is really the substantive part of a PDP. That's the development of a policy. It starts with the interim report. So that needs to be developed first. Goes out for public comment/inputs, and ends with a final report.

And then with the final report, then you enter into stage 3, which is more or less the decision-making phase. And decision-making phase is first the adoption of the final report by the Council, and

then comes in probably one of the major differences between the ccNSO and other organization. Then there is a ccNSO members vote. And if the ccNSO members adopt the recommendations in the final report, then it will be submitted to the ICANN Board of Directors by the ccNSO Council.

Next slide, please.

So characteristics of a PDP, if you drill down a little bit more, the duration of every PDP and policy development process – and we do have limited experience, fortunately – it's set almost by stage 2, so the development of the policy. It includes, at a minimum, two rounds of public comment. It kicks off with a public comment on the Issue Report and then on the interim report. And most of the time, it's also on a draft final report. And every public comment period is, in principle, at least 40 days. It could be longer. And that was one of the experiences with the FOI. Although not a policy development process as defined, it really worked out well to provide plenty of time to the community to go through it, be aware of what's in it, etc. Then if you look what will happen during that second stage, so it's the analysis of the issue, development of recommendation. And my minimal and very, very optimistic assessment is that it will take at least six months.

Then you go into the third stage, which includes the members' vote. And again, that will take, yeah, I would say two months. And then we hit one of the real issues there. And that's what we've seen with the IDN PDP, is there is a quorum rule that at least 80 members currently need to vote. It doesn't matter how they vote, but at least 80 members vote on the recommendation. Then if the majority votes in favor of the recommendation, then it's adopted. So last time, with the IDN PDP, we needed to have two rounds of vote because the first round, we just missed the threshold.

Next slide, please.

So as you may recall from the Marrakesh meeting, we presented to you effectively two methods to deal with these two topics, the review mechanism and the retirement of ccTLDs. The first method is to initiate a single PDP. So that would mean, because I think we have the experience of working groups, not with taskforce, that would mean chartering two groups: one dealing with the review mechanism and the other one dealing with the retirement, so Working Group 1, Working Group 2. And what is very important to understand is if the Council and the community opts for one single PDP, the total package – so the output of Working Group 1 and 2, so both on the review mechanism and on the retirement – is subject to the members' vote. So that's the end of the process.

So next slide, please.

So the second method is initiate two PDPs, one on the review mechanisms. And at the end of that stage, there will be a members' vote on the policy itself, and then initiate at one point. And you can play around a little bit when you want to initiate it. But then start and kick off the second PDP on the retirement of ccTLDs, and then you have a second members' vote at the end of PDP. It's very important to understand that you would first have a vote on the review mechanism, and then later on, on the retirement.

Next slide, please.

So based on the discussions in Marrakesh, and that was the way Becky and I – what we took from the room is, first of all, that the review mechanism on decisions relating to delegation, revocation, transfer has the highest priority. You, the ccTLD community present at Marrakesh, would like to start off and kick off that process first. Secondly, the preference is one PDP. Again, so going back to the single model. But that didn't have as much support at the time as, say, the review mechanism and the highest priority. And then thirdly, that was a suggestion, do as much in parallel as possible in order to speed this process up as much as possible.

Next slide, please.

So what will happen here in Helsinki? And that's why we're back with you on this topic. As Becky already said, at this meeting, the Council intends to launch the PDP, a PDP, one PDP. And the Helsinki Council decisions will be the request for an Issue Report to be published before the Hyderabad meeting, so somewhere early October, so the community has plenty of time to look at the Issues Report. And one of the major questions in the Issues Report, and that you will see in the Council resolution, is whether or not to initiate one or two PDPs. Because we've done some mapping, etc., and timing, and we need your feedback as well on whether one or two.

The second thing is in preparing the Issue Report, we'll be guided by – and I think, again, this is to reiterate what Becky just said – the Delegation/Redelegation Working Group final report on retirement of ccTLDs. This was a report of the 7th of March, 2011. And the main recommendation of that report was that at some point in time, the ccNSO needs to launch and initiate a PDP on the retirement of ccTLDs.

The second major document to be looked at and to guide the Issue Report is the ccNSO Framework of Interpretation, RFC 1591, and then the ISO 3166 Standard, because there are some rules which are in this standard, which are probably very, very relevant with respect to the retirement of ccTLD, and to really understand what it means with ISO code. And as Becky already

said, people forget sometimes this standard, or the list of ccTLDs, is not static. It changes over time. And then finally, the CWG Stewardship final report, Annex O, and that's the survey among the ccTLD managers on whether or not to include a review mechanism in the stewardship proposal. And the Accountability Working Group build on that one as well.

So that's probably the most substantive part of what will be discussed by Council on Thursday. The second point is appointment of issue manage that's driving the process. And then the third one is – and that's again to avoid that an issue manager works in isolation, especially during the first phase, is the appointment of an Oversight Committee of six councilors, one from every region. So the ccNSO members appointed councilors, and one NomCom appointee.

Next slide, please.

So this is where we're at right now, and then I will hand it over to Becky again. These are my words for some of the concerns I've noticed with councilors. First, there is a concern within Council on the availability of community members and the workload for the community if we kick off the policy development process. Based on experience, it's going to be a very intense period. And it's very clear we have some other major projects on our plate

right now, or the community has some major projects on their plate right now.

And then the second one – and this really drives the decision around the one or two PDPs – is when is the review mechanism needed? If you want it to happen quickly, if you want to have a review mechanism available quickly, then you want to go for one PDP or two PDPs, because the members' vote, as I said, determines the time when the PDP is closing. And then it's submitted to the Board, and there is implementation work. If there is one PDP, you have to wait until the policy around the retirement of ccTLDs is completed.

So, Becky, back to you.

BECKY BURR: So just to reiterate that last point, we can launch the Issues Report without making a determination about whether we want to do one or two at this point. So we could use the Issue Report that comes out of this if we decided we wanted to focus first on a review mechanism and getting that closed off as quickly as possible, and then use the same Issues Report for a second PDP and move that along. But my understanding is we don't need to make that call right now. We can do that in Hyderabad with the benefit of the Issues Report. So obviously, this is something that's very important and, like all things related to RFC 1591,

pretty complicated. And yet it is sort of crucial to this community.

So at this point, I think we should open it up for a discussion. The Council does have a draft resolution that calls for development of an Issues Report and appointment of an Issues Manager that we'll be talking about on Thursday. And I see Dr. Lissa. They're not censoring you, I'm sure.

EBERHARD LISSA: There we go. Good morning. I was on the – what was it – the first one, DRDG, whatever it was –

BECKY BURR: Delegation/Redelegation Working Group.

EBERHARD LISSA: Delegation/Redelegation and the Framework of Interpretation Working Group. I think we should have two PDPs. There is no need for speed. We have done without these mechanisms for about – how many years? Well, in my case since 1991. That's 25 years. There is no need to rush things. We have all the time to deliberate carefully, like we did in those working groups. And if we take one first, I also would prefer the review mechanism.

On the other hand, we have currently .an facing redelegation while they are still active domain, even if only 20. And IANA is being stubborn. They're not listening, really. So I don't know which one we should do first. I think we should have two.

BECKY BURR: Thank you. And let me just say, I have to agree that, obviously, we have to take our time. But I have to agree with Bart that the notion that this would be a six-month process was extraordinarily optimistic.

DANKO JEVTOVIĆ: Having experience with former Yugoslavia and these processes, I would just like to support this process. But I think due to the workload for other people, maybe it's a challenge to have it in parallel. So I also think this is something very important and maybe not so urgent. So Council should rethink how the people can be involved in this. And maybe it is difficult to find both people for both processes in the same time, so some of the people might be in both groups. So, thank you.

