
ABU DHABI – ccNSO Members Meeting Day 1 (pt 3)
Tuesday, October 31, 2017 – 13:30 to 15:00 GST
ICANN60 | Abu Dhabi, United Arab Emirates

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: Good afternoon, everyone. Welcome to the ICANN Update Session. Larisa Gurnick, Negar Farzinnia, and Lars Hoffman will be presenting to you the ICANN reviews. Thank you.

LARISA GURNICK: Good afternoon. Thank you very much for having us here to give you a brief update on reviews. I'm Larisa Gurnick.

Let's go to the next slide.

The topic of our update is reviews, and we're talking about specific reviews which were previously known as Affirmation of Commitment of reviews but are now written into the ICANN Bylaws and referred to as specific reviews. These are community-led reviews, and they include CCT (Competition, Consumer Choice, and Consumer Trust) review, the review of SSR (Stability, Security, and Resiliency) of DNS, the RDS review, previously known as WHOIS, and Accountability and Transparency review.

We also have organizational reviews, and these are reviews of the different organizational structures. For example, the review

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.

of the ccNSO, which you see on the very bottom of the Gantt chart, has actually been just recently deferred to next year [but] the reviews of various organizations to see how effectively those organizations operate, whether they have continuing purpose within the ICANN structure, as well as how accountable and transparent the structure is to its constituency.

So as you can see, it's a very, very busy schedule. Lots of reviews happening at the same time. We often get a question as to why the schedule is too busy and why we don't spread things out. While there is some ability to spread the reviews out on the organizational review side, as is evidenced by the fact that the ccNSO review has been deferred for a bit, there is not a similar flexibility on specific reviews. The timing of those reviews are hardcoded into the Bylaws, so they have to take place as specified by the Bylaws. The way to change that would be for the community to agree that the timing is problematic.

Next slide, please. Let's skip.

There's been some good discussion within the community and the Organizational Effectiveness Committee of the Board, who oversees the reviews, about some observed issues that have emerged from the current cycle of specific reviews. There are areas of the selection of the Review Team that are under discussion in terms of: are there ways to improve how the

Review Teams are selected, particularly in the sense as to ensure that the Review Teams have the sufficient diversity and balance, as well as skillset?

This is a timely conversation because, as the specific reviews are now part of the ICANN Bylaws, one pretty significant change from the way the reviews used to be done before is that the selection has transitioned from the ICANN Organization to the community. So now there is a process where each SO and AC nominate their Review Teams, and then the SO/AC Chairs actually do the selection. So lots of interesting observations there.

[inaudible] happening at the same time. Then there are the discussions about unclear expectations that, while the review program is important – an important accountability and transparency mechanism at ICANN – there’s not necessarily a common and shared understanding of what exactly is expected to happen from each review on how to measure whether their reviews are accomplishing their [inaudible].

[JAY DALEY]:

[inaudible] 18, which will give a marvelous result, of course, with [inaudible] doing it. Well, I’m telling you that now so you’ll prepare to give us a marvelous result. And there is the periodic IANA function review, which is a little while off the beginning.

Just a summary. PTI is doing extremely well. The anything that is in [mist] has not had a customer service impact. The CSC is working together as a committee. We've got things to establish about the way we do things that need to be finished off, but the rest of it is good. The whole process is working very well. We are getting to the stage where the ICANN community will need to engage more with us about our role so that we can improve what we do.

Thank you.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: Thank you. There's a comment. Are you starting with a zero? Okay.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: Jay, the survey that you were mentioning where you had the zero percent response – was that on the PTI or on the CSC?

[JAY DALEY]: It's PTI. CSC doesn't do a survey [inaudible].

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: Okay. So then I got that correctly. Is it a rounded-off figure – the zero percent?

[JAY DALEY]: No. I think it's a zero.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: So am I to conclude that –

[JAY DALEY]: Sorry. Elise can answer that better than me.

ELISE GERICH: No. Actually, we got zero responses. But you should recognize that that was [four] delegations, so there's only, I think, nine ccTLDs that receive it. If you go the other one, where we had 13% response, then –

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: Okay. Then I understand. Because I came to the conclusion that all the employing organization of the people involved in the CSC, in the PTI, were not responding to the survey either. But now I know.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: Okay. I think Alicia has defended the zero. Any other comments on the CSC?

Okay. Let's clap for them as we wait for the next presenter.

The next presentation is from the CSC Review Team.

MARTIN BOYLE:

Thanks very much. I'm Martin Boyle, and I will explain how I fit into this in a few minutes' time. We're talking here about a review of a charter for an organization that was set up about a year ago – in fact, it's just gone a year ago.

When the charter was originally written, we were looking at establishing part of the accountability mechanism that was needed for the IANA transition that happened last September. We were flying rather blind. It was completely new territory for us, so we were aware that it was very likely that we would get things wrong.

Now, as I hope [it] has come out over to you all the role of the CSC is very important in that it is aimed at ensuring the success of the delivery of the IANA service. It looks at addressing problems early, and that is in its own right looking towards the customers of the IANA service and the naming customers or the IANA service to make sure that they are getting the service that they need.

The whole plan of the charter review was to check that the charter in place provided a good basis for the CSC to carry out its

job. That was established following a process that was launched at the last ICANN meeting, and the review brings, as does the CSC, people from both registry communities, both the Registry Stakeholder Group and the ccNSO. Abdalla and I are the nominees from the cc community. We will produce a report, and any amendments we propose will need to be approved by the ccNSO and GNSO Councils.

The purpose of the review and its scope – I’ve already covered a little bit of that. But I would like to emphasize that the scope of this review is very limited. We are looking very specifically at the charter and whether the charter helps CSC do its job. If it gets in the way, then we need to look at what we might need to do to change the charter.

I keep on losing the zipper.

As was indicated, and in good ICANN form, there are lots of reviews. When it comes to the effectiveness and performance, those are taken up by different parts of the accountability mechanisms that were put in place as part of the transition arrangements.

As I indicated earlier, if there are any changes that we need to make, we will flag those up to the ccNSO and the Registry Stakeholder Group. Similarly, if there are other concerns that are raised that are not relevant to this particular review, we will

simply pass that information on. But it will not be part of the review itself.

We've got quite a short timescale. We're currently in the phase of consulting the direct customers, which are the ccTLD and the gTLD operators but also reaching out to the wider community. You will have noted that the CSC has got quite an extensive network of liaisons. There is that understanding that the wider community needs to be confident that this quite important accountability mechanism is working and well in place. So that wider consultation is important as part of the process.

The intention is that we will produce at least a draft report by December and that we will then need to go through a consultation process. That rather extends the total timeline for work.

Now, what we've heard so far: generally, everything we've heard so far encourages our original belief that the scope of the CSC needs to be very narrow, very focused, on the requirements of the registries. We also are hearing that the selection criteria and process for members and liaisons has been effective and therefore probably should be retained.

As a slight underscore to that, we actually do believe that this small membership of just four plus a liaison from PTI has been one of the key elements of the success of the CSC to date in that

it focuses very much on the issues of interest to its members and to registries in general.

The liaisons are involved, and we're hearing that liaisons are invited to be actively involved in discussions and that the monthly meetings, while there might be very little to report, are giving that confidence that everybody is reading the reports that come out of PTI month on month.

There are a few slight changes. Where currently the community is expected to be updated no less than three times per year, the suggestion is that it needs to be reduced to at least twice a year. This is associated with the problem of travel funding for people to attend all the ICANN meetings every time. You have just heard about the issues associated with service level expectations

I'm open to hearing any questions or feedback. That's why I'm here. But I would actually underline that it is important that people in the community are paying attention to that monthly e-mail that Byron sends out. Whether they read it themselves or send it to their technical team to monitor, that is almost certainly going to be the early signal that something is not going quite right and that we as a community need to be aware of it.

With that, I will pass back to you, Chair. Thank you.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: Thank you, Martin. Are there any questions or comments for the CSC Review Team?

Hmm. Either, Martin, you are very clear or you are too complicated.

Okay. A round of applause for Martin.

Okay. Next is the Root Zone Evolution Review Committee. Peter?

PETER KOCH: Thank you, Chairman. This is another report from one of the other committees, and we're a bit different. RZERC was established, like CSC, after the transition, kind of late in the game, maybe. We're not a Bylaws committee, actually. We do have a charter that was given to us by the groups working on the transition. The committee was initiated in August. The first people were seated in September, and then we could start work in November. Since then, more or less, the participants have been stable. I am your representative on this committee. I'll come to the rest of the folks later.

What? Huh? Here we go. Okay. You can read this here on the slides or go to the website. It's all there, like for most of the other committees.

RZERC is named the Root Zone Evolution Review Committee. This hadn't existed before. RZERC was designed, it was instantiated to assume the succession of a very, very tiny role that the NTIA had in the whole game, which is not related to the day-to-day operations of root zone changes but for the bigger picture, as in overseeing bigger changes. The bigger changes are amounting to things like the introduction of DNSSEC in the root zone but could be other things. The charter talks about major architectural changes. What that is and what people think about this might differ. I'll come to that later.

The URL is one the screen and on the slides. You'll find these things there.

As I said, it's a group of people. We have been appointed by the various ACs and SOs. I'll start counterclockwise. We have Kim Davies from PTI, Duane Wessels from the root zone maintainer/Verisign. We have Brad Verd from the Root Server System Advisory Committee, Russ Mundy from the Security and Stability Advisory Committee, and Kaveh Ranjbar from the ICANN Board. The IETF has nominated Jim Reid. The ASO – Carlos Martinez. Howard Eland from the GNSO Registry Stakeholder Group, and myself, from this SO.

We've been conducting teleconferences to get ourselves started. This is all, again, published on the website. You see what we've

been doing. We've had monthly conf calls roughly since March. Minutes and recordings are publicly available. Our main task was to get our procedural document ready and then do some thinking about what this committee could actually be out and especially to share our views with the community to respond to the questions that we've received until now. "What exactly are you doing?"

As you see on the top of the screen or in that box, there is going to be public meeting tomorrow, Wednesday, at 14:00 local time here in Abu Dhabi. I think it unfortunately might collide with one of the ccNSO sessions, but scheduling is a bit tough. Maybe another time we will have no collision with the ccNSO. Still, I hope to see some of you there.

You see will a couple of things repeated that I already said or am going to say during my next minutes. I will also dive deeper into some things we've been talking about.

Again, the meeting recordings are available, and we have now one document. The charter was given to us. The committee itself apparently doesn't have the power to change that charter. The charter is up for review after five years, so that is not so much of a concern. This wasn't as eagerly timed as the CSC – or ambitiously I should say.

We started because we needed to select a Chair in February with a document on how we would do this. The charter is setting the frame, of course, and saying, yes, the committee should be consensus. Then it talks about voting and so on and so forth. We made clear that every member of the committee would be eligible as a chairperson. I probably add that, unlike CSC, all these nine members of the committee are equal. There's no special status given to the DNS, like the GNSO or the ccNSO representatives. Everybody is participating on equal footing.

