
ICANN82 | CF – ccNSO: Finance Working Group Session
Sunday, March 09, 2025 – 13:15 to 14:30 PST

CLAUDIA RUIZ

Hello and welcome to the ccNSO Finance Working Group Session. My name is Claudia Ruiz, and I am the Remote Participation Manager for this session. Please note, this session is being recorded and is governed by the ICANN Expected Standards of Behavior and the ICANN Community Anti-Harassment Policy.

During this session, questions or comments submitted in chat will be read aloud if put in the proper form as noted in the chat. If you would like to speak during the session, please raise your hand in Zoom. When called upon, virtual participants will unmute their microphone in Zoom, onsite participants will use a physical microphone to speak and should leave their Zoom microphone disconnected.

For the benefit of other participants, please state your name for the record and speak at a reasonable pace. Thank you. And with that, I will now hand the floor over to Alejandra Reynoso, chair of the Second Finance Working Group. Thank you.

ALEJANDRA REYNOSO

Thank you so much Claudia, and welcome, everyone. I hope you've had a good lunch and are ready to tackle the work we have at hand. This is the link to the presentation that we would like to use during

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.

our session that it's happening on Tuesday. So kind reminder for those who I still don't have your photos, so it would be nice if you could send it to me so we can fill all the participants there. The idea now, I would like to walk you through the draft of these slides.

Like this is something like a brainstorm and it's not finished, and sorry about that. But some events have come up that have prevented it to be already in a final state, but we will discuss how it's laid out if the direction it's the one that we want to cover and any adjustments that will be needed.

So the first slide, it's to the welcome of the session, and then if we could go to the next one, please. So here to break the ice quite swiftly, the idea would be to ask already the question if, for the ccTLDs that are present in the room, if they're financially contributing.

This is to get everyone into the mentimeter already to kickstart the conversation on what this is about, and just to see how are we with the audience that we will have in front of us. The next one. Now we get into the matter. Now we have everyone in mentimeter, and then it's just to explain very briefly what we are doing, and well, the purpose of the financial working group that we have reviewed and of course, the financial contribution models that this is the objective of the group, and that more certainly we need to preserve the principle of voluntary contributions.

So next, please. Here we would like to, and when I say we, Bart and I left these following slides blank because they were having conversations with Shani regarding how to put them here. So the

original model will be the one that we are reviewing. And the next one, please. It's the revised one, as in there had been some adjustments to it or at least some review and to share those here.

So to show where we started and where we are. In the next one, we asked the audience if they believe the model is still reasonable, as in, the start of the work of the working group was to check whether the model was still reasonable. We went from going through the whole details of costs and how that could be not sustainable or not doable.

Then we have the model, the shared model, and now we want to know the opinion of the audience when they see it, how they feel about this, because it's our job to actually gather feedback to report later on that. And the next one. This is the band model from the current guideline just to do a refresher for everyone in the room of what we are talking about.

And this is how it is currently in the guideline. And if we go to the next one. This is taken from the Google sheet that we are using to get an estimation on where we are with numbers, just to let people know the difference. So if we could go back one please. Thank you.

So you see here, I will change. Now I see something in the title. It says number of ccTLD in the IANA database. This is a error of copy paste, but here, it's not all ccTLD in the IANA database are considered, but in the next one they are. So here you see 229 ccTLDs. And in the next one, please. Thank you. It's 309. That's the total of ccTLDs currently in the IANA database. And it's just to

give an idea on what we are seeing. We are not concluding anything, it's just to show what the group is looking around.

So with that, if we could go to the next one. I'm going a little fast on this so you get an overview. And then please what I would like to, from the group, is to tell me whether this makes sense, what to keep, what to take. It's just I'm showing you the whole package. So here, it's one of the graphics taken from that compilation of several reports on ICANN fiscal years. And it's to show the participation of ccTLDs, how it has changed over time, and also how the amount of contributions has fluctuated.

So the idea here is to show how it's working so far, and to let the audience know that what we would like is to have a more stable behavior regarding the contributions. Because if I'm not mistaken, and I'm looking back to Xavier, that's something that it's expected just to have more stability on the contributions and not so much fluctuation on those. But this is to show where we are. Next, please.