BECKY BURR: Thank you. Other comments or questions?

So as I said, I think this question about one PDP versus two, we do not have to decide while we are here. We'll get an issues report on both of the topics, and then we will be able to discuss that. And people will have assessed workload. Hopefully we will be a little further along in some of the Work Stream 2 and transition issues, which may free up some resources from among the folks here.

BART BOSWINKEL: Any other questions, comments? We have plenty of time?

BECKY BURR: You guys haven't had enough coffee yet this morning, apparently.

BART BOSWINKEL: No? That's good.

KATRINA SATAKI: Well, just a quick question then. Who in the audience would be willing to participate in this work? How many volunteers can we…

BECKY BURR: It looks like at least one from each region.

KATRINA SATAKI: Okay. All right. That's encouraging.

BART BOSWINKEL: Yeah.

KATRINA SATAKI: Yeah. Okay, so thank you very much. Well, I'm glad to see that Elise is already here, because apparently we finished half an hour earlier than expected. So, Elise, please join us here. Thank you very much, Bart and Becky.

You will never, ever get so much time next time.

Okay, so we'll continue with IANA update. And you have an hour.

ELISE GERICH: Do I get to sing and dance too?

KATRINA SATAKI: Yes.

ELISE GERICH: Well, good morning, and I'm glad I was able to be here on time. Otherwise, you might have had a much longer coffee break. I'm

so sorry. So do I drive this myself? Oh, I'm sorry. I just wanted to know.

Anyway, my name is Elise Gerich, and I'm here to give the IANA functions update. And we have five topics on the agenda. One, I wanted to remind everyone about the performance KPIs that were set about four years ago, when we did a public consultation. And we've been reporting on them regularly. So just kind of to refresh your memories and give you an update.

Talk about the monthly Root Zone Data Report that we publish and that we made some changes to in April. And I'm not sure if you realized we made the changes, so I wanted to bring it to your attention.

Finally, there's some parallel operations testing that's been happening that has to do with the IANA stewardship transition. And just to point that out, in case you were unaware of it, it has to do with the Root Zone Management System. We've completed the third-party audits for last year, and they've been published, so I'll give you an update on that. And finally, staffing, we have some new staff. So I wanted to make sure you knew who you might be receiving e-mail from, if their names seem unfamiliar.

Next slide. I turned off my mic, instead. Okay, you can go to the next one, please.

So you'll see two slides now. One of them, many years ago – like four – we did a public consultation. And you all came up with these KPIs, key performance indicators, for what we should be doing if we had root zone file and WHOIS database change requests. There were metrics: timeliness and accuracy. As you can see, the targets that were set was, for timeliness, 80% of the time we had to complete a data change within 21 days. So that's into the WHOIS database, the IANA WHOIS database. And then for accuracy, we had to hit 100% of the time.

This is just a snapshot from the report for May 2016. If you go to the iana.org/performance website, it'll show you all the monthly reports that started in 2013 through this month's report. I think on this report, we've hit our targets all 100% of the time. But unfortunately, on the plane my laptop didn't work, so I didn't get to do the data analysis and show a pretty graph. But if you'd like to go back and see all the reports, they're there.

Next slide. Thank you.

The other key performance indicator that we came up with, with you all, through the public consultation process was for delegation and redelegation of ccTLDs. And as you can see, the timeliness was set at a target of 50% done within 120 days. I know when we did the public consultation, there was a lot of comment at that time that sometimes it can take as long as a

year, and sometimes it can take even longer, to do a redelegation or a delegation. So the 120 days was kind of an aggressive target. And sometimes we hit it 100% of the time, and sometimes we don't. But the accuracy is also 100%. So this again is a report from May 2016. And you can find all the reports, starting in 2013, on the website iana.org/performance.

So next slide, please.

So those key performance indicators are key performance indicators that we've been collecting for the last several years. As part of the IANA stewardship transition, the CWG, which included membership from ccTLDs, defined some new Service Level Expectations. And these are things that we'll be collecting data on and reporting on in the future.

So starting in March, we had completed the instrumentation to the Root Zone Management System that would allow us to collect the data and the measurements that were defined by the CWG in its Service Level Expectations. And right now, we're in the process of developing a real-time dashboard so that we can present that information to you all in a more digestible way, instead of just huge logs' worth of data measurements. And we expect that the dashboard will be available at prototype for review by the CWG and others, sometime in mid-July, at which point my understanding is that there'll be a discussion to set

Service Level Agreements from the Service Level Expectations. So the data we're collecting right now is really setting a baseline so that we know what the timelines and the measures are that we've been seeing. And then we can set reasonable targets, based on that information.

Next slide. Thank you.

So next, I'd just like to mention the Root Zone Data Reports, in case you're unaware of those.

Next slide.

So we've been publishing what I call the Root Zone Data Reports since September 2013. Again, these are on the same page, iana.org/performance. And it identifies each change that's been made to the root zone file and the root zone database that were completed within a month. So any change that happened within the month of May 2016 is in that report that's posted most recently. And as of April 2016, these reports also include pending delegation and redelegation requests. That was not originally in these reports, and we started publishing that in April.

Next slide, please.

So this is a snapshot of the report that was published in June. It obviously has a much longer list of pending things, and there are some ccTLDs at the bottom of this list. Most of them that are the

bottom of the list that are ccTLDs are IDN ccTLDs. And then there's a comparable list that's for redelegations. So every month, we publish the list not only of things completed within the month for the root zone file updates, but also things that are pending, that are in process and haven't been completed within the month.

Next slide, please.

And parallel operations results. Please move ahead to the next slide.

So the post-NTIA stewardship proposal defines an elimination of NTIA's role to authorize all changes to the root zone file. So if you're familiar – and I'm sure everyone in this room is – with the process when you submit a root zone file change request to the IANA department, we make sure it meets all the criteria. Then we send it to NTIA. NTIA says, "Okay, yes, you've followed your process properly." And then NTIA tells Verisign, "Okay, now you can put it in the root zone and distribute it." So that role of NTIA between the IANA department and Verisign is going away.

In order to make sure that there would be a smooth transition, in the hopes and the expectations that there will be a transition, we put up a parallel system. Verisign and ICANN together have two parallel threads running so that one thread goes to Verisign the normal way, through NTIA with its approval, and then the

other parallel process does not have the NTIA approval in it. And at the end of the month, we compare – actually, daily we compare the root zone file at the end of the day to make sure, through both processes, that the root zone file that's created is identical.

So as of April 6, ICANN and Verisign began this testing process. And it's a 90-day testing process to verify the continuity and the integrity of the data in the root zone file. And we publish reports on that.

If you can go to the next slide, please?

So there's a webpage – and I've put the long link there, so I won't bother reading it – that shows where all the details about the parallel testing are, the description of it, as well as the two monthly reports. Since we started in April, we have and April and May report are posted. And then finally, Verisign has put up a page where they show the daily comparisons between the two root zone files. So this is information for you, if you were unaware of it, but to let you know that we're doing our due diligence to make sure, when and if the transition takes place, that we have a Root Zone Management System in place so that it can continue without the authorization function of NTIA.

Next slide, please.

Okay, part of our annual agreement is to do third-party audits of our systems. And if you can go to the next slide?

So we have completed the two third-party audits that we do every year. One is called a SOC3. That's a Service Organization Control audit of the KSK system. That's the key-signing system. And this is the sixth year that we've completed that. And we've posted the certificate from PricewaterhouseCoopers, who's the third-party auditor, on our website. And for the last three years, we've done an additional audit. And this one is for the IANA Registry Maintenance System, the RZMS system. And we had no exceptions. This is a SOC2.