So we needed to select a Chair. We did that. Duane Wessels, the representative from the RZM, was selected. We needed a document for that. We've, since then, been working on the operational procedures document that, again, explains how we got to make decisions should we ever have to and made some changes to the Chair role and so forth. We published that in early September. So that's what we have.

We are not, unlike other committees, again, like SSAC or RSSAC – because we are not an Advisory Committee in that sense – supposed to publish too many documents at high frequency but more or less it there and wait for food in one way or another, which is: evaluate proposals that may come out of various constituencies and then bring them to the attention to the committee by one of the committee members, PTI staff, or the

CSC. These are the entities that can actually invoke an RZERC review.

Of course, I should say we have not had any such invocation by now. Whether or not that had to do with the [lacking] procedures document, I don't think that is that the case. It's just that there haven't been any major architectural changes being proposed between September of last year and now, or at least nobody considered any of those changes to be of a major architectural nature. Also, the KSK rollover, which is arguably one of those things, was laid down at the time, and DNSSEC was introduced already. Also, the process had started before the committee was seated. So nothing to do for us.

What's in the Procedures document? We do have three types of meetings: regular, which is usually what we do as teleconferences, executive – same thing but we reserve the right and, actually, the charter empowers the committee to withhold details of the meeting, should security related issues have to be discussed – and the public meeting that you'll hopefully enjoy tomorrow.

The decision-making charter says the committee should decide by consensus, but then you all know that there are various flavors of consensus. So it is a full consensus of a committee that we should have the opportunity to distinguish between full and

rough, meaning anonymous – no, [unanimous], I’m sorry – or rough consensus. But for a rough consensus, the deviating views are encouraged to submit minority statements, should that ever occur. These are all precautions, doing things from scratch, and being a bit careful about topics.

Handing of issues to consider. What are the timelines? Mostly copying from the charter, but I’m filling out some interesting details: how do we get to know about issues? And so on and so forth.

The charter also requires the committee members to publish Statements of Interest, details of which have been outlined in this document. We are now in the process of having those Sols collected. As I said, the first document was incorporated so that there’s only one RZERC document available at the moment.

Next steps. What are we doing now, except for sitting and waiting for food? As [inaudible] like talking about the menu a bit to remain in the picture, how [stay in that] because there are different views. You saw on that slide that there already other committees represented in RZERC that have their own functions in assessing topics that are relevant to the security, stability, and resilience of the DNS, namely the SSAC and the RSSAC. So we decided to do some scoping exercise, coming up with more or less random topics, like 40-odd things that came to our minds,

and then did an internal survey: what do members of the committee think? Could this or that be of relevance?

The poster child for this is, of course – yes, the introduction of DNSSEC would have been an issue that would be of RZERC’s concern. We are all in agreement that the positioning of individual root servers is clearly out of scope.

There’s a lot in between, and in their interest of time, I’ll defer until tomorrow’s public meeting, where we might go into some detail of what issues we see that may or may not be next up on our plate.

Now, this is the final slide. From a ccTLD perspective, it is interesting to know that there is now yet another committee, but since – again, speaking with the ccTLD hat on – it’s not our job to feed these committees. From a TLD perspective, it’s more that we have certain topics or issues that we see that burn under our feet or that we’d like to see changed or be proposed. So from that perspective, it’s more important to see where to address these things, which is orthogonal to what the RZERC just did. But this is a thing that the community at large needs to think about. If there are issues that pop up and can’t be addressed canonically because things happen at different levels, RZERC has this high level architecture oversight. Then there are operational things, like at PTI or at other parts that we don’t

want to engage into too much, as in: avoid micromanagement. There may be other dimensions to this that, again, we collectively need to think about.

Which brings me to my last bullet item. If there are any questions or inputs or things you would like to raise, please do that now, if time allows, or find me in the room or in the hallway, or by e-mail.

Okay. The Chair just told me we have time, so if there are any questions, that's your time. But you don't need to rush.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: Any questions to Peter? Hmm. An interesting room this afternoon. Okay. Let's clap for Peter.

Now, the PTI Team. Kim?

KIM DAVIES Thanks very much. I'm Kim Davies from PTI, and I'm here to give the IANA names function update to you today.

I'm going to cover a variety of topics, starting with some technical topics and ending with some technical topics and a few other things.

First thing I'm going to talk about is new DNSSEC algorithm support. DNSSEC – we've supported a number of algorithms

since the launch of DNSSEC in the root zone in 2010. The support that we had for different algorithms was based on what was standardized at that time. But since that time, since 2010, a number of new algorithms have been developed and standardized, particularly associated with elliptic curve cryptography. These algorithms are desirable by a number of people, particularly because they're smaller in size. So the packet size is actually smaller if you use these.

We're happy to announce that, as of this month, we've now added support for three new algorithms: two elliptic curve algorithms and also the Russian GOST standard. We've also added support for two new digest types, again, a GOST digest type and SHA-384.

With this, we've implemented what is essentially in production. There are two additional algorithm types that have RFCs, but they're relatively immature. We'll continue to monitor those, and as mature implementations of those come along, we'll reassess and potentially add those to the repertoire as well. So for those that have been waiting for using elliptic curve cryptography for their TLD operations, this gives you that opportunity.

Another development that we have for our root zone management system is the implementation of new automated

workflows. Since we implemented root zone management software, we've had routine change requests transmitted between us and Verisign via EPP.

However, there were still three business processes that communicated manually as part of our business processes. First there were changes to the authorities of the root servers, the deleting TLDs, which was extremely rare – but the New gTLD Program has seen a number of TLDs also removed in recent months – and the process of escalating a change request to be an emergency. The way it would work historically is that change requests would be submitted at normal priority, and then we would raise Verisign via external channels, and then it would get flagged as an emergency.

However, as of August 2017, those scenarios I just mentioned are now fully automated. That means that 100% of interactions that we have with Verisign in transmitting requests are now down via EPP. This is not only good for ensuring that all transmissions are error-free and don't have to be re-keyed, but it also accords with the master that we had in the root zone maintainer agreement to reach 100% implementation of these.

For those that are interested in general in the changes that we make to our root zone management system, recently we posted

a new help document that lists the changes and deployments that we do of that software at that URL.

Another thing we've been working on is finalizing our implementations of the framework of interpretation. For those that have been following, we implemented what we could immediately, but we also had systems that needed to have [current] updates and so forth. That process has been carried on over the recent year.

The framework of interpretation provides guidance to us that informs us, essentially, how to implement the requests that we receive to delegate and transfer ccTLDs. The three main areas I want to talk about that impact us are technology changes, informed consent, and delegation contacts.

One of the key terminology pieces of guidance that were in the FOI was deprecating the term “sponsoring organization.” The document actually asked us to use the term “ccTLD manager.” Where we have ccTLD-only documentation we've made that substitution. However, most of our documentation was actually designed to be agnostic about whether it's talking about a ccTLD or a gTLD. Obviously, doing a substitution for “ccTLD manager” is not useful if it's used by gTLDs. So we've changed the wording around in various documentation. We've used “TLD manager” in some instances, for example. If you look at the IANA website, if

you log into RZM, you'll see that "sponsoring organization" has been eliminated from those platforms.

Another terminology change, amongst others – but I think this is the key one – is deprecating the term "redelegation." "Transfer" was identified as the preferred term for when operation of a ccTLD or a TLD is migrated from one party to another.

Again, our documentation has been updated to use the word "transfer." This one is a little more difficult in that "redelegation" really is part of the vernacular still. I've had meetings just this week and I'll tell you, without fail, people are asking me about redelegations, not about transfers. So I think it's going to take a while for that terminology change to embed itself in our community. With that in mind, we're writing documents essentially using both terms so that the people looking for "redelegation" aren't completely lost. But over time, I expect we'll slowly phase our "redelegation" more and more. So, yeah, "transfer" is what we're using in our recent reports and in the title of our documentation.

Uh-oh. Let me guess what that slide said. "Informed consent," I guess.

On this, there were a lot of recommendations from the FOI Working Group regarding informed consent. Informed consent is the notion that those entering into a transfer – i.e., ceding

management of a ccTLD to another party – do so with their eyes wide open. So there were a number of recommendations in terms of the existing incumbent ccTLD manager giving free and informed consent. And there were a number of points that it asked the IANA functions operator to make sure are met in the context of a transfer request.

Our approach here was implementing essentially a pro forma. It's a document that literally spells out all the FOI requirements. In recent approaches that we've had in ccTLD transfers that are in process now, we've provided that pro forma to the applicant for them to execute their consent with. So that is our primary approach to that. I'm sure the missing slide will be on the website at some point.

The last point on the FOI implementation was this notion of a delegation contact. The FOI recommendations state that the IANA operator only seek consent for a transfer request from the incumbent manager and the proposed manager. The IANA operator – and this is important – should not seek consent from the administrative or technical contacts. So if you're the administrative and technical contacts for the domain, you are not to be sought consent from.

We're implementing this today in a manual process, but looking forward, we want to find a way to implement this concept in

terms of our automation systems and our regular business processes.

Those familiar with our plans to adjust the authorization model, which I'll get to in a moment, will know that we're trying to fold this into that. The idea is that you can create additional contacts that are neither the admin or tech contact in your account. Effectively, these contacts will be people that are authorized to approve transfers. That's something you'll be able to manage in your management console and RZMS. Additionally, we expect to retain [ataban] mechanisms to conduct it through the due diligence process.

We're of the belief – and we're happy to get feedback on this – that we've implemented the recommendations from the ccNSO at this point that have clear guidance, but there are some pending issues that I think the ccNSO is aware of that are works in progress. We'll continue to monitor output of the ccNSO and implement it as those recommendations become available.

One such thing is procedure on how to revoke a ccTLD for cause and keep it operational. There is a provision in the FOI that, if a ccTLD is misbehaving and the ccTLD is removed from them for a justified reason but there is no subsequent operator identified, we need to take steps to keep the TLD operational. But how that happens has not been defined yet.

Another implementation issue is the appeal mechanism. If someone feels aggrieved by a decision that we've made, there are provisions for an appeal mechanism. But that is yet to be defined.

In terms of our management system, we've completed the new automated workflows I've mentioned, new DNSSEC algorithm support, and FOI implementation. We're now looking forward to a next-generation re-architecture, and I'll get into the details of that now.

The primary feature that I think is of interest to you of our next-generation system is a new authorization model. I've given fuller presentations on this in other forums. I'm happy to do so here as well, but I think we have limited time today. Essentially what we're doing is taking the existing model of an administrative and technical contact and separating that from the people who authorize change requests for [your] TLD. So you'll be able to configure a number of different options in terms of how change requests [your] TLD might be approved and implemented through our system.