More information that we have is from the how the ccTLDs are distributed, and it's important to consider that in these 309 ccTLDs in the IANA database, we are including the IDN ccTLDs, and this is how they're distributed per region.

And in the first set, it's the total of ccTLDs, and in the second, it's how many of those have contributed through time, because if you see it's 138 ccTLDs that have contributed through time, but they're haven't contributed consistently. So it's, again, information that we have. Next slide, and then we could do a little bit more deep

diving into the information. And now, we will see some blank slides, but they're placeholders if we think this is something worth.

So next one, please. So for example, contributions by the ccNSO membership. Here, we could kind of have a graphics showing from the contributions, how many come from ccNSO members, how many from non ccNSO members, and by the difference how many ccNSO members are not yet contributing and the others as well.

Again, showing data so we can see where we are. And the next one. Remember in our last session we spoke about adding another data point, if you will, on the ccTLD type of entity. We have four very broad, as in, it gets more complicated when we try to go into more detail.

But right now, we have academia, government or regulator, entities that are contracted by government, and private entities. And here there's a showing the total that are total of ccTLDs by the type of entity and how many of them are contributing, just again, to check on what this could mean later. So we can see, for example, academia and private entities, my own analysis here is half are kind of contributing.

The ones that are government or regulators, it's only a third, and then these other very small category, two thirds are contributing. And the next one. And here we start with the feedback gathering for us.

So these are questions to bring us information and in particular, we discussed that we wanted to explore what is it that motivates

ccTLDs currently to contribute financially. But asking the question so directly might not be as effective as going a little bit on the side and saying, which of the following do you relate to? Just to check.

So my ccTLD supports IANA services or my ccTLD value ccNSO activities, my ccTLD benefits from attending ICANN meetings or my ccTLD benefits from decision of policy work, my ccTLDs advantage in having representation at the ICANN Board or other, if any, so to check where we are.

The next one, please. In the others, is there anything that we are missing for reasons to financially contribute here and see if there are any ideas? Again, by using mentimeter, we get the opportunity of having a more frank feedback because it's anonymous.

And with that, we should be also aware that maybe the responses we get are not necessarily from ccTLD, so we need to take that information with a grain of salt. But still the next one, please. And then, has your ccTLD changed its contribution over time?

So no change has started, increased, decreased, or stopped? Just this, when we will see live the responses, then we could ask if anyone would like to share why any of those, as in maybe why they started or why they stopped or why they increase or decrease just to get a sense of what is it that affects the contribution.

And the next one, we could have it as a question itself so people can input in an open question with text or we could ask it while we are seeing the results and take notes of those. So this is related to that one. And then, the next one, please. So do you think the current

band model is fair? Because we should make suggestions, if any, to the current guideline. So it's good to get the feel. And the next one. What would you change about the band model, if anything?

And the next one, it's the last one. So here is what can you expect between now and Prague? As in, it's not a question for the audience, it's for us to tell them what are the next steps of the working group that we will analyze alternative models, we may do a survey to confirm the results of what we are consulting with them then.

And then we will provide suggestions to improve the process as well. So I think I went a little too fast on that one, but the idea was for you to see the overall, so I would like to know your feedback if you think this makes sense. Any other ideas? Yes, Andreas.

ANDREAS MUSIELAK

Andreas Musielak from .eu for the record. I think the last two slides will be probably too difficult for the audience. So either you have to go very deep into the model. Otherwise, I think the responses will be quite general from this point.

And I think the group started so completely comment out, which is not connected to this presentation. So my understanding was from this group to cover basically the costs which will really occur, right? So you don't talk about in this presentation about that. I know you did that in the past meetings, and I don't know if at least you need to convey this message to the audience because I don't see this message here included in these slides.

ALEJANDRA REYNOSO

Thank you, Andreas. Yes, they're not there, but there's a placeholder for that. We didn't have the time to put the information, but if we could go to slide number eight, please. There. So here is where we will share that as, in via the shared cost financial model as it was presented originally.

And in the next one, I know it's only titles, but the next one, it's now the one that has been reviewed and completed and has responded the questions that were raised in the working group as into have a more detail on those, it's here will be like, okay, from that one, this is what has been reviewed and increased. I don't have the information here. I'm sorry for that, but we didn't have the time to do that yet. But it will, and you have to link to this Google slide so you will see it evolve from now and tomorrow. Tomorrow it'll be finalized, I promise, but yes, here's where we start the discussion. Irina.