There's a difference between SOC3. Sorry to use that jargon, but that's the way the auditors call it, SOC2 and SOC3. SOC3 is kind of a pass/fail. Basically, they just say "You did good," or they don't' tell you anything. So the fact that we've gotten acceptance for the SOC3 for six years means that we've done well and we passed. We didn't fail. And then the SOC2 is a big, long report that the auditors provide to ICANN. And this tells us areas where we can see, even though we've done well and there's no exceptions, that we can maybe find places where we want to make improvements. It doesn't mean that things are bad. It just means we get more information. So these audits are conducted annually, and you can find them posted on this link.

Next slide, please.

Staffing. So this brings me to my next-to-last slide. If you go to the next slide?

So it's a little pictorial of everyone in our department. I'm the one that says, "Elise." That's me. And I'm the VP of the department. Then you know Kim Davies. He's been here regularly for many, many years, and he leads our Technical Services department. Working for Kim are Andres and Punky and Ali. And Punky, that's his nickname. He prefers to go by it. But Andres and Punky are the cryptographic key managers in the department and so they take care of all the KSK key ceremonies. Ali is a software developer. He's actually in the IT department, but we've adopted him because he's completely dedicated to working on our systems and our registry systems, and all the tools that we use.

Then Naela Sarras, who's next to Kim, she manages the team that handles all the processing of the requests. And her team includes Sabrina, Amanda, Selina, and Paula. They are IANA specialists, and you may interact with them if you've sent in requests. So Sabrina, Amanda, Selina, and Paula really handle all the processing and the requests.

Then Marilia Hirano, she's our Continuous Improvement Manager. She manages our audits and also our continuity and

contingency planning. So when we do rollover plans or tabletop exercises, Marilia is in charge of that. She also sends out the customer survey every year. So if you've received any of ICANN's IANA department customer service surveys, it's Marilia who is responsible for that. And Shaunte, who's below her in this photo, reports to Marilia. And she's our audit associate. She's the person who does all the legwork for the audits, collecting the samples and the data and everything to share with the third-party auditors.

And then finally, Jennifer, on the bottom row, she's our administrative assistant. And she supports us, and we really need that support. We are thankful that she's there.

So Michelle Cotton, on the top row, is our IANA Engagement Manager with the IETF. And she manages all of the protocol parameter engagement. And that means attending three IETF meetings a year, staffing an IANA support desk at the IETF meetings, reading all the RFCs that have IANA considerations, and taking care of that aspect of things for the IETF protocol parameter function.

So this is the IANA department staff, and I thought some of those names and faces might be new to you and that this might be a good opportunity to introduce them. And that's the end of my presentation.

Next slide.

Thank you, and I'll take questions, if you have any.

KATRINA SATAKI: No, no, not yet. Not yet. We have a question from Ching.

CHING CHIAO: Thanks for the presentation. Just out of my curiosity, and probably many people here in the room will be interested to know, who is the talented person managing the IDN tables?

ELISE GERICH: So the IDN tables are the code and the RFC that's been written, is Kim Davies. Okay. Oh, good, I'll share that with him. Thank you.

KATRINA SATAKI: Thank you. Are there any more questions? We still have 40 minutes until coffee break.

ELISE GERICH: Time for a song and dance? Just kidding.

KATRINA SATAKI: We have a question here. Take your time.

ELISE GERICH: You have 40 minutes to get to the microphone.

Don't rush, now.

JAY DALEY: Thank you, Elise. In Marrakesh, we had a conversation about the assumptions of privacy around how long a particular TLD's request takes to go through. I, and a number of the other Registry Operators – this is from the gTLD space – who had been involved in the SLE discussions had assumed that there would be no issue about saying that this request for this particular TLD took this long, this request for that TLD took that long, and things. And we felt that was important, because it would enable transparency about whether or not different regions have different processing speeds that may then indicate problems with language or other things within particular regions. It's not that IANA treats regions differently. And that assumption came against the assumption from within ICANN that that stuff ought to be private, that you could show a request took this time, but not who the TLD was, because there was an assumption that TLDs would want that private.

When is a process going to start to consult about that, and to find out which of those assumptions is correct and whether we

can remove that privacy so that we can see that data openly about provisioning?

ELISE GERICH: So I think I would characterize our conversation in Marrakesh slightly differently, because I thought there was conclusion from the people in the room that the aggregate data, without identification of individual TLDs, was the intent of the report, and that there were different perceptions by some of the authors of the report and it wasn't within the report. But I thought Lise and Jonathan had said that their expectation was that it was the aggregates. But that's beside the point.

And so the question is, when can we raise the discussion about whether or not that information of individual TLDs – for instance, say .nz took two years to make a root zone change for some reason. And it would show that the IANA department spent two days on it, and .nz used a year and a half. That's a bad example, of course. And if the community would support having every one of their TLDs identified like that and showing that there's IANA time – I'll call it that – and then there's TLD time, and then there's potentially, I don't know, Verisign time, say.

So that discussion, I think, could happen at any time, say, within the ccTLDs. The gTLDs have more contractual relationship. So

some of that information is contractual in the SLAs there. Did I answer your question at all?

JAY DALEY: Sort of. I think I'm trying to make you responsible for something here.

ELISE GERICH: Oh, okay. All right.

JAY DALEY: I think that in IANA should begin a process of consultation, across CCs and Gs, about this. I think that what you talked about, about the contracts in the Gs, is only there because of this underlying assumption. And so it's not there because it's been thought through and people have agreed it should be there. It's just somebody wrote it in, thinking that's what's needed. And so I think an overall consultation from IANA, which tries to avoid a differentiation between Cs and Gs, and just talks about TLDs and privacy expectations, or not privacy expectations, would be very useful here.

And I'd prefer also that it [worked] on the default of open data and said, "IANA is in favor of open data. We believe it should be published like this, this, and this. Who objects, and why do they

object?" And ask those who want it to be made private give good reasons about it. I think that would be a very useful step for us getting a framework underneath privacy within IANA database, or within the transaction database.

ELISE GERICH: So I see it's different. It's an ask, versus just a question. And I think that's actually a good idea. However, I would like to wait until we find out if this transition goes through or not, mostly because anything that I ask right now would then come under the purview of NTIA. And according to the contract at this point in time, I would have to consult with them before I could consult with you to make changes to what we do.

JAY DALEY: Okay. Can you –

ELISE GERICH: Because there is explicit language in the contract today about confidentiality of data that we receive from you and send to them.

JAY DALEY: Right, okay. That makes sense. Is it possible to start an equivalent of a Work Stream 2 process, where you say, "We're

not talking about anything now, but future, when this happens, this is the consultation about that," so that we can at least begin that conversation?

ELISE GERICH: It's kind of a question of what's most important to you to start right now, because the transition has put a lot of changes in place, or will be putting a lot of changes in place. So we have a lot of moving parts. Is this something that we should start now and delay some of the other things? Or is this something that could wait 'til September or October?

JAY DALEY: It can wait. I think it will be nice to see a plan of all of those things so that we then are listened to when we're asking things like this, what impact that would have.

ELISE GERICH: So hopefully, I know there is going to be an implementation of the IANA stewardship transition here, an Implementation Plan. That has a lot of the moving parts that I'm talking about, because most of the moving parts do impact the IANA department. And we're engaged in a lot of the implementation things, like the parallel testing and other things of that nature. We also have on our plate the Framework of Interpretation

changes, which have made little progress to date, except for retiring ICP 1, is it, or 2? I'm sorry, whichever ICP it was, it's retired.

JAY DALEY: Good, because it's rude [inaudible] that one.

ELISE GERICH: Yeah. Sorry. But it's retired. It's gone, or archived, or whatever the right thing is.

JAY DALEY: Never existed is the [crosstalk] –

ELISE GERICH: Okay, I'll take it out of my vocabulary.