Some of the design considerations that are going into this – part of this feeds off the last ICANN meeting, where we had a discussion about some of the issues here – include, firstly, migration of the existing contacts. One of the facets of our

approach is to phase out role accounts for authorizing parties. This doesn't mean you can't have role accounts in the WHOIS, like you can today, but the people who are authorized to approve change requests on your behalf need to be known to us as to who they are. They can't simply be a role account.

Another design consideration is granularity of control. This new model will allow you to effectively configure it in a number of different ways. For example, you can have people that are only authorized to approve technical changes for your domain. They can't approve other kinds of changes, so that might be good if you have a backend outsource provider. You can give them limited access to just approve changes that they're responsible for without giving them access to controlling the whole domain.

How we set up that granularity and how many knobs are added is a design consideration that we're working through now. Understanding the scenarios on how you want to configure this is important in helping us form this. We gave a presentation earlier today to the GNSO as well, seeking their feedback so we can create a holistic model that works across different TLDs.

One of the issues that we haven't got a handle on is that RFC 5091 has a requirement that the administrative contact be in the country. Whether any aspect of that needs to transcend to the

authorization contacts is not yet known. I think that's a discussion to be had, but we don't have a solution for that yet.

Also, we want to clarify the protocols for adding special instructions that we might have one file. We heard at the last meeting the idea of having special procedures for certain ccTLDs that might want to, in the event of a transfer, have special procedures conducted and so forth.

I just wanted to briefly touch on some of the other development work, even though the authorization model is my focus right now – designing that in a way that meets everyone's needs – we do have a raft of other changes that our team is working on. We're building a whole new technical check implementation. The idea there is we're separating out the technical check module. It's currently a monolithic separate, but it'll be separate from RZMS and it will be a standalone application. So you will be able to test things independently. I expect it will be open source and allow us to iterate on a different schedule to the base RZMS system.

Another item is providing you with a customer API so you can programmatically our system. This is important for people that have different portfolios for registry service providers and so forth so they can do things like key rollovers in a systematic way without making it error-prone. User-created options providing

for multi-factual authentication, mandatory authentication for authorization requests, providing a comprehensive audit log so you can log in and see all the interactions that have been done with your TLD and your colleagues so you have a complete record of what's being done to your domain, and some various other improvements.

Another unrelated-to-RZEM topic that we've been working with the CSC on is instrumenting our process for managing the IDN table repository. We're migrating to terminology "LGR repository." This is something that you might not be familiar with, but we retain a repository of IDN tables that are used by various TLDs. Historically, it's been extremely low volume, but with the new gTLD contracts, they're contractually obligated to use it. So the activity on that has been increasing significantly over the last year. In recognition of this, we're trying to build SLAs and management monitoring around this, and that is ongoing work right now.

Another topic is KSK rollover. As I've updated you in the past, this is a multi-year process to replace the trust anchor for the DNS for the first time. This is sensitive because software hasn't been tested in the real world to do this in the past. So for the first time ever, we're changing the trust anchor. Whilst there are mechanisms to automate the rollover, we're not sure how well they'll work. So we're going through a multi-year process to do

that rollover. We've already generated the new key, and it's published. In fact, it's on that graphic right there.

Now, the [cutover] was planned to happen on the 11th of October this year, so we should be talking about it in past tense, but in the weeks leading up to October 11th, a new technique of measuring resolvers' capability to recognize the new trust anchor was starting to be measured. Verisign and ICANN's research staff both had started getting telemetry that showed that a small percentage of resolvers were not yet aware of the new KSK.

There was enough of a percentage to give us pause and to in fact pause the KSK rollover. So the exact rollover date has been referred while studies are conducted as to exactly why that percentage is higher than we would have expected.

A new date hasn't been nominated, but essentially the technology means it has to be every three months. So it could be roughly the 11th of January. It could be the 11th of April. It's going on that kind of time schedule, but the exact date has not been picked yet. It will depend on the outcome of studies that are being done right now as the cause of those resolvers not recognizing the new key.

Just a reminder: we have really comprehensive reporting, as you heard earlier in this session, about performance. We provide

monthly reports to the CSC that are published on our website. Also, we have a real-time dashboard that lets you drill down into the data on how we're performing.

Lastly, as you heard from Jay, we're doing our annual customer survey. Invitations were sent out last week. If you've transacted with us in the last twelve months, you should have received an invitation from a company called Ebiquity. This is the third party company that conducts it on our behalf. They anonymize the data, so we never see who said exactly what. They will aggregate it and provide our findings for us to publish.

You saw that, for ccTLD delegations and transfers last year, we had a zero response rate. But even if you take routine change requests, the number of ccTLD managers that respond is relatively low. So anything we can do to increase the response rate will help us better understand what your concerns are and how we're doing.

So if you did get that invitation, I encourage you to respond. Responses are due by the 17th of November. If you have any questions about the process or you feel that you should have got an invitation but one never arrived, please feel free to e-mail our team at iana@iana.org and we'll get back to you.

That's all I had for today. Happy to answer any questions.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: Any questions for Kim? Okay.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: Hello. [inaudible] from CZNIC. First, thank you very much for implementing [inaudible] in RZMS. It was our request [for] some time, and we will definitely use it soon. Probably I'll test it soon. Maybe to put it more generically, have you considered maybe implementing this request from ccTLDs in more predictable by [inaudible]? I can imagine the ideal way when the ccTLD manager has the request to implement some feature in RZMS. They will fill the [ticket] the same way as they fill request for changing nameservers. And there will be some process behind it, like the evaluation of IANA. If this is completely nonsense or it's a request for more ccTLDs or more organizations, then evaluations on how much time it will take, for example [inaudible] can we implement it in a few months? Or it's a complex task – maybe implement it in a year. So I could see in the ticket, for example, which state this request is in and when I could expect it could be finished.

So, yeah, I think we are missing this process of how to process these kinds of requests. Have you considered to maybe do something in this way?

KIM DAVIES:

Thanks for the question. I, to be honest, I haven't considered doing it in such a systemic way that you would get a ticket number and you'd get updates on timing. Certainly we get feedback requests, and we always consider them. I think, in this particular case, as you know, this has taken longer than you would have liked to implement. I think some of the factors that went into that is we were doing significant software development in support of the transition. We have a very small development team, so it's not like we have a lot of time.

Also, we need to coordinate with Verisign. Verisign, as the root zone maintainer, has their own independent system from ours. When we make changes like this that are applicable to both systems, we need to coordinate our development efforts with their development efforts and get on a schedule.

I think, without the transition, this probably would have happened quicker, but I can't guarantee resources for others. But I take your point, some more predictability. I think both us and Verisign, in our discussions on implementing new algorithms specifically, are of a belief that, as soon as there is mature implementations, our desire is to implement it reasonably quickly.

Moving forward, hopefully we can take that approach. I think we probably should have implemented those algorithms a little earlier, but we're at where we're at. But it's a good idea. We'll think about how that works. It's not like we get tons of requests for features, but we'll think about how we can communicate those better and set expectations correctly.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: Okay. Thank you.

PETER KOCH: Hi. Peter Koch for the record, provided we have one. I have two questions. One is the ED1, I guess, and it goes along the lines of what [Yarmeer] asked about your introduction of the elliptic curve things, which is good news. I was wondering, you mentioned technical checks, and I just learned that, of course, you did consult with Verisign, so we can assume that the checks on the Verisign side, on the RZM side, were either not applicable or have been adjusted in the same way. Is that correct?

KIM DAVIES: In the context of algorithms, yes. Both ICANN and Verisign do fundamentally two checks. We match DS records supply to DNS keys, and we check the [RRCs] on the SOA to make sure we can validate the apex of the zone. Both of those required

implementing the new algorithms' code. We did it on the ICANN side, the PTI side, and Verisign did it on their side. Is that –

PETER KOCH: Yeah. That's the final response. Thank you. Adding to that, since we know that the KSK rollover sometimes is a bit of a rough ride with stepping into manual processing, can you see any precautions for algorithm rollover? And I apologize to the audience. It might sound technical but it's actually not a technical but a procedural question.

KIM DAVIES: It's worth thinking about. I think an algorithm roll for a TLD should have no issues. I'll check my assumptions. We're looking across the whole set of DS records that the TLD will continue to validate. So as long as you have multiple DS records in an algorithm roll situation, the old and the new, that theoretically be a problem. But I'm happy to talk to you about scenarios, perhaps offline.

PETER KOCH: Okay. Let me come to my other question, which is about the next-generation authorization model. I was wondering: did any committee or whatever expert group that we usually have

review the security models and maybe the shift in threats and mitigations that might or might not arise?

In addition to that – again, sorry, two-and-a-half questions – you said that you’re looking for community feedback here, and you also presented that in the GNSO. So does this now [inaudible] a community feedback process, or is this all on an informal basis? How would the next steps be? Could the community get input to propose solutions to questions? You get the gist, I guess.

KIM DAVIES:

The process that we’re on and plan to do, subject to amendment, is we’re doing high-level discussions and feedback. Obviously, I didn’t drill down into great specifics here. I did give a more full presentation earlier this year at a different ICANN meeting, but essentially we want to make sure the shape is right and then turn that into a detailed implementation paper. The idea is that this White Paper, or whatever it is, will have enough detail that you can pour over it and find logical problems with the approach or raise very specific concerns. We’ll share that with everyone and welcome input from TLD operators and beyond as to whether that’s the right model. The idea is to get something specific enough that we feel confident in implementing it. We’re not planning on having a formal approval

process with the ccNSO or GNSO unless we get feedback that that would be appropriate.

This model change we consider additive to the current approach, and it shouldn't have any regressions from what we have today. It's worthwhile testing those assumptions. It's adding more options that are essentially all opt-in for the TLD managers. So as a TLD manager, if you don't want to partake in this, you can keep your setup the way it is. So that's –

PETER KOCH: Thank you. Looking forward to the White Paper.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: Thank you. The last part of the presentation is from PTI.

LISE FUHR: Good afternoon, everyone. I know this is a long and quite technical session. I hope I can make it a little less technical. My name is Lise Fuhr, and I'm the interim PTI Director, one of the two so far. I would like to thank you for giving us the time to give you an update.

As you know, we had our one-year anniversary now, this month. Elise gave a very good presentation of where we are on a technical basis or as the PTI Board yesterday. I actually have two

objectives with this presentation. One is, of course, to give you a brief update, and other one actually is to get some feedback from all of you on some issues I believe we have.

If we go to the first slide, I have chosen a picture of a surrealist, Salvador Dali: “The Persistence of Memory” from 1931. Why am I using a picture at this presentation? Well, the interpretation of this picture is that Dali wanted to illustrate how useless, irrelevant, and arbitrary our concept of time becomes when you’re inside a dream state. But I want to use this picture to actually illustrate that, after a year, I still believe we have some issues we need to deal with in relation to PTI. Time has no relevance in a dream world. I certainly think it has importance in how we actually have our everyday work as TLDs and registries.