IRINA DANIELA

Thank you. Irina speaking in my capacity as an observer of this group. The comment on particular this slide, we have discussed the new model. We very close to say it's completed, but we have not completed it a hundred percent. So just be careful with words because there are minor items which are still under question for me at least.

ALEJANDRA REYNOSO	Shall we say, instead of revised, under review so it's clear.
IRINA DANIELA	Yeah, under review, it's close to be done.
ALEJANDRA REYNOSO	Under review. Okay.
IRINA DANIELA	And I have a couple of comments for later on slides, but I can wait if we are gonna move through the presentation.
ALEJANDRA REYNOSO	Maybe let's go already to the other slides.
CLAUDIA RUIZ	Shani has his hand up a little earlier.
ALEJANDRA REYNOSO	Oh, sorry. Oh, Shani, where?
CLAUDIA RUIZ	Yeah, he's in the Zoom room.
SHANI QUIDWAI	Yes. Thank you, Alejandra. Just a couple comments on the revised model. Bart and I have been exchanging notes on this so I am pretty close to being able to share some of the new numbers. The

one that I'm struggling the most with is the ccTLD host services for ICANN meetings. As I think everybody knows, this is a hard one to measure, and we've received feedback from a few different people on kind of what the impact was when their region hosted it, and they significantly vary.

And so I think no matter what we do, I think we just have to acknowledge that this number is very, what's the right word, volatile or kind of dependent on the region and the level of effort that that country is giving to support the meeting. Because whichever number we go with, I think is purely an estimation, and in some years could be high and some years could be low. And so ultimately that's something Bart and I have kind of left that I think we need to just discuss a little bit more and get everybody's thoughts on how to approach that one.

ALEJANDRA REYNOSO

Thank you, Shani. And yes, this ties up with what

ANDREAS MUSIELAK

Probably short response to that from Shani.

ALEJANDRA REYNOSO

Yeah.

ANDREAS MUSIELAK

I think it's important probably to distinguish if you come from these four different sectors. For academia, you probably can't afford it to

pay so much compared to a private ccTLD. I think this is probably something we need to take into consideration. Yeah.

ALEJANDRA REYNOSO

Okay. I'll come to you, Pablo, I see your hand up in Zoom. So yes, and this comes to what Irina is saying, that this is not completely revised, so that's why we will change to on the review. And the different things that we are taking into consideration are being still analyzed, and that comes to this particular point as well. And I forgot what I was going to say after that. So I'll go to Pablo.

PABLO RODRIGUEZ

Thank you, Ale. And this is Pablo Rodriguez from the registry .pr for the record. I don't know if you are going to talk about another slide, but there is a particular slide in which the audience has been asked why are they contributing? And my question is, is it going to be one response or do I have the ability to pick several of them?

ALEJANDRA REYNOSO

It's not the ones that are here. No, I don't know. The others, the multiple choice.

PABLO RODRIGUEZ

Oh, okay. Thanks.

ALEJANDRA REYNOSO

Multiple choice.

PABLO RODRIGUEZ

Thank you.

ALEJANDRA REYNOSO

Shall we go to another slide, Irina?

IRINA DANIELA

Irina speaking. Slide 18 if possible. It's probably the same slide Pablo is talking about. So here, just wording, my ccTLD supports IANA services, it's not really correct because ccTLD receives certain services from IANA. So it's supported somehow by IANA services, so we just need another word here instead of support.

ALEJANDRA REYNOSO

I agree. Any suggestion?

IRINA DANIELA

Acknowledges were served by IANA, something like this. Receives service from IANA.

ALEJANDRA REYNOSO

Pablo.

PABLO RODRIGUEZ

Thank you. This is Pablo Rodriguez from the registry .pr. In any event, it would be my ccTLD supports ICANN who happens to then support the IANA services. Would that be correct?

IRINA DANIELA

That's a little bit different, because we may be willing to support ICANN, which does a lot of different things. And we might be already just to pay exactly for the service we receive from IANA and we do not want anything else from ICANN. This could be a position. So it's a little bit different.