JAY DALEY: Okay, that's great. So that plan shows the impacts on IANA clearly, so we can then understand.

ELISE GERICH: It doesn't relate directly to the IANA department, but it shows you all the projects that are in flight at this point in time, and we're engaged in those projects.

JAY DALEY: Okay. So there's no easy way to extract the IANA impact timeline from that?

ELISE GERICH: Well, the IANA impact is obviously the deadline would be September 30th. Between now and then, we're very engaged.

JAY DALEY: Okay. So it's just one plan, one thing, September 30th. Okay, great. Thank you, Elise.

ELISE GERICH: Okay. Thanks for the suggestion, and we definitely will follow up.

JAY DALEY: Okay, thank you.

KATRINA SATAKI: Thank you very much. Nigel?

NIGEL ROBERTS: Hi, this is just a follow-on from the last conversation in regard to Framework of Interpretation. Sorry? I'm not blaming anybody, Garth.

I'm going to ask, how can we help you? Because basically, I've said this for many years. I don't it needs implementing. It simply needs to be held up that whenever you make a decision, you refer to that as the authoritative source of any interpretation, whether it's a question of how do you… I do know there's an outstanding question. I think it's the outstanding question that Garth – Garth was here yesterday. Sorry, Bart. And I'm very happy to assist in any work that might need to be done on that. But how can we help you?

ELISE GERICH: So I think you just volunteered. And Bart's probably going to talk to you about it. There's one piece of the Framework of Interpretation that needs implementation that has to do with the sponsoring organization or managing organization. But it's a way of identifying –

NIGEL ROBERTS: This is what you're saying? You're –

ELISE GERICH: Yes. Yes.

NIGEL ROBERTS: Right, okay.

ELISE GERICH: And in order to make the kinds of changes to the Root Zone Management System and all the e-mail messages that come out and everything, we need to understand how that's supposed to work so that we don't have to redo work over and over again.

NIGEL ROBERTS: Okay.

ELISE GERICH: And so that's the one open question, and then we can try and move forward with a plan and timelines, etc.

                       And Bart has just volunteered that it's on his plate, and please talk to Bart.

                       Do we have any other questions, or anyone volunteer to sing a song or do a little dance? Okay. Well then, I think that's all I have for the IANA functions update. Thank you for your attention.

KATRINA SATAKI:	Thank you very much, Elise. And with that, we have 45 minutes for a coffee break. 45 minutes. Yeah, we reconvene at 10:45 for the ccTLD news session, chaired by Hiro Hotta. And, well, expect to see all of you back.
	Dear colleagues, if you need an invitation to the ccNSO cocktail tonight, you are welcome without any invitations. But invitations have address, time, and a nice small map on the back. So please come to Kim and get your copy.
HIROFUMI HOTTA:	So there are presenters in the ccTLD news session, please come to the front. Do we have Juhani? And all right. And Dmitry and Andrew and Freddy. Yeah, please come to the front. Yes, I think you turn on the – okay.
	All right, now it's time start our popular ccTLD news session. So today we have four presenters from .fi, .ua, .vu, and .id. So first presenter will be Juhani, Juhani Juselius. Okay, please.
JUHANI JUSELIUS:	Well, thank you, Hiro, and it's nice to see you again. This time, I didn't have to run here, so I was ready on the spot.
	Okay, so this year it's really interesting for .fi because we are hosting this ICANN meeting. But it's not the topic that I would

like to now have a presentation about. This year, it's about the big changes for the .fi registry. And there's one big change and, well, one minor one. And I will just start with the minor one. Yeah.

So .fi, it's operated by Finnish Communications Regulatory Authority. And we just had a minor change in our organization. And those registry operations functions, they were moved to under our National Cyber Security Centre. Actually, it's just another department within FICORA, so it's not basically a big change. But I hope it enables us to cooperate more closely with other security functions within FICORA. In this change, customer service functions were separated from other functions. They're under a different department nowadays. But those people are still sitting physically next to us, so it was not a big change. And yesterday, three person from the customer service were just helping us at our booth. You might have met with them yesterday.

Well, but the big change, it's about many things. It's kind of a bunch of mini-changes that were bundled together. And why we bundled them together, actually the reason is, I would say, the law, because quite many of these things are written in the law or in the regulation. And we just decided to have a big change, instead of many smaller ones, because changing the law, it's

quite a difficult project always. Now we just handle one change and that's it.

And the reason why we're having all these changes, actually, there are two reasons. First, we just our current processes were planned and implemented in 2003, when we had 80,000 domain names. And nowadays, we are having almost 400,000. So those processes that we implemented in 2003, so 13 years ago, they are just not suitable anymore for our operations. So we have to change our operational model.

And the second goal or reason for this change, it's the changing domain name industry. So to some extent, it's getting more commercialized. And we can't stay in that comfort zone we used to be, so we have to change as well and give up all those national restrictions we are still having.

But the biggest change is about to move to registry-registrar model, because currently we serve both direct customers and registrars. And we are now getting rid of those direct customers. So we are going to have very simple accreditation process. And basically, all the new registrars should have to do is to respect Finnish law and regulation. And I expect that we're going to have about 3,000 registrars. It's the current number, and I see no difference in our new operational model.

And the second big change, it will be the local presence requirement that was are now having at the moment. So we are going to get rid of that requirement as well. So in the future, anyone, anywhere can have a domain name. So even Hiro can have a .fi domain name if he would like to have one. I guess you want? Yeah, it's a big change for us, because currently this local presence requirement is really strict. So you have to be a Finnish company or a Finnish association or public [inaudible] or Finnish private person. And so we are going to get rid of all those requirements.

And we are currently having an age limit for private persons of 15 years. So if you are younger, you cannot have .fi domain name. So I think we are currently the only "not suitable for children" ccTLD. So we are going to get rid of that requirement as well. So if you have children, you can buy .fi domain names for Christmas present, for example, for them.

We are going to allow domain parking. So at the moment, we require name servers, but we are going to get rid of that requirement as well.

I had a very good question yesterday, why we are going to allow domaining. And I see no reason why we shouldn't allow it, because we have done marketing for 12, 13 years now. And we have try to find customers as hard we can, customers who really

use the domain names. And if domainers will succeed better in this kind of marketing, if they find customers to us, I would just be happy. In this change, actually, we are going to allow domaining, especially in the way that at the moment it's illegalized. If you buy a domain name, you basically have to use it by yourself. You can sell it if it becomes obsolete, but you cannot register .fi domain name at the moment in purpose to resell it later. And that will be legalized.

At the moment, we are having kind of blacklist of names that cannot be registered. And actually, this blacklist contains three different categories. One is the name of other TLDs, like com.fi or eu.fi. But those names will be released, because it's obsolete or very old technical reason why we block them. And it's not valid anymore, that reason. And the second category that will be released for registration that are names that express the form of a corporate, like limited.fi. And the third category are words that are offensive or words that might provoke someone to commit a crime. It's a list that we have invented by ourselves. And we don't want to be a censor anymore, so we are going to get rid of that list as well. So we are going to open these names for registrations, actually, September 7th. So we want to protect our system from those domainers and implement these changes in two steps.

And currently, those personal names – I mean the combination of first and last names – they are protected. So only person with that name can have the domain name. But this restriction will be removed, and mainly because foreign registrants, they cannot know what names are Finnish first and last names. So it's just for their protection.

And from technical point of view, we are going to replace our current web service based interface with EPP. And we are trying to keep it as standard as possible. We are implementing registry lock at the same time, and two-factor authentication as well.

Because it's a big change, so we are getting foreign registrants a lot, is my best guess. So we are getting new tools also to improve the security. And one very interesting tool is that in case of serious or suspicion of IT-related security or criminal action, we can monitor the traffic, we can change DNS settings, and we can even suspend the domain by our own decision. But of course, all these decisions can be appealed to the court if the registrants prefers to do that afterwards.

