
ICANN82 | CF – ccNSO: ccTLD Financial Contributions Session
Tuesday, March 11, 2025 – 15:00 to 16:00 PST

CLAUDIA RUIZ

Hello and welcome to the ccNSO-ccTLD Financial Contribution Session. My name is Claudia Ruiz, and I, along with my colleague, Joke Braeken, will be the remote participation managers for this session. Please note that 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. Interpretation for this session will include English, Spanish, and French. If you would like to speak during this session, please raise your hand in Zoom. When called upon, virtual participants will be given permission to unmute, and on-site participants will use the physical microphone to speak. Please state your name for the record and the language you will speak if speaking a language other than English. And please speak at a reasonable pace to allow for accurate interpretation. Thank you, and with that, I will hand the floor over to Alejandra Reynoso, Session Chair. Thank you.

ALEJANDRA REYNOSO

Thank you very much, Claudia, and welcome, all. I hope you had a nice coffee break. Can we go to the next slide, please? So, as I told

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.

you earlier today, we will be using Mentimeter in several of our sessions. So, if you would be so kind to already get into today's Menti, I would really appreciate it because we will start with a question.

So, the idea today is to tell you about what the Financial Contributions Working Group has been doing, the information that we've been gathering, and especially what we want to do today is gather your feedback to collect all the information and then be able to continue our work. With that, can we go to the next slide, please? So, here we are. These are some of the faces of the Working Group. If you have any questions, please, well, raise them today, but if you think of anything else later, please don't hesitate to reach out.

Next slide, please. So, the objective of the Working Group is to review, explore, and propose financial contribution models that are fair and equitable, to encourage ccTLDs to contribute at a level deemed reasonable, and to preserve the principle of voluntary contributions. So, with that in mind, let's go to the next slide, please. So, here's the first question. Has your ccTLD made financial contributions to ICANN? The three possible answers are yes, no, or I don't know. So, please, let us know.

And if by any chance you didn't get the QR code, first, the code, you can see it at the top of the slide as well, and it will be pasted in the chat in Zoom. It's already there. So, all right. Well, thank you very much. It seems the majority from the people in the room today are contributing. Good to know. Next slide, please. And now I will give the floor to Bart.

BART BOSWINKEL

Thank you. And this is just a brief historic overview, and just as a kind of basis, it goes back to the discussions concluded in Buenos Aires in 2010, or 2013, and around the basic model. Xavier introduced this already in Istanbul, but for the sake of this session, we'll repeat it. So, the underlying, I would say, philosophy is there is a value exchange and a value exchange approach between ICANN and the ccTLD community, and that resulted in a shared cost financial model.

And the value exchange and shared cost, the working group at the time identified, I would say, three major buckets of costs. One is specific, and these are costs directly, from ICANN, directly related to and in support of ccTLDs around the ccNSO. Shared costs, costs relating to activities and categories of costs that directly benefit ccTLDs and what is important, and others. And you will see later on, one of the shared cost components is, for example, the IANA naming function, or the IANA function in general. So, it has nothing to do with the importance, it is just a bucket.

Then the shared costs from ccTLDs to ICANN, it's, as you know, some ccTLDs have and will host meetings, and they provide all kinds of services, including people as well. So, ccTLDs service costs benefiting ICANN and others is, again, included, but this, in this case, as a component from ccTLDs to ICANN and others. So, therefore, included.

And then there is probably the third category, which is global costs or generic costs. And, again, as I said, it has nothing to do with the

importance of efforts, etc. But this is really ICANN's and the ccTLD global community's efforts to strengthen, I would say, the multi-stakeholder model, either by ICANN providing this global platform in the sense of the ccNSO and other work they do in interaction with other stakeholders and also the ccTLDs' efforts in that respect, and including through their work, providing legitimacy to the role of ICANN and the multi-stakeholder model as such.

What is important, and you will not see it again, but, therefore, I'll mention it now, it is not quantified, not in 2013, and it will not be quantified in the new model either. But it is a very, very important category, and a lot of work of both the communities goes into it.

Next slide, please. Shared Cost Financial Model of 2013. So, this is the historic model. You can see this in the financial or in the final report of the first finance working group in 2013. It's on the ccNSO website. You can see the numbers at the time. There was an extensive discussion before this final report, and we'll go in a little bit more detail, or Shani will go into a little bit more detail on the current state of affairs, but this is the starting point. So, this is now under review by the working group and ICANN, and Shani will talk to it.

Next slide, please. And the real reason for introducing is in 2013, and some of you were at that meeting, probably it was in Buenos Aires, I think it was during the AGM, is that the ccTLDs present after extensive discussion agreed that both the value exchange approach, so we just discussed, and the shared cost financial model are considered fair and reasonable. They were considered

fair and reasonable in 2013, so that's the starting point and has been the starting point of the discussion of this group.