PABLO RODRIGUEZ

I recognize that, I was wondering since we are not sending money directly to IANA, how else can we-- I understand that what we're trying to say is that we want to support the IANA services, provide the ccTLDs, no problem. So I guess it would be difficult to consider how else can I support the IANA services if it's not through ICANN.

ALEJANDRA REYNOSO

Yeah, the idea behind that sentence was more like without putting it in the full words, and maybe we need to, the support's like my ccTLD pays for IANA services. That's the idea behind that word support, but I know it can be interpreted many ways. So we'll find a better one, but it's more to-- maybe I'm over complicating this, but.

And the idea here was to know why ccTLDs are financially contributing without asking it so directly that people might not be so they don't feel invited to reply somehow. So this is the other way to say why they do so, because they are paying for this kind of, like, this is one of the reasons why.

PABLO RODRIGUEZ

Could it be my ccTLD benefits from IANA services?

ALEJANDRA REYNOSO

I'm not sure that's the best word because without IANA services, we don't exist. So more than a benefit, it's a function issue, yes. So Irina.

IRINA DANIELA

Maybe if you attempt to rephrase it, like we as a-- my registry is ready to pay for IANA services, opportunity to attend ICANN meetings, blah, blah, blah, et cetera.

ALEJANDRA REYNOSO

Can you repeat my registries.

IRINA DANIELA

Is ready to pay for, no, to contribute for the opportune-- to pay is actually not the correct word in terms of voluntarily contribution, but it is very easy to understand.

ALEJANDRA REYNOSO

I'm going to Spanish now. Okay. So I'll write a note here, and then we'll check the language later. Thank you. Any other? Yes, Irina.

IRINA DANIELA

Irina for the record. On slide 21. Why did you answer the way you did? I understand what you are meaning, but it's maybe, again, not the best wording.

ALEJANDRA REYNOSO

Agree completely. So here I would like to ask whether, because to me this slide could or could not be removed. If we go to the previous one, please, Claudia. So here, so when we are-- like during the presentation, we can ask while this is like people are actually choosing this, then ask with the results on screen why did they answer the way they did? As in why they decreased, why they increase, or something?

IRINA DANIELA

Let me just-- why did you increase, decrease/stop/kept the same?

ALEJANDRA REYNOSO

Ah, okay. And there are two consequences. Either ask it like that and then we take note from whomever it's ready enough to say that, or we ask it in the next one and request people to type it, which might be easier. Okay. So why did-- I hear you. Okay.

IRINA DANIELA

And my last comment regarding slide 24. The last bullet point, suggestions to improve the process. Which process are we talking about?

-
- ALEJANDRA REYNOSO The whole, everything that could be done in the financial contributions, maybe starting from the billing or if there are any suggestions to be done to there, as in maybe more awareness, or.
- IRINA DANIELA Maybe just suggestions on the next steps because it's not necessarily improving the process. It's not necessarily the process is bad and needs improvement.
- ALEJANDRA REYNOSO Ah, true. Okay. So better phrasing of that. Anyone else? Andreas.
- ANDREAS MUSIELAK Andreas for the record. Can you go back to slide 14 or 13? I don't know exactly where you had these bars with the numbers of ccTLD contributing, and yeah. Now one slide back. 13. No, then. Yeah, this one, 13.
- My question is just because I don't understand, so we have in FY22 116, and it went down to 109. So, which means we have still a high number of ccNSO members, but less members contributing. That's what I have to understand from this chart.
- ALEJANDRA REYNOSO This ccTLDs in general, it doesn't say that there are not members of the ccNSO. So these are ccTLDs that have contributed that year, but it doesn't say anything about membership.

ANDREAS MUSIELAK Okay. So only ccTLDs. Okay. That makes it clear. Thank you.

ALEJANDRA REYNOSO And Atsushi, sorry, I just see the Zoom.

ATSUSHI ENDO No worries. Atsushi Endo .jp for the record. Slide 20, please. Yes. There is some five selections of answers, but I think that it's up to each ccTLD how much to pay, but the several, I'm not sure how many ccTLD is the same, but they just go along with the guideline that says if you have 1 million registration, you pay I'm not sure for 50,000 or like that.