And we're also getting more simplified process to revoke a domain name if there's an obvious trademark or company name violation. And in case of typosquatters, well, the world will be more much difficult. So we are getting more simplified process to transfer those names away from typosquatters, as well.

And as we are giving more power to registrars, we want to make sure that their operations are secure, so we are setting new security-related requirements to them. They are based on the regulation we are giving. So there are some special security requirement for every registrar. And especially those who are using EPP interface, our requirements will be much, much deeper. And we are going to have right to audit this requirement. So we can walk to registrar, cannot [bar door] if we want to check that they are really following our requirements.

I think I just went through the big change package we are going to have, so it will really change our operational mode. And if you have any questions, please have them.

HIROFUMI HOTTA: Thank you, Juhani. Questions? Yes? Irina first.

IRINA DANELIA: Thank you, Juhani. And I am really happy that now I'm able to register .fi domain name for myself and for my younger daughter. But altogether, it looks like a very big change in your approach. So could you explain a little bit about the reasons and how you came to these decisions? Because it's not easy decision, actually.

JUHANI JUSELIUS: Okay. So I think this domain name industry, it's changed. Those New gTLDs, they are increasing competition. And we have not seen it yet, but we will. And these are just measures to protect our current position in Finland. So I believe that more registrars are getting more power to choose the TLDs they want to operate with. And with our national, those restrictions, they are not so willing to do. So this is a way to make our cooperation with registrars much easier, and they might choose us when they are selling those domains to customers.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: [inaudible] from NIC Chile. How many direct customers do you still have, and how do you plan to migrate them to registrars?

JUHANI JUSELIUS: Actually, in the beginning of this process, we had about 20 persons or domains registered directly from us. So it was not that big amount. And those who had registrar, it was not a problem. So we knew the registrar. But those 20 persons, we have contacted them directly by e-mail so far. No, I don't think we are going to send traditional mail to them. But we have informed them in many ways, and this e-mail was the last effort. And this number of our customers, it's getting down all the time. So we are approaching zero before the September 5th.

SEBASTIEN PENSIS: Good morning, Juhani. Thank you very much. I just had a quick question about the opening up of the domain name registrations. I was wondering, will you be keeping a list of reserved domain names put aside? And would you establish a sort of reserve names activation procedure for certain protected names?

JUHANI JUSELIUS: Well, the simple answer is that, no, we are not going to have that kind of list anymore. So all domains are free for registration, on first come, first served basis. So if you want to have eu.fi, you must hurry.

THOMAS MACKUS: Juhani, I want to ask about disputes and resolution. Is it FICORA which is working on dispute resolution? Or courts? Or you have some other institution?

JUHANI JUSELIUS: Actually, yes, we are handling those dispute cases by ourself. So we are the first level in dispute resolution. Of course, all decisions can be appealed to the higher court levels afterwards, but there will be no change. So in the future, we will handle

disputes as well. And currently, our process, it's quite complicated that before we can implement our decision, we have to be sure that the registrant has received our decision, whatever it is. And when we are going to have much more foreign registrants, so there is no way anymore that we can be sure that this registrant really receives our decision. And actually, this new law allows us just to send one-way e-mail to registrants. It doesn't matter if their e-mail address is correct or not. It's just enough that we send a decision to registrants, and we can just implement our decision after that.

THOMAS MACKUS: Thank you.

HIROFUMI HOTTA: Thank you. Some more? Okay.

EDUARDO SANTOYO: Thank you. Hi, Juhani. Juhani, question. You said that probably you are going to do monitoring content. Are you allowed by law to do that?

JUHANI JUSELIUS: No, actually. I think we are just going to monitor not the content, but those DNS [inquiries], DNS traffic.

EDUARDO SANTOYO: Okay, thank you.

JUHANI JUSELIUS: You're welcome.

HIROFUMI HOTTA: All right. Thank you, Juhani.

JUHANI JUSELIUS: Thank you.

HIROFUMI HOTTA: Okay, the next presentation will be done by Dmitry Kohmanyuk.

DMITRY KOHMANYUK: Thanks. Apologies for the lack of graphics, although I prefer to have simpler things. It's titled "New from .ua." Well, now that I heard the Finnish presentation, I would probably like to add some comments. But it's a long road, and we have been there. So good luck. Not everything will probably work as you expected. And if I can give you one advice, that please consider having a third-party resolution process beside the court, because it would really remove the liability from you as a registry. It maybe not a concern by law, but still it would allow

you to be a neutral party, especially when you do the transition. Because after you've done the transition, actually it's okay, because then your registrars are doing that. But in the meantime.

So anyway, well, we have been an independent country since '91, is pretty much when the domain was delegated, was [inaudible] delegation, not ICANN – well, ICANN didn't exist. So that means about 24 years. We had our annual event in December. Everybody is invited. It's free. It would be first week of December. And I hope we'll get some participants from ICANN and other registries.

We have about half a million plus domains under management. That means that we have actually shrank over last few years. As well, I'm going to go in more detail later. We have about – I think I actually obscured some text by this. Okay. We have about 100 registrars. Some of them are inactive. When we went to EPP, we got about ½ of them remaining, because many of them didn't want to install EPP software [right in] themselves, so actually we shrank registrar count.

We have multiple models. So for example, .ua names are available. Also you can get your company under .com.ua or your organizations are .org.ua, or if you live in certain city, like Donetsk, you can get your name .donetsk.ua. And, yes, that still

works, also there have been some issues with financial systems and other utilities working there.

So now over 50 TLD domains. These domains correspond either to generics, like .com, .net, .org, or we have some delegated by the city name. And that's something unique I want to talk about later. We have a private company as a manager, so never actually being run by the government. Before the company was established, it was run by individuals. But the corporation happened in year of 2001. So most people consider us to be there forever. We actually recently signed accountability framework with ICANN, and that gave us little more hand up in talks about domain delegation.

So there are only two foreign registrars, and really encourage everybody – I know you're not our target market, but anyway, perhaps you have knowledge about that – to come to us and become one. But I'm not here to sell. Just want to stress two things. The renewal rate, even though the number of [delegation] shrank, had remained pretty high. I was actually amused by that. I thought it's much worse, especially for the .ua names which are trademark related.

We operate our own WHOIS registry, meaning that our registrars are just adding data to the database by EPP. So we don't ever had the system when the data was distributed through the

registrars. When we moved to EPP, we eliminated NIC handles. And so that was all moved to the centralized database, even though the WHOIS handles were also managed by us.

IDNs and EPP were available for several years. It has been a while since I did my presentation about our EPP implementation. So since then, it has expanded to cover most of the domains, because then it was just a pilot. DNSSEC was launched a couple years ago. And, well, I can count my DNSSEC domains on – okay, now on two hands. It used to be one. We had only one major bank to sign the domain, then promptly was withdrawn because they felt like it's not really competitive with Amazon, believe it or not, Amazon domain hosting. And some other stories, but it's too little time to talk about this.

There are a few policy points. As I said, registry is thick. It's not listed there. You can privacy protect all of your data, including your name. The registrar will do that for you. And that's due to the pretty strict local legislation. There have been debates whether it's good for people or not. If the criminals will hide, the good guys can. So privacy and security sometimes can [do] each other. But still, of course, the court or other binding document can let to uncover this.

We automatically extend by one year. We had a lot of discussions whether transfer should be done for free. And the

result of that, to discourage the registrar hopping, every transfer has to be paid. It would have to be paid and would extend registration for one year, up to the ten maximum. There are no domicile restrictions. There actually haven't been ever any. And the renewals are always automatic, although there is a 30-day grace period when the registrar is not billed.