This is actually in relation to the IANA stewardship transition and how we implement it. Here, the persistence of memory is, of course, important. So my aim is actually to highlight that I think we should look into the actual implementation of the proposal and if it meets the letter and the spirit of the proposal we all signed off to a year ago.

I’m just going to give you a brief agenda here for this presentation. Now I used another artist called Banksy, who is painting the streets of any capital all over the world, in fact. This

is actually to show that I don't think I would sweep anything under the carpet. I'll try to be bold with you today.

The first item we're going to discuss is actually the new PTI CEO or V.P. As you all know, Elise will be leaving us, unfortunately. I think she looks very happy, so I think she's looking forward to it. But we will certainly miss her. So right now, there is a search ongoing for a new PTI CEO.

Jonathan Robinson and I are part of this. We're independent directors, a part of the interviews of the shortlist. The timeline is not very clear, but we hope to actually have this concluded shortly after this meeting and that we have someone who can take over from Elise early in the beginning of next year.

I have another thing. This is actually the slide that, to me, is the most important slide. It's important to find the CEO, but that's an ongoing process. I think that's on track. Here is where my issue lies: the roles and responsibilities. The problem is that we started discussing this with ICANN in January 2017, and we still need to define how the different cuts are going to be between the ICANN Board, the ICANN CEO, and the PTI Board. That is supposed to be done in a document that describes the roles and responsibilities. It's a discussion we have continued on Copenhagen. It's a discussion that we have stressed is urgent because it's actually setting up some barriers and also some

uncertainties of who's responsible for what, where our remit is, where it's the remit of the ICANN Board, and where it's the ICANN CEO's.

For me, I think this is a key issue to actually stress that we need to have solved as soon as possible. I think we as to the PTI Board would do best by also having independent legal advice on the document per se because we have some legal responsibilities as Board members, and we need to live up to the duties as directors. That's why I put that we discussed within the Board. It was raised by Jonathan and me that I think we should get some legal advice for this, and legal advice externally, not our usual legal advice, who are ICANN Legal. In many cases, this does not create any problem, but in this particular case, it would be nice to have an outsider.

If I look at the next thing, that's the budget, which I have no problem with. I actually hope that you will all take a look at it and give us some comments to it. I think, when we made the budget, in hindsight, I would have liked to have been more proactive in reaching out the Customer Committee. We didn't do that as the PTI Board, so we have discussed with Byron that this might be a good idea in the future, that we talk about this before actually sending out a budget for public consultation.

Of course, it's not too late. The CSC can still give input, but that's a bit on the late side when it's out for public consultation. I don't see this as a huge problem right now, but it could be in the future if you had any things that needed to be included in the budget. So this I don't highlight as a problem. This is more a matter having a Board that actually tries to establish some procedures. We might want to try to write them down. We don't know that yet, but this is the first year. It's a test year. This is one of the issues we will better at, and we're learning as we move forward.

The next one is actually at the Board. We also discuss operational issues, and those are discussed almost at every meeting. I think it's a key issue for us to know, of course, to get an update on how things are going with the Customer Standing Committee.

On another note, it's also very important to get the status on the technical projects and compliance with the Service Level Agreements. We tried to keep an oversight to the operations without getting too operational because that's not our main task as a Board, but it's a fine balance of knowing what's going on and not getting too deep into operational details. We don't want to get into the details of the operational details, but of course we have Akram on the Board. We also have Elise on the

Board, and they are very into the operational details anyway. As the independent directors, it's good to be updated on this.

I have a new Board. As you might know, we have been nominated. There have been two nominations. One is me. I've been nominated for two years. We need to be officially elected by the ICANN Board. The other one is Wei Wang, who is going to sit on the PTI Board for three years.

I actually chose another Dali picture. Elise told me it's a very dark picture as I have on the presentation, she thought, because I wanted just to tell her what I was going to say. It is a bit dark. If you look at what Dali wants to say with this picture of Narcissus and Echo. It's an old tale. There are two main themes. One is passion and one is grief.

I do believe we all as the PTI Board have a great deal of passion, and we do have some grief because Jonathan Robinson is leaving and Elise is leaving. So we actually have a very new Board that will have a new dynamic. But of course we're very glad to have Wei Wang onboard and are looking forward to working with him. Just to repeat, the others on the Board are actually going to be David Conrad, Akram Atallah, and a new PTI CEO.

If I am to continue a bit on my interpretation of painting – sorry to give you this culture lecture here today – this is a chessboard

in the background with only one piece on it. Actually, that shows that Narcissus is the only being in his life. He's actually having a one-person game. I don't see the PTI Board as a one-person game. I'm sitting here to ask you all for input and thoughts on the PTI Board that are raised today. I find that the dialogue with the community is essential. So now you actually have the community to provide feedback. That's not going to be the only opportunity you have, but of course you can always provide feedback to the PTI Board as such. I just want to make the little disclaimer: for any operational issues, you should go through the normal channels and not use the PTI Board to do it.

I have three messages I want to leave you with, and I also have a quote, just to warn you. That is that I still believe the PTI is a good team. It's a good idea. It's a good function. But I do think we have some work to do in relation to the implementation of the actual proposal that we all signed off on. My third message is that I actually need your input if this is important to you. Or, if it runs, why change it?

I would like to actually finish this presentation with an Albert Einstein quote, and that is, "You should learn from yesterday. You should live for today. You should hope for tomorrow. But the important thing is not to stop questioning."

With that, I have my final slide, saying “Thank you for listening.” This is also Banksy. It’s from Boston. So in the streets of Boston, you have a nice piece of Banksy.

I don’t know if there are any questions. It’s not to be disillusioned. It’s just to say I think we should move ahead now if we want to change things because this is the one year, and that’s a year where you do evaluate.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE:

Lise, thank you very much for your update. I have to say I was a bit distracted – and I still am a bit distracted – by all the paintings. If I combine two things that you mentioned, one is that there’s still no clarity on roles and responsibilities, and, two, you’re looking for new Board members and a new CEO. I can imagine that the letter is going to be a difficult trek.

What is keeping ICANN from coming up with the documents, and what is maybe keeping you from then approving them?

LISE FUHR:

We agreed in Copenhagen in March with the ICANN CEO that he would deliver a document for us. It would be sent to us very soon. We have been asking for this document at every PTI Board meeting since. I think they wanted to sort out the recruitment

process of the new CEO process first. I disagree in that you can't have the two processes –

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: You mean the new PTI CEO?

LISE FUHR: Yeah. Sorry. The PTI CEO first. I think you can have both processes in parallel. I think it's a big thing to make those things in writing to say, "What are the roles and responsibilities?" I don't know if they're afraid of actually coming out of the bush, saying, "This is how we see the world, and this doesn't really comply with the proposal." I have no idea. For us, we've been asking for it. For me, it's a matter of, "Should I really go into a long fight for this?" Do you want to back me up on this, or do you think this is just going to be... well, it's fine. If it's just rolling, it's not a big deal.

For me, I don't think this is crucial right now. It will only be crucial if we have some crisis. This is actually where these things become important because, in everyday life, things are working. We're communicating. Things are happening. But we do have to push an extra mile. Jonathan and I had to really step on and say we want to be a part of the selection committee for the CEO, for example. And we got to be on it, but it doesn't come naturally.

So a document like the roles and responsibilities would give us much more leeway for this to come in a more natural way.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: Okay. Thank you.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: Lise, that was a very philosophical ending.

LISE FUHR: Yeah. Sorry.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: Okay. Let's give her a round of applause.

Okay. I'd like to thank the team for the presentation they made. I think we have lesson we have got is they need input from the ccTLD Team. The Customer Standing Committee gave us a zero-something. We need to improve that. The CSC also needs our input, and also the Root Zone Team. So let's give us the input. Next time we're meeting we should have a response of 99.9%.

Let's stretch ourselves for five minutes. Let's be back at 17:00 for the next session. Thank you.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: Dear ccTLDs, if you still have a postcard with you for Steve Crocker, this is the last moment to give them to me or to Kim.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: Okay, speakers for the Regional Organization, if you could come up and take your seats please. We will try to start in about two minutes. So we need Eduardo up here. He's coming? Oh, Matthew. Oh, he's... okay. Oh, Ignacio.

Okay, so. Well, thank you everyone for staying. We're winding down to the last meeting of today's full session. And I think this session will be a session that we can all start to become lightly again, because we have several very animated speakers.

This is the Regional Organization Update Session. We have four representatives from the region, and so before – I should just let you start. Barrack Otieno. Thank you.

BARRACK OTIENO: Thank you, Chair. Good evening, colleagues. My name is Barrack Otieno. I'm the Manager for Africa Top-Level Domains Organization, so I'm just going to give a brief presentation on emerging trends in the ccTLD landscape in Africa. I hope I try to put it in a format that cannot be up there, but you can check on your screens in case the fonts are very small.

So, for those who might be new to this forum, AfTLD acts as a focal point for all the African top-level domain managers to discuss matters of policy that affect country code top-level

domain registries globally, as well as to present the groups position as one voice. So we endeavor as much as possible to also participate in the ccNSO or increase our participation in the ccNSO which has been a continuous exercise. So in terms of how the organization is structured, I've put a table in front of you that shows how we are structured. We are member-driven, so we have the General Assembly, we have the Board of Directors and then we have staff, but because this is something most of you know, I will not go through it again and again.

So, in terms of members, right now we have 41 full members representing just about 50% of the country code top-level domains in Africa, and I've put the list of members that is up there.

So, in today's presentation, I am going to quickly touch a bit on some emerging trends in the Africa domain-name industry that, based on a number of questions that I've been getting from some of the community participants when we are here.

So, some quick statistics or facts is that we have a total of 54 country, let me say, countries in the African continent, in terms of ccTLDs. I've put a list of the country code top-level domain registries there. We do have 53 that are functional, but we also have the 54th one in the pipeline, .ss, which represents South Sudan.

So, currently, the process of delegation is underway. Kenya Network Information Center is assisting South Sudan, the government entity that is following up the delegation of the .ss. The technical part has already been sorted, and so the policy aspect is what remains. So, hopefully, before mid-next year, we hope to see .ss go live, and so the 54 countries will be well represented.

I've just listed the ccTLDs per country, and also with the number with the kind of organizations that manage them. Currently, in Africa 24 ccTLDs, which account for 45% of the total number of registries, that is the 53 that are working, are managed by an organization that is government-driven. So, we have a substantive number of ccTLDs, 45% to be precise, that are being managed by a government-related entity. Some of them can be a national telecom operator. Some of them are regulators in different countries, and this, of course, affects the way some of these registries interact with the international and also local Internet communities. You realize that government institutions typically follow government procedures to operate.