Or if you have 2 million, 75,000. So it's not the increase, decrease stop, but just go along with guideline. My suggestion is adding that kind of answers to adding that for--

ALEJANDRA REYNOSO I'm not sure I understand.

BART BOSWINKEL Atsushi, do you want to include it as a new item?

ATSUSHI ENDO Yes.

-
- BART BOSWINKEL Just in accordance with the guidelines. So that's an option.
- ALEJANDRA REYNOSO Will be added. I'm adding it right now, so I don't-- to the guideline. There. Okay, thank you. Any other comments? Shall we remove any slides? Shall we include any slide? I took note from what Andreas said regarding the last two questions might be too heavy handed. Should we remove them, ask them differently, or what should we do? Can we go to 22, please? Thank you. Any suggestion on what to do with the last two questions? Irina.
- IRINA DANIELLA Does it go right after the model itself?
- ALEJANDRA REYNOSO No, but we could put it so people--
- IRINA DANIELLA Because it makes sense to ask right after, okay, here is the current model, do you believe it's fair, otherwise there is a lot of information, people have a chance just to forget.
- BART BOSWINKEL May I suggest that you add the word still, is still fair, because in 2013 people thought it was fair.

ALEJANDRA REYNOSO

Now the question would be, so we asked this at the beginning, we go through, this is how the band model is in the current guideline, this is new information from our gathering of-- like can we go to slide 11, please?

IRINA DANIELLA

Or maybe you just repeat the slide with the current band model before the question.

ALEJANDRA REYNOSO

Exactly. That was going to be my question, whether we ask that at the beginning or we show it again, and then we ask the question.

ANDREAS MUSIELAK

Yeah, I would show it again. I think you had the flow, so you maintain the flow, but you repeating and that helps probably make sense just to copy and paste this slide before slide number 22.

ALEJANDRA REYNOSO

And Yes. And even in Mentimeter, I believe we could add it in parallel with the questions, like to show the model and the answers so it's displayed while they're answering. So it's at the same time.

I think it can be done, but if not, we'll see how. Okay. And we are showing the model again, we're asking whether they think it's still fair, and then we ask if there's anything they would change. That make sense now, Andreas? Okay. And Bart.

BART BOSWINKEL

As an intro text, because just to make very clear that in 2013, either you speak to it, but I keep it in the slides as well. In 2013 as an intro sentence, in 2013, the vast majority of the ccTLDs present found it fair and equitable, the process. So the model. And now you can ask, is it still fair? Then it still makes sense because you ask it again.

ALEJANDRA REYNOSO

Alright. Irina.

IRINA DANIELLA

Irina speaking. There is another tricky question. I'm not sure if we want to ask it or not because in general, I might consider this model to be fair, but I will not follow it. So this question would start about are you ready to contribute to coding the model?

ALEJANDRA REYNOSO

Shall we include it? And I'm asking all the members of the working group.

ANDREAS MUSIELAK

Andreas, for the record. So if we add such a slide, then you need to add another slide again to say who is contributing, not according to its band. No, it's true, it's really. If you ask that, you need to show, okay, they are difference.

ALEJANDRA REYNOSO

We already are asking kind of that question in-- let's go to--

ANDREAS MUSIELAK

I know, but if you would like to add, Irina, which I think makes sense, then they need to understand that people are not making it according to the band model.

ALEJANDRA REYNOSO

Yes. Irina.

IRINA DANIELLA

If I may, I wouldn't do it publicly, but the table with the financial contributions is available and we receive it couple of times per year so everyone can easily check, do his own exercise. It's not a big secret, but I wouldn't demonstrate it.

ALEJANDRA REYNOSO

Well, I'm not sure if that's necessary. We could try to check that anonymously as in saying, we don't have the info. We have the info, but we haven't analyzed it. And to say, okay, these many ccTLDs who are contributing are on their band and these are contributing outside their band, whether above or below because that's also the thing.

There are some that are above, there are some that are below. Not everyone that is not in their band is below. So that's also another thing to say. So we have the question, has your ccTLD changed its contribution over time? We are asking that.