And again, that is probably my advice to Finnish guys. When you work on your transition, really consider the billing cycles of your registrars. I don't know what would they want. But depending, of course, on your country business practices, it may be very interesting repercussions, for example, if they paid for the service and the domain is cancelled, how the thing work. Like for example, if the client didn't pay but the registrar did pay, or other way around. So the automatic installations may be your enemy when you move to the registrar model.

We have this interesting policy case. We traditionally used city names for local domains, and then capital of Kiev, back in '90s, I guess, was more Russian speaking than Ukrainian speaking. Now it's actually the reverse. So the parallel domain, kiev.ua was launched, as well as some other domains. And we thought long and hard about how are we going to implement this, because lots of people had kyiv.ua names. Not everyone wants to replicate their name. What we did, that we basically reserved all the names, but it's not just one-time reservation. It's a

permanent reservation, meaning that these two domains operate as mirror by owner, but different by technical parameters. So if you're the owner in one of them, you can register the same name in the other. It must be the same registrant. It must be the same registrar too, because then the registrar can check that it's indeed the same person.

And the technical parameters can be different. So, for example, you can move to the new domain and kill the other one. In the first year that was available for free. After that, you have to pay for both domains if you want to keep parallel names. If you want just to keep one name, you can keep one name and the other would never be available to anybody but you. That was set for three years. And now there's two years remaining. And then we will see whether we want to expand it for another couple of years or not.

So some things we have learned, and it's not all we have learned, that price is surprisingly not a big factor. I mean, $5 a year or $10 a year is not a big difference. As you may not know, the Ukrainian currency have dropped in value about 60%, so meaning that the euro rate in the banks are now about 28. Used to be 11. So it means that, in theory, domains should have went down in price three times. In fact, we did increase our prices a bit, more according to country inflation indexes. But that wasn't really indexed to the dollar or euro. It was something in

between. Even though that happened, most of our customers have kept their domains. It just means that dollar amounts is not a high price if you want to operate a business with online presence, right? Although I have heard some people say, "Look, $10 a year too much. It should be $5. It should be $3."

So I'm going to tell you two short stories. So the one – oh yeah, and we use Anycast. And I was mentioned the DNSSEC and the adoption is really bad, although IPv6 is a little better.

The "lawyers are not your friends" part is very interesting. We had several legal cases over the last couple years. And again, I'm not going to go through them. But the one that was most interesting, and the one that I don't have a killer slide in here because I wasn't able to obtain a proper copy of the document in electronic format – maybe I'll edit and send it later with the additional slide just after this.

There was one court case when the guy who sold the company, who used to be the owner of the company, kept the trademark registered to himself. And the result, the domain name was really left into his name. Well, the new owners found, after investing, I guess, hundreds of thousands of dollars for the new online shop of flowers, I think, and other things, that they can't actually operate the domain. So the dispute lasted for a couple of years already. It's still in the courts. What's interesting is that

the court recent decision in that case says, from my memory of course, "Please put such-and-such domain list in the EPP client hold status." So in my opinion, it's the first time ever you see EPP status codes [inaudible] in a court document. Maybe that's progress. So I don't know what next. It would probably, I don't know, maybe include autonomous system numbers for ISPs that want to use that domain or stuff. So there was lesson number one.

Lesson number two was the one, the case with the DNSSEC by the bank, that communication is everything. And of course, everyone knows that. But what practically happened is that somebody who I knew in the bank contacted me, and I contacted them back. And we launched this pilot of the DNSSEC. Basically, the signing was done by the bank. They knew how to do this because they had recently the .bank domain, and the .bank gTLD has requirement for DNSSEC. So they already knew how to do that.

What happened though, when they suddenly decided to move to the new DDoS protection system with their own DNS – no, there was not CloudFlare, because I know CloudFlare does DNSSEC. And we did work with them a bit on some experimental DNSSEC deployment. They just suddenly had to undo that. And of course, normal business practice would be to send this during business hours instead of start messaging me on Facebook or something.

So, yeah, once you deploy new technologies, it's very important to keep the loop short.

That's pretty much two lessons I want to talk about. Oh yeah, and last thing about the growth, or actually not growth, I have some numbers on my phone I will probably add to this presentation too. So if you take the June 1st of 2014, just after the Crimean annexation by Russia and other unfortunate political events in our presidential election, and appealed in the Eastern Ukraine, the domain count was 670,000. As of today, it's 550,000. So that's about 18% down. The negative growth in the year after that events were about 13%, and for the last six months has been flat.

So basically, I would say you can use the number of domains delegated as your macroeconomic indicator. And it has delay of about six months, because we started to see the significant drop in new registration by end of the year that the events happened, and we started to see the slowdown and basically zeroing the fall I would say, the minimum growth, in the middle of this year. And actually, the economic situation Ukraine vastly improved since the beginning of this year, when the currency finally was stabilized.

So that may be interesting thing for people in developing economies to watch and maybe [install] the data. I don't know.

Really, your week, two week, or maybe month, two months registration deltas, like the additions, renewals, and deletions, may be a good – especially when you subdivide them by geography, a good way to gauge your economic activity in your country. So that's actually lesson number 3, which is not here. I'll add it too.

Thanks. Any questions, perhaps?

HIROFUMI HOTTA: Questions?

DMITRY KOHMANYUK: Oh yeah, this slide. These are just our contacts, my e-mail and our general e-mail for the company.

HIROFUMI HOTTA: Further questions? No? Okay. Thank you. Thank you, Dmitry.

DMITRY KOHMANYUK: Thanks.

HIROFUMI HOTTA: So the next will be Andrew Molivurae.

ANDREW MOLIVURAE: Good morning, everyone. And thank you, Hiro, for allowing this session for me to share a bit about .vu.

First of all, I have a few slides, and it should not take long. A few things to go through this morning is, first of all, one, where it is. I know it's quite a long way away, and many people do not really know where that is. And then I'll talk a bit about what the role of my organization is and what is it to do with .vu ccTLD name space. And then what we're trying to achieve, what has happened in the past, the current situation, and of course, the anticipated future.

So if you do not know where Vanuatu is, it is somewhere there, between Australia, Fiji, and New Caledonia, and New Zealand. So generally, Vanuatu is made up of 83 islands, and 63 are inhabited. We have a very small population of 285,000, with a land area of 4,000. And 75% of our population live in the rural areas, and 25% in urban areas, with six provinces and three small towns. In the telecommunication coverage, it is 92% at the moment, but it's mainly voice, with some 2.5 or 2.7G Internet availability to those 92%. We have 3G and 4G, basically in the main four centers as listed there. So that's a bit of a general information about the country.

So what is the role of TRR? If I [must say], that is the short form of that long name. So it is the telecom regulators that is in

Vanuatu. As we all know, .vu is the ISO code for the Vanuatu, as a nation, ccTLD. And it has been delegated to a private company, Telecom Vanuatu Ltd. At the time of the delegation, Telecom Vanuatu was owned by three companies, including the Government of Vanuatu. So the British Telecom and French Telecom and the Vanuatu government all shared one-third share each in the company. And at the time, it was the government, so it proper to have it delegated to Telecom, who was, at the time, who actually had the infrastructure in place.

So what is the role? TRR is new. It's only the law was enacted in 2009. And in that act, there is a section that provides for TRR to manage and administer the .vu country code. And since that time, there has been a lot of discussions on the issue of – excuse me – how it will be done. And as you can see, it took quite a while. There has been a lot of collaboration within the stakeholders in the country.