We have a total of six ccTLDs, which account for 12% of the 53, that are run by universities or academic institutions. So we still have a number of the ccTLDs that are run by universities. We have 14 ccTLDs out of the 53, which account for about 26%, which are operated by private entities or private companies

across the continent. And then we have 9 ccTLDs that account for about 17%, which are public-interest organizations. These are basically multi-stakeholder organizations or public/private partnerships that run the ccTLDs.

Moving farther, we have about 12% of the ccTLDs that are undergoing transition. And when I talk about transition, of the 45%, that is the 24 ccTLDs that are managed by government-driven entities, we are seeing a situation where most of the government wants to exit from management from registries. They can be both a referee and a player at the same time. So, most of them are choosing to provide an oversight role, and so they are transitioning the ccTLDs into entities that they can be able to license or regulate. So this is one of the things that we are seeing in the continent, and about 12% of the ccTLDs are currently undergoing this transition phase.

In terms of delegations, and [inaudible], we have about 11%, which is six ccTLDs that are in the process of transitioning, either to a government entity or from a government entity to a public/private partnership sort of environment.

The other thing that I would want to point out is that, of the 53 country code top-level domain registries, 58% are now fully automated. They provide some form of support to EPP, and most of them are actually utilizing the 3-R model. This is a

remarkable improvement, because increasingly most registrants want to be able to purchase domains as and when they want. We are working hard to make sure that at least 100% of these registries become automated, as is the case in the center region. But, so far, that's basically where we are.

The ccTLDs that provide support for EPP account for the bulk of ccTLD registrations in Africa. That is approximately 90%. So, we have a total of about 1.6 million names for all the ccTLDs in the region. And, of course, the registries, the 17% ccTLDs or rather, sorry, the ccTLDs that support EPP are the ones that account for the bulk of these registrations. So we are also working hard to make sure that we improve the numbers.

So, again I would like to just touch a bit on our study that was released earlier this year by ICANN, which indicated that there are about 5.1 million domain names associated with the African continent. And, out of the 5.1 million domain names, 1.5 million, or about 1.6 million approximately are ccTLDs. That is just about 30%.

So, as you can hear or see, the region has great potential. We are still grappling with basic challenges like infrastructure and power, but the market is becoming more and more responsive to acquiring ccTLDs.

Again the ICANN report called for many countries to remove barriers to the growth of the domain-name industry, but some of the challenges we are facing is the fact that the bulk of the ccTLDs are government-driven, and government-driven entities require protocol and procedure. So, sometimes it may not be as agile as the Internet environment requires.

Again, the other issue that came out clearly in that report was that there is considerable potential for growth in the DNS industry in Africa. We have a population of about a billion. So, you can see that the potential is really high. And, as more and more ccTLDs automate, it will open up the region for markets beyond the African continent.

So, as I summarize, I would also like to point out that we are working on an observatory. It's been a long idea, but slowly we are getting there, which of course will be able to provide most of the statistics that I'm reading out in demand. And we are doing this in partnership with ICANN. So, the presentation is up there, in brief, and most of what I've been telling you is listed there. I think I would like to stop there and when the right time comes, I'll respond to your questions. Thank you very much.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: Thank you, Barrack. We've been hearing these regional updates every meeting, and we learn something new every meeting.

Thank you for the full description of the situation with the African TLDs.

Do we have any questions for Barrack? Yes. If you could step up to the mic. You may need to turn the –

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: Thank you very much for the very interesting presentation, and congratulations on the growth and work that you've done. I was just wondering, of the 1.6 ccTLD domain-name registrations, do you know how many of those would be internationalized domain names?

BARRACK OTIENO: To response to that, we have two IDN ccTLDs that are active, but the one that has been in operation for a while is .masr, which is in Egypt, and they account for, I would say 1%, because most of them have just started operating. So, it's even barely 1%. In terms of numbers, there are very few, but it's an area that is growing on the continent. And we are more countries, especially in the Arabic-speaking world, getting their IDN ccTLDs.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: Thank you very much.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: Thank you. [inaudible]. Thank you for that, Barrack. I'm not going to go through the study you did with ICANN, but I just wanted to ask you about this number that is a little bit surprising. You say that's 58% of African ccTLDs support EPP? Yeah, this is fact, that 58% of the African ccTLDs support EPP? And this is done by the contractors that has worked for ICANN? This number is derived from their work?

BARRACK OTIENO: Actually, the statistics that are showing are based on our own desktop research. Our interaction as the AfTLD secretariat with ccTLDs, so that ones that can actually provide support for EPP are the ones that 58%. Most of them are now automated.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: Okay, so if I understand well. I'm not going to take too long with that. You say that more than 50%, more than the majority of African the ccTLDs are automated and support EPP today. Okay. Thank you. I'm going to say, and this is my point, I really don't believe this figure at all.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: Thank you. One more question? Okay. One more question and then we will –

SAIF AL-MASHHADI: Hi, this is Saif from .IQ. A question from my colleague from .masr. He asking that could the ITN, if it's from different entity that .eg and .masr are different. Could they join in ccNSO?

BARRACK OTIENO: Actually .masr has been participating in the ccNSO and has also been very active in AfTLD programs, so I think they're even around.

SAIF AL-MASHHADI: I don't know why he asking that if he is already in ccNSO. I think the only [.eg]?

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: Well, I think with regard to that question, maybe Katrina or Bart.

BART BOSWINKEL: Unfortunately, the ICANN Bylaws have been drafted in such a way that IDN ccTLDs cannot be formal members of the ccNSO, and it's part of the overall policy to change that Bylaw. It's a definitional question of who is and which TLD can be a member of the ccNSO. That's an unfortunate thing, but as the overall policy still needs to be adopted, that's important, and that's the only formal limitation. IDN ccTLD can participate in all the work,

etc., of the ccNSO. You don't need to be a member of the ccNSO to participate in the ongoing activities.

SAIF AL-MASHHADI: Okay. Thank you.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: Thank you, Bart. Okay, so let's move on to our next presentation from Leonid, from APTLD, with a very interesting title.

LEONID TODOROV: Thank you, Chair. Well good afternoon, good evening, everyone. Well, I will just follow up on what Barrack has just said, and I just realized that it would probably be interesting to not do side different stats, but just to drill into the topic which I guess we started a year ago, and I was presenting in Copenhagen on that. Now, that is a capacity building back in 2000 – no, that was one year ago. Okay, so one year ago, I [was] stated that a capacity building became sort of a neutral, organic move for APTLD. And since then, there has been a certain progress.

But, let me first revisit certain issues, because I think that partly it could be a response to what we discussed earlier, those ccTLDs' contributions and all that stuff in interaction with ICANN. So, what do we know about our ccTLDs in the region? I'm

not sure that everyone is aware of some really appalling facts, because sometimes we treat those ccTLDs as if we knew them very well, and their life is that quite rosy, which is not the fact. Just to give you some ideas. Speaking of those, let's say transactions, one of our members on each dollar transferred to APTLD in membership fees spends a whopping \$1.80 in transaction costs, just for you to understand the complexity of that challenge. For another member, this is just random examples, for another member, which is perhaps unknown for the community and for the ICANN as a whole, there was an interesting story that was a university – that is a university-based ccTLD registry. And, unfortunately, there were tribal clashes within that city and within that university and some student, I mean a student was killed from one tribe. So, the other tribe decided as a matter of revenge to burn down the data center and to basically destroy the registry. So, that small registry team was besieged in that data center for several days trying to basically preserve that data center from being destroyed completely.

So, that's the life in certain parts of Asia Pacific, for those who think that, well, they can quickly and [assimilously] expand their [inaudible] ccTLDs and make a great progress. So there are many hurdles like that.

Meanwhile, what do they know about themselves is a very big question, because at times we face a certain requests or those requests that we are familiarized, because they come not to ICANN. And that's an interesting story, because I told you they are ignorant of ICANN, but to the local ITU office in Bangkok. And imagine, for example, a request comes from whatever national regulator or whatever authority, and of course it's not all about domain names. Rather, they want everything and to be delivered momentarily and in full, to lay fiber optics, to build conductivity, to train staff. And then somewhere down at the bottom of that list, there is and then something about domains. Something should be done about domain names. Usually, it's like "Could you help safeguard our domain names from" whatever hostile takeovers or from some improper influences which are incompatible or against our moral or spiritual principles and foundations? So, in other words, there is a very dim or vague concept of domain names' space in many parts of our region.

"How could we help?" is a very big question for APTLD. As I said, we are all up to deliver a certain capacity building for our members and prospective members as well if we can do that. We do understand that, although we do fellowships in many of them, and we do webinars for our members, especially for those members whom cannot reach physically, because these are you

know countries too dangerous to come. Like, for example, Afghanistan. We only can do webinars.

So, webinars and fellowships are there, but we do understand that this is like one of development and there is no continuity. There is no consistency, or it's not that enough to ensure it's a meaningful progress. And, we believe that there should be a genuine technical capacity, technical assistance in the capacity buildings projects, and there should be build on quite understandable and familiar foundations. And you could see that they should be well thought through, they should be consistent, well-coordinate and customized, because once [inaudible] obviously doesn't feed all obviously.

Of course we work in tandem with other "I" organizations, i-star organizations. First of all, these are regional registries, and I must say that APNIC and RIPE NCC do a lot of amazing things in the region across the region, because our region encompasses both, RIPE NCC's partly and APNIC's mandates.

Of course they have great experts, who are ready to contribute with their expertise and share good practices. And, of course, we have our members as well as RIPE NCC and APNIC experts in the field, so they are very much local. So they know those local needs and speak local languages. They do have well-developed training programs and courses indeed. And we benefit from

those, but of course we try every time to help them adjust those courses so that they would match our members' and non-members' needs. And of course they are available. I'm always happy to deal with RIPE NCC and APNIC just because those guys are really available even on a short notice and really happy to team up with us whenever it comes to some capacity building exercise.

Some of you might be surprised by it, but ITU as a focal point for many small ccTLDs across the region, especially in Asia is very committed and very much willing to help, except for they cannot do it by themselves, simply because that's not their area of expertise. So, we communicate with the ITU office in Bangkok in a regular manner on many occasions. And well, you see that with the word ICANN, it's followed with a question mark, because I will just talk a little bit about that later.

So, we recently started an absolutely new approach which we hope will be beneficial for both, let's say, sponsors or donors and recipients alike. And this is a peer-to-peer effort in which one registry, more developed, more mature, helps another to build some solid foundations. But we are not talking about physical infrastructure. Rather, we are talking about policy development, because again, to better understand it, I don't know how the things are in Africa, but many of our members do not have even policies in place to run their ccTLDs.

So, policy development. This is one thing. Staff training. This is a different thing, and it also should be done under these breakthrough projects, so we will see how it's going to work. And of course it requires a very thorough audit of what that particular ccTLD, in this case, [do more or less] has already and what it should get in the nearest future to make sure that we talk the same language and we can implement certain ideas and concepts.

As you can see, we are hoping that we are going to have some more projects down the road, and one is for .IQ and Saif is here. We are hopeful that we can do something meaningful for .IQ. Understandably, we cannot go to Iraq, so there should be some unorthodox approach to that.