And after that result, we will get information whether it hasn't changed, it has started because maybe they weren't paying, it has increased, decreased, or stopped, or it's according to the guideline as it was proposed. Do we need to ask that? Can we infer something from that information or do we need to ask? Can you please speak to the microphone?

BART BOSWINKEL

Yeah, because Sean is there. Why not use that as a starting point for a question with the audience and a dialogue with the audience because that's the important part is, okay, you've got the answers.

If you go to that question, you will see some people who will do one and some people will vote on another one or check that box and then ask people to speak to their response. And I think that dialogue is the most interesting part for the finance working group, because that gives you direction where to look for on improving.

Because we started that dialogue, if you recall, in Istanbul with Rule of Byron when they explained, or especially rule of when he explained say the behavior of Dawson El with respect to their financial contribution. And I think you want to understand the behavior of others as well, but the only way is ask them and that this is really, what's the English word, not consulting, but the other thing.

It's not a survey because then you have a strict one. This is really trying to interview people and get people to respond on, and then you can start confirming afterwards, it's really soliciting views.

ALEJANDRA REYNOSO

I'm thinking how to include it.

BART BOSWINKEL

You don't include it, you, you just pause because you will see the responses, and then you see the responses, then you ask people from the audience is what we do all the time with Mentimeter sessions. Can you speak to it? Why did you respond? Do you feel that you can respond to it?

ALEJANDRA REYNOSO

Well, maybe they won't because I don't think they will. Let's go to slide 20 just to check if we can cover it in another way. So this is when we ask about how things are, and in the next one, when we make a better phrasing of the question, can we go to the next one?

Then we are asking them to type why they answer the way they did. So we'll see what they have to say then. Then we will ask if they still think the current band model is fair, if there would be anything that they would change. I'm going through the next slides, and the question now is whether we should add a final question on will you be ready to start to contribute if you haven't done so or something.

BART BOSWINKEL

I'm also thinking a little bit like the flow of the session because what you will see is you see a lot of people looking at their phones, et cetera, and typing away, and we ask these questions and that will be 15 minutes. But having the dialogue is the interesting part. Or

you look at some of the responses because they will show on the screen, and then have a dialogue around it, ask people in the audience why did you answer the way you did.

ALEJANDRA REYNOSO

Instead of asking people to type them?

BART BOSWINKEL

Yeah, yeah, yeah.

ALEJANDRA REYNOSO

Not sure if people will be willing to share, but Irina.

IRINA DANIELA

I think it's up to you if you are presenting, just do whatever you believe at that moment is the right thing. I cannot predict how it'll go.

ALEJANDRA REYNOSO

Okay, so let's have it as a-- I would say let's have the slide as a-- and if nobody it's willing to speak, maybe we can ask if they want to type it so it remains anonymous. Maybe the question regarding whether they're prepared to start contributing or not, we could keep it for when we present suggestions and like at the end.

Like not now, but in Prague, because I think now it's a little bit pushy if we don't have yet any conclusions on whether there is room for improvement or not in what's happening. So I do want to

ask it, but I think it makes more sense to ask it afterwards than now.

What do you think, Irina?

IRINA DANIELA

What you're saying makes sense, but another approach when developing a new model, you maybe need some like limits. Like if you see that people are not-- there are five registries which are paying \$225,000 and there are multiple registries which will never pay this amount.

So it does not make sense to create such an event if we know in advance that people will not pay it. Or another approach, well, this is what you need, and try to sell it at this price. But it's a choice, it's a trade.

ALEJANDRA REYNOSO

Okay. I think that will come clearer when we see if it's fair or not, the model. Any other comment, suggestion? Do we feel good about this? And as mentioned by Shani, him and Bart, they're still finalizing some details and we will fill some of the slides.

One more thing, and it's the one that I-- oh no, we did say we will keep it just to-- so okay. If we can go to slide 16 quickly, I think it is interesting, but this one. We did say we will keep it, right? So I will put the graphic showing percentage of ccNSO members paying, not paying.

Okay. And well, there's that. Any comments? Going once, going twice? If not, then well, that's it for today's session. So thank you

so much for participating. We will finish it up. As soon as it's in its final version, we'll send an email to the mailing list so you can have a look, and at any point you can of course still send further suggestions and see you all in the next days. Thank you. We can stop the recording.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]