So what can we say that – what is TRR trying to achieve with this ccTLD? Well, we want to have it at the international level, to be reliable and secure DNS infrastructure; a well-managed registry service; and also to have multiple, probably one or two, registrars or more, because the market of telecommunications in the country has been liberalized in 2008. And also, to promote .vu ccTLD, basically within country, because a lot of people currently are registering .com or other domains for their

businesses. And also, so that we can develop adaptable policies to manage the ccTLD better, so that it is in line with international standards.

So the current situation is that TVL, or Telecom Vanuatu, is the ICANN-recognized manager of the .vu ccTLD. And it runs the registry and the only registrar. It has implemented DNSSEC two years ago. And, yeah, the registry, yeah, it's there, called Vanuatu Network Information Center. And we have had a lot of discussions with Telecom, and we are in good relationship with them as we are moving forward with this approach.

And TRR has also developed a new ccTLD regulation, as reflected in the TRR Act of 2009. And I want to thank a few people in our region that have supported us in developing the regulation. The .nz, especially Debbie from the Domain Name Commission in .nz, she and her team have been assisting us a lot in developing this regulation. And also, we have got some support from .au as well.

So as we speak now, this regulation is being finalized and is going to become effective probably in the next week or so. So our approach going forward is to finalize the regulation. The next part of it is to tender out registry services to see if we can get some interest for someone or organization to run the registry services. And also, we are working with the Telecom on interim

registry services as we're going forward. And then also, we want to have some more registrars, whether on shore or maybe one or two offshore. We're going to accredit those. And, yes, and TRR is anticipating the redelegation of the management of .vu. And as I said, we are working very closely with Telecom Vanuatu at the moment for the transition to actually take place.

So I think that's a bit of an update of .vu, and thank you.

HIROFUMI HOTTA: Thank you very much. Questions? Yes, please.

MATS DUFBERG: Do you have support for IDN names? I see that at least French is spoken in your country, would need IDN.

ANDREW MOLIVURAE: At this moment, I would say no, not yet.

MATS DUFBERG: Do you have plans for IDN?

ANDREW MOLIVURAE: I think we maybe look at that, yeah, in the future, in the coming.

MATS DUFBERG: Thank you.

HIROFUMI HOTTA: Anymore questions? Okay, thank you, Andrew.

So the last presentation will be given by Freddy Manullang.

FREDDY MANULLANG: Yes. Okay, thank you, Hiro. First, my name, Freddy Manullang. And I am a system network administrator – sorry – and PANDI. The topic of my presentation is .id country updates.

Okay, before I go to agenda or point of [inaudible], let me introduce to you about PANDI. PANDI is a non-profit organization and the registry for .id Internet domain names. Sorry, is it working? No. Ah, okay.

Next slides, Kim. Okay.

Okay. PANDI, established in December 2006 in a multistakeholder approach involving government, academics, ICT communities, ICT industry. Fully operates in July 2007. PANDI moved from SPRS to SRS in October 2012, and IANA redelegation process in May 2013.

Next, please. Okay, next, please. It's not working. Yeah.

Okay, this slide about domain statistic from 2015 until June 26. Red bars are months in 2015. Start from January, there are 123,960 of domain name registered. And blue bars are months in 2016, from January to June. There are 192,496 of domain name registered. So over the year, registration increased 68,536 from January 2015 until 2016.

Next slide, please.

Okay, these are about technical development. The first point of technical development, there are 176 domain name has DS record, means 176 .id domain names run on DNSSEC. Also, when we have run some DNSSEC workshop, the latest DNSSEC workshop in the PANDI meeting held in May 2016. And also, PANDI have DRC in Batam, start operating in October 2015. The last point of the technical development, PANDI has Anycast servers that they distribute to local server in several cities, like five servers in Jakarta, one server in Batam, one server in Jogja, one server again in Surabaya, on server in Bali, and the last one Anycast server in Australia, host by APNIC.

Next slide, please.

PANDI has been certified ISO 27001:2013 since April 18, 2016, which cover risk assessment; information security policy; information security management system policy, standard and procedure; monitoring and measurement; business [inaudible]

plan and disaster recovery plan; internal audits; and management review.

Next slide, please.

Okay. This point of my presentation, about 1 million .id domain names. 1 million .id domain names is program of the Ministry of Communication and Information Technology Republic of Indonesia. So this not PANDI program, actually. The program period is three years, from 2016 until 2018. And the program free for the first year means the registrants, you pay for in your domain name hosting. This not target, but expectation for registration for registered domain name is 350,000 domain names each year. Currently, from January until June 2016, around 6,000 domain name registered on this program.

Next slide, please.

Okay, why? The reason why ICT Ministry the Republic of Indonesia runs this program, because ICT Ministry the Republic of Indonesia have some reason to run this program. The first is March 2016, import international bandwidth has been 1.5 terabits per second, or around 16 trillion rupiahs. And so we're increasing the number of .id domain users Indonesia, is expect to use less international bandwidth in the future. And Indonesia has about 57 million small and medium enterprise business operator, but only 7 million of them are in the trading business

in digital. So 50 million small and medium enterprise business operator not use Internet for trading.

Okay, next slide, please.

Okay, about who and how. So who is able to operate the program? The program is open all small and medium enterprise business, schools, communities, and village in Indonesia. And this point about how the program work, the program is free. Applicant will get .id domain name and hosting for one year. ICT Ministry allocate around 15 billion rupiahs, or around $3.8 million US, to use this Internet [inaudible] with the program [inaudible] with Indonesia hosting only. So the program, not used for [end] hosting or foreign data center service.

It's so long to describe how this might work, but I can try quickly, technically. PANDI, as the registry, create a new registrar [are gone]. Then ICT Ministry [default] registrar application. And the application connect to registry by [APP] protocol. And selected hosting provider connect to the application by [APA]. Okay, the first procedure to get domain names, applicant like small and medium use this. School communities, and villages try to register a domain name in the application. And the final step of registration, applicant must fill number of ID card, and also uploaded scan of ID card, and also legal document. Example for legal document for small and medium business is [inaudible]

license. So they are two documents must uploaded. The first is ID card, and the second is legal documents.

Application will reject registration automatically [first-time] identity number, so one ID card or one registration. There are ten operators work for [refer] registration manually. They will review each ID card and legal documents. If registration is comply or approve, the application will do some things. The first is the application will do registration automatically. When send registration, [APP] comments to registry. And the second [inaudible] if level hosting [inaudible] based sequence procedure. This through by [APA]. And then send it [inaudible] to applicant e-mail automatically.

Next slide, please.

Location of the program, sorry. 350,000 .id domain names to be released to small/medium business enterprise, schools, communities, and villages in the Goes Digital event, with targeting 20 province every year. We are currently focused the four province, namely West Java, Central Java, Yogyakarta, and East Java. And the last ICT Ministry, we apply back transaction to registry and its hosting provider at end of every year. The big challenge we're facing until now, most of small and medium enterprise doesn't want to have a [web set].

Okay. The last slide? This our e-mail slide. Any question?

HIROFUMI HOTTA: Questions? Okay, thank you, Freddy. So I think this is the end of the morning session. Please thank all the presenters.

So are there any message from the Chair or the Secretariat now? No? Okay.

MATS DUFBERG: [inaudible]

HIROFUMI HOTTA: Of course.

MATS DUFBERG: Actually, question for Ukraine, because it's an IDN question again. So you didn't mention if there's support for IDN under .ua.

DMITRY KOHMANYUK: Oh, yes, thanks for bringing this up. So we had actually launched the IDNs just before we launched TPP. We had our table registered with IANA, and it's Cyrillic letters. Yeah, so I didn't mention that. We had original allowed that only in some of second-level domains, like for example in .com.ua you can have that. Under .ua, due to pending policy change of the trademark restriction, which we plan to repeal at some future point, the

IDNs [we're not able]. But we are planning to launch them first before we open it for general availability. So meaning that .ua itself is only Latin, and the second-level domains can have the delegations in non-Latin script. But –

MATS DUFBERG: How many percent of the domain names?