And for Bhutan, but again, the problem is that Bhutan is not a member as yet, and we hope that as APTLD is moving to Katmandu and Nepal for our next meeting, then we would be able to engage with the government and the regulator of Bhutan, to make sure that we speak the same language, understand each other. Because again, the least of their requirements is enormous, absolutely enormous. So, they need everything. They are in need for everything.

Now, speaking of ICANN, I promised you. Do you know this guy? I mean, some of you probably met him. Of course, yes, thank you

very much. So, when someone talks ICANN in Asia Pacific, I believe the first and immediate thought is of this gentleman, who is known by his first name, Champika. I'm sorry I cannot just spell out his last name. It's too complicated for me. But this is probably the most passionate and the most experienced fellow who delivers a lot of training across Asia Pacific. You know, he is always on the move from one country to another, and everybody knows him. Everybody respects him very much.

Apart from that, I'm afraid I cannot refer to any other significant effort ICANN has made to date in the region. My intelligence sources told me that some project is under way in Vanuatu. I don't see the guys from Vanuatu here, so I cannot approve that, but – sorry. Debbie, yes, I mean, I would just take your question, absolutely. I'm not so sure, but I heard ICANN is doing something in Vanuatu. That's what I heard from my grapevine.

Now, more than two years ago, two years and four months ago, ICANN – the ICANN team – came to me with a suggestion to do a Trainers program in Asia Pacific. I was happy that we could cooperate. In two years after that, ICANN was back to me saying that finally they pinpointed the location for that training, that's Bangkok. And from that point, probably we would join you further on. During those two years, APNIC launched several program like that, training trainers across the region.

RIPE NCC deployed a lot of people, a lot of their staff, to do similar projects in some other parts of the region. So, you would understand that this is something very peculiar about ICANN's effort.

In my country, we all love metaphors. The only suitable metaphor would be our famous Russian saying that "The circus left the town, but clowns have stayed on."

So, my point is that we learn certain lesson, and I think that ICANN's experience is also a lesson to learn. So, we do not think – we cannot just build Rome overnight. We cannot play a messiah to our members and prospective members. We only can do something for them – something meaningful. So, we try to be as local as possible. We try to implement sometimes very unorthodox approach, and we try to be adaptive and very collaborative. And of course, windows of opportunity in each and every country, especially across Asia Pacific, open and close very unexpectedly, so we've got to be ready for each and every opportunity.

And, of course, we're not that much about reporting. We try to implement something first, and then we will be happy to share that with the community. All times, we try not to go to the governmental level. We try to focus on ccTLD in the hope that that ccTLD would be able to relay that signal to the government

to be serious about what we are doing and what that particular ccTLD is up to.

So, that is it. Thank you.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: Thank you very much, Leonid. Very detailed planning and thinking about what you can actually do to help. Any questions for Leonid? Okay.

DEBBIE MONAHAN: Debbie Monahan, .nz. I just want to clarify, Leonid, that it's not ICANN helping Venoatu.vu. It's actually .nz. So we've actually had the ICANN staff come and do training, and we've helped them do their policy framework and their regulations. It might not be you, but it is if you like an APTLD initiative, because it's us helping rather than ICANN.

LEONID TODOROV: I am absolutely happy and basically I had two kind of channels of information. One was saying yes, that was .nz, but on the other hand, some people would claim that that was ICANN. I'm very happy that Internet.nz took that proactive role and leadership in that project. Thank you very much.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: Good for .nzed. Okay, moving on. Let's move onto the third presentation, which is from CENTR by Patrick Myles. Patrick.

PATRICK MYLES: Hello. Thanks. So, the perceptive people in the room have probably worked out now that my name is not Peter Van Roth. I'm Patrick Myles, and I'm also from CENTR. So, Peter couldn't make this meeting. He normally gives the update from CENTR, so I will do it today. Since I get to choose my own topics for this presentation... Does this work? I get to talk about my favorite topic, which is my job, and that's data at CENTR.

Just to give a starter to the topic, I would like to describe why we bother to collect the data, and what I assess for that topic is that we would like to describe the market in which we work in. With CENTR, we've always started with the low-hanging fruit, and built a data culture for a long time. So, in order to do that, we've taken a few approaches. We've started some automated data feeds in CENTR. We've been doing that for a long time, to collect registration stats. And we also run a lot of surveys, in fact, around 12 or so per year and these surveys initiated most of the time by the member.

We also have created, in the last couple of years, a full data platform, which is a sub site to CENTR, called CENTRstats. And

what that helps is the members aggregate all the information in one place.

So, a little bit about some key performance indicators in the European market, and I'll go into a bit more detail of a couple of these points, but the overview is that we are starting to see a very clear stabilization of domain growth in Europe. So, it's becoming very flat after years of very noticeable decline.

The year-on-year growth, as recorded in September, the median rate was 3% over say around 40 ccTLDs located in Russia. [Not] Russia, don't know why – in Europe. Five grew over 10%, it's worth noting. And four have actually contracted in that period.

The renewal rate is around 80%. We collect this data from our automatic data feeds, and we have methodology in how we calculate renewal rate. The market share, that is to say, the ccTLDs registrant proportion in any given country has an aggregate of 56%. So, in most of the cases, the ccTLD is the more dominant TLD in each European country. And the wholesale price, which we track from year to year, is between €6 to €7, and in the last year or two, there's been around five ccTLDs who have increased their price.

In terms of market share again, I just mentioned it, but that's the breakdown of TLD type in market share. So, 56% in aggregate form in favor of the ccTLD. And this has taken over say 500 TLDs

that we record registrants' statistics from. That's around 107 million domains.

So, a couple things on trends. Again, what I mentioned before was the flat lining stabilization of growth of ccTLDs in Europe. This shows the fast declines over the last few years, since 2013, and then a recent kind of flat line stabilization with a bit of a bump from Chinese registrations, which were coming into the European market. Those Chinese registrations are for a good portion starting to disappear, but they created that bump at that point, and that's what explains it.

In other ways of looking at that same chart, we can break it down by the zone volume. So, that gives a bit of a different sense about the different trends that different registries are facing over time. And further granulated, we take out the outliers and we can see, and outliers being those who have made a significant change to policy or if they've made a very significant discounting period. And this explains a little bit better, without those outliers the trend in those market groups. So, for example, ccTLDs that were between 100,000 to 500,000 have one of the higher percentage growth rates in the last year or so, as well as the 1 million to 2 million domains.

Another way of looking at that – we try and look at it from lots of different points of view – is to give seasonal trends. So, that's

just a month to month seasonal look at the monthly changes of around 35 ccTLDs in Europe, and we can see where the highs and the dips are. This explains seasonality and when people are buying domains.

Back onto market share, since this accumulation of TLD groups since January 2016, in terms of CCs versus legacy gTLDs that's .com, .net, or .biz, and the new gTLDs. And you can see ccTLDs are doing fairly well there in terms of their evolution over that period.

So, it's not very sensible that we only look at registration statistics. So, in CENTR, as I mentioned, we have automatized this process now fairly well. We're able to give fairly good granularity and offer benchmark tools to our members, but we are increasingly interested in the "why" of domain-name usage and trends. So, who's registering these domains? What kind of industries are they attached to? And there's an increasing pool of work that's going on in the community now, and one of these things is a project called "The Registry/Registrar Data Group," otherwise known as the RRDG, which is a sort of ICANNy-type acronym. And there, the members of this group taken a month or two ago, in Frankfurt. We meet about one a month, usually on a WebEx call. It's a group of registries and registrars. CENTR did not initiate this project. It was started by a couple of registries

that got together about one and a half years ago to try to understand the market in a much more granular detail.

And so, what are they talking about? If you see below there, we have the key areas of work in this group are standardized approaches to classification of registrar business models, industry and industry classifications And what we're moving toward now is more standardized approaches to registration, definitions and methodologies.

There's more information there on that link in the middle of the page, which is on a public page on the CENTRstats site.

Just a couple of points on those specific key areas of work. The registrar business models are a standardized and agreed-upon approach to classified registrars by their core business model. Now how is this helpful? This can help a registry give a more granular detail to their registration reporting to their registrar channel and I'll give you a couple of examples in a minute.

On the domain usage part of the project, what the group did here was take European NACE codes, which is a form of categorization of industry type, and make a more simplified hierarchy that is linked to those NACE codes. Now what this can do is help those who create crawlers, for example, that can crawl websites and attribute domain names to industry classification

areas, and then give more of a view about the different types of industries that domains are being registered to.

One example of how this can work in practice is if you take national statistics of data by industry and in Europe, this is reasonably good data that is possible to get from Eurostat. Attribute it to those categories on the total business numbers and then by use of crawler technology, delegate domains by industry type, and then you get an idea about the potential of a market area.

In terms of the registrar models, this is all public information. The registrar models are out there and we encourage registries to take a look at them. It might help a registry classify their registrars into these models and then give better statistics to their channel about the trends that they're seeing in their own TLD. So, there's a couple of examples that we've put together here of how that could look for registries and registrars. All those samples, by the way, are interactive dashboards that are available publicly on the CENTRstats site and the link is down below.

Other recent activities, we had our very first CENTR leaders Day a couple of weeks ago in Brussels and that was after, we'll say, a few years of the CEOs and general managers of the registries asking for a more closed group where they open agenda to talk

about the topics that they're interested in, so that was run alongside of our General Assembly two weeks ago and it was very positively received.

Other content related issues that are high on the agenda for ccns in Europe at the moment are the, of course, the GDPR regulation ongoing and due to be implemented in May next year. We're looking at that from both a technical and legal point of view, so the Legal Working Group has discussed this at quite high length a few weeks ago in Stockholm, and the R&D Working Group has also discussed this in a technical point of view about how to anonymize data.

Other issues and projects that we've had, we've had probably the largest survey that we've ever done in CENTR, which is produced a report of about 40 pages and this is a very detailed analysis of the legal situation in ccTLDs. It was broken up into about six or seven areas from transparency and abuse to corporate governance and legal structures. And this is being processed right now and will be made available to CENTR members pretty soon and those public parts of that report will be made available, as well, so our data resources is helping to produce this and it will benefit the members but also a bit more broadly for those public sections, as well.

And then we had our CENTR awards, which we've done every couple of years and there are the winners there. There was six or seven categories and it was a very fun night in Brussels and it sort of aims at highlighting the good work and initiatives around the European ccTLD community. So, that was my presentation. I hope I was clear and if you have any questions, I'm happy to answer.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: Thank you. Very efficient and productive and you look like you're all having a lot of fun. Any questions? Yes. Patricio.

PATRICIO POBLETE: Patricio Poblete from Chile. Super interesting presentation. What's your source of data for gTLD research in Europe?

PATRICK MYLES: For the aggregate registration figures globally, we just pull the data from ICANN, of course, on the [cz] [inaudible].

PATRICIO POBLETE: To compute the market share.

PATRICK MYLES: Yeah. For the market share, we only have one source, which is ZookNIC, who provides that country-to-country. We've discussed that topic quite in detail in certain groups in CENTR and as far as I'm aware, it's one of the few sources of that information and that's using WHOIS to attribute registrant location by country.

PATRICIO POBLETE: Okay. And the other question is that [inaudible] has actually an interesting page with the statistics and by looking at that, I see that halfway through 2016, Portugal had a big jump, like 20% all of a sudden, and did anything in particular happen there?

PATRICK MYLES: Portugal and it was mentioned on which site?

PATRICIO POBLETE: In Korean information.

PATRICK MYLES: Okay.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: I'm sorry. I'm not familiar with that site. I'm going to have to check and [inaudible].

PATRICIO POBLETE: It was like 20% in just one quarter, so I was curious if anything special happened in .pt [inaudible].

PATRICK MYLES: Well, something special happened a few years ago in .pt in that they changed their policy and they became much more liberalized and that took a multi-stakeholder approach. They restructured their organization and from then, their growth has been fairly high compared to a lot of European ccTLDs. I can't comment about the specific quarter growth that you're talking about. Maybe it's promotional related, I'm not sure, though. You have to ask .pt.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: We don't have .pt here, do we? Okay, well we don't have that much time so we need to be finishing up. Let's go to LACTLD and we have a new presenter, Ignacio Estrada.

MIGUEL IGNACIO ESTRADA: Hello, good afternoon. I'm going to start [IDN]. Eduardo was supposed to give this presentation and at the end introduce me as a new general manager but he couldn't make it so I'm going

to do that. My name is Miguel Ignacio Estrada, everybody calls me Nacio, so please call me Nacio if you need to speak to me.

LACTLD is the regional organization for Latin America and Caribbean. That brings together the ccTLDs from the region. We have 26 associates and 5 affiliates and 11 observers. We have been continuing with the implementation of the working group focused strategy. We've been strengthening the working groups. We have four of them. One is for policy with 19 participants, the other for legal aspects, and that has six participants, other for technical aspect that has 17 participants, and one for commercial aspects that has 25 participants.

We have been having regional workshops with approximate of 40 attendees each. We have been having usually one for each working group but this year, we had a combined workshop for policy and legal aspects. We had trouble support for around seven up to eight participants for each workshop. We had the policy and legal in May in Brazil. The technical was in August in Costa Rica, and we are going to have the commercial one in November in Mexico.

We are also in the process of improving our web presence by renewing our digital assets. The first one we are working in is the website. And we have some collaborative projects. One is the Anycast cloud that started in 2013. It aims to better coordinate

the ccTLD resources and share knowledge among the members. I have some operational details. We have three cooperating teams, .br, .cl, and LACNIC. They hold regular coordination meetings each month, and 24/7 not provided by .br.

The management interface is provided by .cl and we have some seven nodes at the moment. Six nodes, sorry. Three [inaudible] nodes, one is .br, other .cl, and the other is LACNIC, and three local nodes. One is .ar, the other is .cr, and the other is .co. We have clients, also. We have 70 zones from .ar, .cr, .ec, .by, and .uy.

And we're also working, kind of starting the DNS observatory. It's this project is in collaboration with ICANN LAC. Information for 450,000 domains was gathered to check how resilient is the DNS system in the region. The operations are being held by .cl. And we're looking forward to grow the numbers of domains to analyze in this observatory. That's all. Thank you very much.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: Thank you. Do we have any questions for LACTLD? No? Then we are two minutes before the hour and that is perfect because then it will give us enough time for the next session, which I hope you will stay for, which will be the review of the meetings strategy. And I would like everyone to show your appreciation to

our very interesting presenters. Gender unbalanced panel. It is true. Well, maybe better next time. Thank you.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: Okay. The Chair of the ccNSO has decided to pay drinks for all those who have survived nine hours meeting because we are talking about nine hours. No? Am I right? Yes. So, can I see... Can I [inaudible].

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: Nine and a half.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: Sorry. Nine hour, not half. Let's see if they make it to the half. For that matter, it's nine hours, so please, please show your consensus, green, if you like Trina to pay all the drinks. I mean, the ccNSO Secretariat, I mean. That's what I mean. I'm sure they have some funds somewhere somehow. Okay, so it's consensus. Let's move to the presentation. Thank you so much for staying.

YOUNG-EUM LEE: Well, welcome, everyone. We continue our session of the ccNSO meeting strategy review, and Giovanni and Jordan, and [inaudible] will be leading us. Thank you.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: Thank you very much, Young-eum. So, I will do a short introduction of the ccNSO meeting strategy review and pass it on to Jordan and Giovanni, Giovanni especially for the entertainment.

So, why are we actually discussing this? In 2016, there was an advice formulated by the ccNSO Meeting Program Working Group regarding the future of how the ccNSO member meetings should be held. And they advised to continue with three meetings a year at least until the end of 2017 and then revisit this topic again. So, the Council has accepted this advice, this recommendation, and has made a resolution. So, there's a link in the slide if you want to read more about this Council decision from last year.

What has happened in the meanwhile? Well, a Drafting Team has been assembled. You are able to see the members of the Drafting Team on this slide. So, they stepped forward based on a call for volunteers and this Drafting Team is currently writing the Terms of Reference for the ccNSO meeting strategy review.

So, these Terms of Reference, they contain mainly the scope of the review and this is why we are sitting here. It's important to have your feedback regarding the scope, but also defines the roles and the processes and the timeline for this review. We'll go into detail later. Moreover, defines the organization of how the

review will be conducted, so to members that are currently part of the Drafting Team, they will become the members of the Review Team later on, since they have started already with the work in this area and have experience. The main important thing is to mention that your input is important, so there will be a community consultation has already started here today, and it will continue up and until ICANN61.

So, here is a short timeline of what will happen next. So, as mentioned, a Drafting Team is currently preparing the Terms of Reference, and once those Terms of Reference have been finalized, it will be sent to the ccNSO Council for adoption.

Then we'll start drafting a consultation document, which is actually leading into the initial report and that will be ready around January/February. The initial report will be sent out for public comments and the consultation will continue until ICANN61.

So, after having received your input and your feedback, the initial report will be revised, input will be incorporated, and we will draft a final report, which will be sent to the Council for adoption, so that is a shorter timeline.

The role of the Review Team is indeed to detail the topics that should be covered by the ccNSO meeting the strategy review and also, obviously, to consult with the community and to

produce the reports, first the initial report, and then after community feedback, this will lead into the final report.

I'll now pass it on to Giovanni, who will talk about the scope.

GIOVANNI SEPPIA:

Thank you, [inaudible]. Indeed, I can go back on the slide. Okay. So, the suggested scope of the review, touch base on four points. First one is consult the goals and format of the ICANN meetings and review how the ccNSO session fits in it. Second is consider other formats for the ccNSO members meetings. Third one is establish the need or lack thereof to have ccNSO members meeting at every ICANN meeting, and the fourth is to consider how to best encourage sharing of ideas and developing relationships between ccNSO members and participants.

So, the first one is to think about and, eventually, think about how the ccNSO sessions are currently fitting into the revised meeting formats of ICANN, and as you know, since not so long ago, there are three meetings a year in sort of different format. The first one is meeting A, the community forum, which this year was in Copenhagen, and this is the way the meeting was structured and this is the way the ccNSO meeting fit into the Meeting A, the Community Forum, having on day four and five,

the full member, the Member Day, and the previous two days were day two and day three for the working groups, and second day three was Tech Day and working groups.

If we go to the following meeting, which was Meeting B in Johannesburg, the Policy Forum, we had on day one Tech Day and working groups, and then we had the second and third day, the ccNSO Members Day, including some side, let's say, but very interesting and well-attended meetings, including the cross-community meeting. And the last day, day four, was about the PDP Retirement Working Group.

If you look at the current one, so Meeting C, the Annual General Meeting, which lasts seven days, we have the first two days, day two and day three, about working groups and Tech Day. And again, two days for the member meeting, and an extra day for the PDP Retirement Working Group. This is the current structure of the ccNSO meetings within the current set of the ICANN meetings and part of the work of this working group will be to consult with the community and see if this set fits well in the ICANN current meeting framework.

The next one is Jordan, as we are really doing like a trio of 10 or so.

JORDAN CARTER:

So, we'll just brief you on these four end goals for the revise or four topics for the review to look at, and then at the end, we'll ask you for your suggestions, feedback. We'll come back through them, so we'll – oh, and Giovanni will throw a bowl at you if you ask the wrong question or the right question. So, the second topic is the possibility of other formats for the ccNSO members meeting and the goals of these new formats. And I don't think we will – the Program Working Group is an important part of this. We don't want to have a clash with the Program Working Group, which is why [inaudible] as part of the Review Team.

So the role of the Program Working Group is to define the overall schedule, the topics, presenters, and so on. That's not our job. We're not trying to replace with this review the work of the Program Working Group. Instead, it's to provide the kind of structure within which those meeting-to-meeting decisions are made. So, that's the kind of question that we've gotten. We've got the regular familiar rhythm of what's in the topics for the ccNSO members meetings, and we'll be asking for feedback on whether the right sorts of areas are covered or not, essentially.

So, whether we need to have different kinds of sessions then, say, a regional organization update or a members' update or a legal update and so on. So, that's what that one's about. Back to Giovanni.

GIOVANNI SEPPIA:

So, the third point is to check if we really need to have a ccNSO Members Meeting or Working Group Meeting or Tech Day Meeting at every ICANN meeting. I guess that if I ask this after nine hours at the end of this meeting, I prefer not to hear. I mean, it's a consultation but sometimes you prefer not to hear the response, but we'll try to do it because indeed, at present this year, the ccNSO members meeting was held three times at the three meetings and if we decide differently to reduce the number of ccNSO Member Meeting or Working Group Members or Tech Day Meetings, we should ask which of the three ICANN meetings annual meetings we yearly meetings because [inaudible] is this one, at which of the ICANN public meetings, which of the ccNSO meeting if is going to be sort of rotation. And also, what is the impact? Especially if you're looking at the working groups or the council face-to-face meetings in person meetings, what are the consequences for of certain choices on the work developed by this community. And I'm passing the floor again to Jordan.

JORDAN CARTER:

This topic is about whether we've got the right ways of doing our meetings in place to get people to meet and mix and mingle with each other. I mean, one of the key benefits of being participants

in the ccNSO is that you meet other ccTLD managers and the kind of question of this topic would be along the lines of do we have the right set of interactions here? We have the Tech Day, we have the new sessions so we can share news, the ccNSO cocktail, where we can mix and mingle and formally we often have a ccNSO cocktail. Mix and mingle and share ideas, and of course, by using the room cards, we can sort of see each other's points of view on various topics, and the question will be is that the right set of things? Is there something else that we should be doing to help people get to meet each other, to get people to broaden their network in the ccNSO beyond the people that they already know today?