DMITRY KOHMANYUK: Oh, the percentage of that, off the top of my head, it's in single digits. It used to be close to five or six. I think now we may be down. I can actually, if you let me wait for just one second, I'll tell you immediately.

MATS DUFBERG: Yes. A rough figure is enough.

DMITRY KOHMANYUK: Yeah, it's a few percent. As the hostmaster.ua [inaudible] doing this right now to answer your question. We have monthly reports of the status, and we have certain number of percent. I'll tell you. I will tell you right now. I'm looking at percent right now, just to give you the details.

Any other things you wanted to know about it?

MATS DUFBERG: That was my question.

DMITRY KOHMANYUK: In .com.ua, it's 6,000 out of 300,000. So that's actually close to 2%. In some other domains – we used to be a little bit higher, but most people who registered IDN names didn't renew them. So as time goes by, they go down. But I still see them on the street sometimes for targeted ads for some, like an event. So maybe people use IDNs mostly for one-off things, when they launch a new product or maybe festival or something. They just use that to catch attention. They do catch attention.

MATS DUFBERG: Do you have any mechanisms to prevent lookalikes, to prevent [crosstalk]?

DMITRY KOHMANYUK: Yes, we do. That was actually my invention, but okay. So the simple way is that the Cyrillic alphabet is somewhat similar to Latin, but it's not exactly Latin. So the requirement is as follows. The name has to be all Cyrillic or all Latin. So you cannot mix scripts. And if you use Cyrillic script, at least one letter must not look like Latin letters. So basically, we have two types of Cyrillic

letters in our table. If you go to IANA database, you'll see that the specific and Latin lookalike. And you have to have at least one specific Cyrillic letter. So for example, letter Я would work, which looks like Latin R upside down. Letter R would not work, if you have a single-letter domain. If you have multiple-letter domains, as long as you have at least one letter that is genuinely Cyrillic letter, then we know you're not doing the Latin script. And then rest of the letters would be Cyrillic as well. They're just not counted. You can have them as many as you want.

MATS DUFBERG: Thank you.

KATRINA SATAKI: I won't let you finish so early. So the question, actually, I have a question to our host, Juhani. We were a little bit confused here when you mentioned this children-friendly domains, meaning that you will allow children to have their domains registered. And actually, I think you complained that you are the only children non-friendly domain. Probably the only explanation I have, as far as I understand, is you have the law for domain names. So you register them as administrative acts, apparently. Domain name registration is an administrative act.

Because for us, it's civil agreement. Basically, it's a contract, right? So children are not allowed to enter into a contract, because they have to accept certain liabilities when they do. So we do not allow children to enter the contract, because it's not allowed under the law. So if a parent registers a domain name for the child, yeah, certainly the child can use it. But legal obligations are still under the parent. Yeah, so could you elaborate a little bit more about this child thing? How did you mean it? Thank you. 15 minutes. Thank you.

JUHANI JUSELIUS: Okay. In that case, so if you want to have a long answer, do you have any lawyers here? Sanna, [Kirousi]? There's at least – I see Sanna is out. Can you please answer to this question? There's a mic here.

Actually, we have had those cases when parents bought a domain name for their children actually. It was not a nice job to refund that kind of domains, telling those parents that, "No, you cannot do that." So Sanna is here. She is our lawyer.

SANNA SAHLMAN: Hello. Thank you very much, Juhani and Katrina. What a pleasure. I would like to discuss this topic outside, without the microphone.

Well, complicated. Registering a domain in Finland at the moment, it is an administrative act. Like we do a digital decision to the registrants to get the domains. And like Juhani said, we only have a law. We don't have any contracts between registrars, nor with the registrants. And at the moment, it's simple because it just says in the law that you have to be more than 15-year-old to get a .fi domain. And the rule will be gone, starting from 5th of September.

So as I think it, it's just as simple that anyone, as a private person, can have a .fi domain name, and it doesn't matter how old you are. You just put your Social Security Number there if you register domain name under a private person. If a private person registers a domain, it still will be an administrative act, but we don't give the decisions as of the 5th of September anymore. We just take it as a registration, simple. Filling the form, putting the credits there. As a private person, for example, Social Security Number. And if you are registering a domain to your child, you can either put your own Social Security Number there as a parent or your child's.

KATRINA SATAKI: Yes. And if something bad or if spam messages have been sent out using this domain, and it's registered to a 7-year-old, how are you going to react?

SANNA SAHLMAN: Anyone else want to answer this question? I can give the mic to someone else. What is in other registries? What do you do?

KATRINA SATAKI: We do not register [inaudible] do not allow.

JUHANI JUSELIUS: Thank you, Sanna, very much.

NIGEL ROBERTS: Well, you want to know what other registries do. We had a rather interesting case some time ago. But the difference is really that you are doing this as an administrative act and not as a contract. So for example, can you issue, as administrative act, a passport to a 2-year-old? Of course you can. You may have to have the parents who are going to make the signature, but of course you can. And so the rules are under the administrative.

We operate purely as a contract. Now, in the UK and in the Channel Islands, the ability of a minor to enter into a contract is not as clear as you think. It's not simply 18. It's 18 for everything, but underneath 18, it depends on the age and the type of the contract, until you get to the age of 5 or 4 or a child that can just speak. They can still do a contract, but they can only do a

contract for something that is necessary, like buying some food or something like that. I'm not sure a domain is necessary.

When you get to the age of maybe about 13, 11, 12, you're getting into the area in the UK of what they call Gillick competence, which means that a 13-year-old can give consent to various things, such as contraception, even. And it depends on the child concerned. Some children can do this, and some can't. And the assessment is whether the person can do it. So if you have a 13-year-old who's a clever hacker, of course they can register a domain name. If you have a complete idiot, perhaps not. Maybe that's where you get the spam from.

So we took a view, we only had one case like this, where we had – and I think the guy was 16 or 15 or something like that. He registered a bunch of domain names and then didn't pay for them. It was easier for us to say, "We cancel the contract," because he wasn't competent to enter into the contract. But that was a convenience for his father, so not having to pay the bill. But we don't inquire. It's only if there's a problem we'd have an issue.

PATRIZIO POBLETE: Sorry, Nigel, I was about to ask you a question. But, no, no, later.

KATRINA SATAKI: [inaudible] later.

PATRIZIO POBLETE: I know, I know, but not now. Not now.

MARGARITA VALDÉS CORTÉS: Something that maybe you need to keep in mind, sometimes in legal systems you, as authority, the act of register a domain name could be administrative from your perspective. But sometimes from the particular, is a civil contract. It's a civil act. So probably you may have to, when your rules will be running, keep in mind that probably you will have two kinds of visions of this same act, civil or private, from the perspective of the registrant, and maybe public or administrative act from your perspective. But at the end of the day, probably if you say that the registrant have to have 15 years old, the key question, is 15 years old is an age that people is available to do something else? It's like you have citizen rights or something else? That's the good question for you. Thank you.

PATRIZIO POBLETE: Well, you know how the Internet is really used. Will your rules allow me to buy a domain for my cat?

JUHANI JUSELIUS: Well, actually, I think it's for human beings only. I'm sorry. But you can buy it for your cat. Just put in your contact information there.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: If the cat is over 18, can the cat enter a contract under UK common law?

JUHANI JUSELIUS: That was a good idea. Maybe we should expand our marketing to those pets as well.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: I'm afraid Catalonia was there first.

KATRINA SATAKI: Okay, that's fine. We will reconvene at 1:30, and we'll continue with a very interesting session on transition and all related stuff, CWG. Yes, Lise will chair the session.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]