GIOVANNI SEPPIA:

So the next steps, as we said at the beginning, is really to, let's say, start the consultation with the community and kick off the review in order to produce an initial report that will be submitted for public comments and then for following steps as [inaudible] described in initial slide. But the main point here is that we'll move forward with the adoption of the Terms of Reference after this meeting, ICANN60, including the scope of the review, but I think it's quite important for us to start sort of consultation as soon as possible. So, for the survivors, to the survivors of today's meeting, do you have any initial emotion, feeling about the future of the ccNSO meetings? What are your

initial thoughts? And if you can please get to the microphone, those of you who like to speak up and say, “Yes, I want to see a line like a ticket office of a Cold Play concert.” So yes.

JORDAN CARTER: Just as you’re coming up, the other kind of questions you might like to think about are of those areas for this review to focus on, are any of the wrong? Are any of them not worth thinking about? Or alternatively, is there another topic we should be looking into that we need to add to that list? So, that would be helpful feedback among all your other thoughts. And we will finish at 6:30, so. Giovanni, you can chair this. More. Okay.

PETER VERGOTE: Okay. Rudolph wants to know what we have to do to win the poll. Is it the longest question, the longest intervention.

GIOVANNI SEPPIA: That’s good point, Peter, because I would just love to say –

PETER VERGOTE: The most hostile intervention?

GIOVANNI SEPPIA: If it's a hostile intervention, you get the bowl in a different way. If it's a pacific intervention, you get the bowl properly. But in any case, you get the bowl. Yeah, that's the point. Thank you.

PETER VERGOTE: Thank you. No kidding. For the record, Peter Vergote, .be. I very much welcome this review because I think that a lot of the members have a decisive opinion on this. Not saying that it's going to be easy to reconcile all the opinions but it certainly is going to be a very interesting examination and potentially we can only improve for the future, which is of great interest of our members. So, very much looking forward it.

I like the scope, as well, although some things might be more difficult to start debate with than others, especially point four. I think we will have to do some dragging to get some relevant feedback from the members, so just a friendly caution on that perspective.

What I wanted to know, whether it's possible or not to add to the scope, and then certainly, in the scope element number one, is the number of ICANN meetings itself. Because if I look at – what was it? The second or the third one? Well, anyhow, the second or the third mentioned is it necessary that we have ccNSO member meetings or ccNSO meetings, including Tech Day, etc. at each and any ICANN meeting, so that's, quite frankly, putting already

a couple of steps ahead. While the key question is, do we actually need three ICANN meetings a year?

And I understand if this is something that is completely unchangeable, then the next question would be do we, as a ccNSO, do we need to be present at any ICANN meeting? But it's going to have an adverse effect. Suppose that we say well, two of three ICANN meetings is more than sufficient. As a ccNSO, we are going to skip one ICANN meeting, but the thing is a lot of our members are probably here wearing different hats. They're here as a representative for their ccTLD but they can also offer other services, they can be here to do relationship building with the registrars, they can be here in their capacity as a gTLD registry operator, so we should certainly take that into the balance, as well.

So, I would like to raise the question one level. Do we really need three ICANN meetings a year? Thanks. That's it.

GIOVANNI SEPPIA:

Thank you, Peter. I think that the number of ICANN meetings is out of the scope of this working group for sure, because there was already, I mean, the current ICANN meeting framework has been already under discussion. [inaudible] the Board, that was [inaudible] question and was split in this working group in great [inaudible], so sorry. But no, I'm just going back one step back.

The current ICANN meeting structure, having the policy form, the annual general meetings has been the output of the work of an ICANN, I believe it was a Cross-Community Working Group that spent about two years to review the entire ICANN meeting structure.

And this is the first year that the full ICANN meeting structure is – no, it was last year when it was the [inaudible] so it's the second year, the full new ICANN meeting structure is deployed over the year, so I think that it may take a few more years before that can be revised further, if I'm not mistaken. But we can look into that and we can speak about that when we provide an update to this ccNSO community.

PETER VERGOTE:

I clearly understand that we do not have the capacity to change that but nevertheless, the document that will come out of this review, we should not refrain of putting that forward, that this is a strong desire or not. I'm not anticipating, I'm just saying that we might formulate an opinion on that and integrate it into the document. Excellent.

GIOVANNI SEPPIA: I fully agree. It's a very good point and we'll make sure that we'll provide this kind of, let's say, side comment when considering the different options. Thank you, Peter.

PIERRE BONIS: Hi. Pierre Bonis, for the record, AfNIC.fr. Yeah. Very happy with the scope that you presented. I think most of the questions are asked and I think it's a very good initiative. Two remarks or suggestions. When you ask if there is need for a ccNSO member meeting at every ICANN meeting, I would add something like is there a need to have a ccNSO members meeting that lasts the entire ICANN meeting or most? This is the first point. [inaudible] Sorry?

GIOVANNI SEPPIA: Sorry. Can I ask you what do you mean? Because currently –

PIERRE BONIS: That's because the, when I'm talking about the ccNSO events, not only the ccNSO members meeting, you had some ccNSO related [event] yesterday. You have today, you have tomorrow, and you have on Thursday also, so as far as I know, the ICANN meeting starts on Monday and ends on Thursday, so way or another, if you want to attend all the ccNSO-related events, it lasted the all ICANN meeting more or less. So, this is a question I

want to raise and I, on that, it's the length of the ccNSO meeting. Not saying that it's too long but I think this is at least as important to ask yourself this question as to ask ourselves if you want to meet at each ICANN meeting.

And the second suggestion would be to work on the possibility to have some parallel meetings within the ccNSO and maybe when there are working groups that are working on very important topics and at the same time, very technical or complex ones, between two ICANN meetings, maybe the members would like to go and attend special events on this working group that are of interest for them and they could choose between going half a day on the working group on the ccTLD retirement, for instance, or on another topic. This is another suggestion. I mean, go deeper during the ICANN meetings because almost everyone is here on specific topics, and give the choice to the member. That was the suggestion [inaudible]. I don't have the [bow!].

PETER VERGOTE: I think those are two very good suggestions to add. Thank you.

GIOVANNI SEPPIA: Thank you. Mary.

MARY UDUMA: Yeah, thank you. My name is Mary Uduma from .ng. I'm so excited about these strategy you've come up with to do a review and see what are the meetings [inaudible] can do to improve on that ccNSO meeting.

GIOVANNI SEPPIA: Speak, speak, yeah. Thank you, Ralph, that was –

MARY UDUMA: I want to start from the Tech Day. It will appear that the Tech Day concentrates on tech, everything tech, so the business of running ccTLD registry, I don't know whether we have considered that.

The other one is whether we have considered about having leadership training for members and we found out that members, I don't know whether we have taken the statistics of the new membership we have every meeting, whether everyone understands what it takes to be a member or you know sometime because of information overload, we don't even read some of the resources we have online, so if you can consider that.

So, one of the meetings or any of those meetings that we have in [inaudible] we have leadership training and also business training. I know we share resources, we share best practices, but

it's so short, so short a time, I don't know whether it's things as much as we achieve those things we want to achieve during the training period. So, I mean, the Membership Meetings, so we should consider that I think it makes a lot of sense to be here when ICANN is meeting because some are not only for cc. You could attend other program but just like this, an outreach, maybe the cc community will also think about outreach to the region or the area we have come for any program.

I know there was a time we did a training in Kenya. I was [inaudible] they did some training for us in Kenya, so such things will help us not only the Tech Day for the tech people, there are other people apart from the tech people. Thank you.

GIOVANNI SEPPIA:

Thank you, Mary. And indeed, there was a time when ICANN organized, I still remember somehow to develop business [continuity] at ccTLD registry level. That was back in I think 2007-2008 when the ccNSO meetings were complimented by these training organized by an external company contracted by ICANN about business [continuity], so that's indeed an excellent idea. We'll think about it. Thank you.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: Good evening. [inaudible] .rs registry, for the record. Actually, Mary gave me a perfect introduction. I was thinking about outreach events and maybe just a suggestion to think about them. Because I have attended the outreach event of the NCUC and they gave a new excellent update about what they do, what the topics they're tackling, what are the issues they're facing, and how the community can be involved, which can be a great moment for the mingling of the community and for the mingling of the ccNSO without their members, so thank you for the inreach.

And I would also like to invite maybe for the members to be more connected with the Newcomers, the Fellowship session with ccNSO will be represented, will be held on November 2 from 12:45. It's actually the space nearby. I think it's Hall A, Section 8. So if other experienced members of the community would like to attend and meet up with the Fellows and with others who are interested to learning more about ccTLDs, we'll be like distributing these [guides] that we made, so that will be also pushed out towards the mingling and presenting the community like on a broader scale. Thanks.

GIOVANNI SEPPIA: Thanks a lot. Good point.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: Who won the bowl?

GIOVANNI SEPPIA: It's not over yet.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: Somehow, I suspected this is going to be the second-longest living working group that we ever had. I think this is one of the most difficult subjects to tackle for this community. We've been discussing the length and the frequency of ICANN meetings so often, and then we have the objective to shorten them and somehow the short meeting becomes the length of a normal meeting and the long meeting, of course, becomes a longer meeting.

I think the approach of the review is good. I've now commenced on that. And if you ask for some inputs, if we meet as a community, we might as well have a ccNSO meeting. And I would change the question into do we need it today ccNSO meeting every ICANN meeting because I sometimes get the impression that we're kind of struggling to fill to the program with really good stuff.

So, that might be a suggestion and my other suggestion would be to consider if we can have parallel tracks because I don't think that all subjects interest all participants in this meeting,

and we might experiment with that to see if we can have a shorter meeting and still cover a lot of [inaudible], so yeah.

GIOVANNI SEPPIA: Thanks a lot, Ralph. Very good input for the parallel tracks. We'll certainly look into that option with working group and with the broader community.

Anybody else? It's just about 9 hours and 28 minutes after we started this meeting this morning. Outside is dark, by the way, and there is apparently farewell cocktail waiting. Any last minute thought? Nobody? Just – no, wait, it's not over. One more? That's the wrap-up. No, we are not wrapping up. Sorry. Let me give the floor to [inaudible] for some final remarks.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: Just a logistical announcement. So, apparently, the entrance or exit doors, no, not really. So, the ones in front of the aloft are locked because there's another event going on at the same time. So, in front of Hall 4, there will be golf carts that can bring to the aloft and the other hotels that are close by, the Premier Inn and the Center [by Rotana] I believe it is called. So, that is one way of getting back in that direction or simply follow the U-shaped hallway, walk all the way back to the lobby of the aloft. Thank you.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: Thank you for staying for our session and staying awake.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: Thank you.

YOUNG-EUM LEE: Thank you, everyone. I expect to see you all back here tomorrow sharp at 9:00.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]