Next slide, please, and I'll hand it over to Shani because now we go into the financial, or I'd say the updated shared cost financial model. Shani, go ahead.

SHANI QUIDWAI

Thank you, Bart. So here on this slide you can see the same format that Bart had just presented that was developed in 2013, and the numbers here have been updated for the current costs of ICANN. And so starting with the specific costs, those are the very direct and clear costs that are benefiting the ccNSO. This includes the travel support that ICANN provides along with the policy development and secretariat support.

Next we have shared costs. These are costs that we essentially take a portion of them and attribute them to the ccNSO. This includes things such as governance, Board support, ICANN meetings, as well as IANA-related costs, and so for each of those we take a portion and use some logic. So, for the IANA costs, we use the number of ccTLDs as a percentage of the total TLDs that are in the route and take that portion of the costs of IANA and include it here.

From a governance perspective, we look specifically at the number of ccNSO board seats and take that percentage of the costs. And so, using that already agreed upon methodology and process, this was developed in 2013, and the costs were roughly \$3.5 million at

that time. They have grown over the last 10 or so years to \$4.8 million.

If we move to the next page, what we've been doing as a working group is we initially started meeting to A, understand the history and what was everything that went into the components of that cost. Once it was better understood what was in there, the team has worked together to make some updates and adjust a few of the calculations to better reflect what the belief is of the value model. And so, you can see here that the costs are slightly lower at \$3.6 million, and we've put them in red because this is the current status. This is not quite finalized, but this is what we've been discussing as a group.

The biggest change is that within the shared costs, we are no longer taking all of the IANA costs. We're only looking at the naming costs within IANA. And so that's about 60% of IANA's costs relate to the naming function, and so we take those costs rather than the whole amount, and this has roughly a million-dollar impact in bringing the number down to 3.6.

Another item here that's still under review and hard to estimate are those host services that Bart had mentioned. It really does vary by the meeting and the level of support that's provided, and so we have a very high-level estimate here, but in speaking with the group it can be higher than this at certain times and it can be lower. It really just depends on the situation. So, if there's no questions, I'll pass it to Alejandro.

ALEJANDRA REYNOSO

Well, let's pause a little bit to check if there's any comments or questions so far. Yes, Pierre?

PIERRE BONIS

Yeah, thank you very much. I don't know if you could elaborate a little bit on the rationale to go from a situation where we took all the IANA function to the situation where we just take the naming. Because I guess in 2013 it was a part of the IANA function as a whole, and I think the rationale was that the naming without the numbering is not working very well. So, what is the rationale for this change? Thank you.

BART BOSWINKEL

The rationale for the change is, as you can see, this is shared costs. Think about it, ccTLDs pay for that part of the IANA function that is relevant for them. And based on that logic, it was, if you look at the IANA functions, you know there are three buckets, the naming, the numbers, and the parameters of the protocols. And the naming and protocols, of course they are important, and you can't separate them out in the naming function, you can't separate them out, and you can't separate all TLDs or gTLDs and ccTLDs are TLDs. So, in a way, it's fairly artificial to separate this.

At the same time, this is a mechanism to allocate costs to a certain group. And going back to the original thinking behind and the logic of the model is you take that part, which is relevant for the ccTLD community, and therefore it's this part of the IANA naming

functions, and then according to the number of ccTLDs and gTLDs. So, that's the logic for focusing on the IANA naming functions. It's very clear it is a shared cost aspect, so other stakeholders, but they will pay their fair share of it as well, one way or the other. That is the reason.

PIERRE BONIS

Sorry, it means that it's the same thing. We have the same kind of discussion on the gTLD part, where the money that they give to ICANN, they presume that for the IANA function, it only finances the naming function and not the numbering and the protocols?

BART BOSWINKEL

I don't know. I think with the gTLDs, they have a completely different funding model and reasoning of funding, and that's one of the reasons. So, I wouldn't be-- This is the model that has been agreed upon in 2013, and therefore we start on this. And the working group at the time thought this was still a valid way of looking at the cost.

ALEJANDRA REYNOSO

Andreas?

ANDREAS MUSIELAK

Andreas from .de for the record. Pierre, probably as a response for the registrars and registries, you have clear agreements. So, therefore, it's clearly mentioned in the agreement, so I think they are publicly available if you're interested in. Here we're talking

about voluntary contribution and find some points how we can match that to the current contribution in total. But for the registrars, they have a clear contract. I think that's the answer. I don't know. We have to look into that, but they have a contract.

ALEJANDRA REYNOSO

All right. I don't see any more hands here or in Zoom. So, with that, let's move to the next slide, please. So, do you believe the shared cost financial model is still reasonable? So please go again into Menti. We will copy and paste again the link in the chat with the code, just in case you just arrived to the Zoom. And please answer. Yes, Pierre?

PIERRE BONIS

Sorry. We are talking about the last financial model that you showed just before?

ALEJANDRA REYNOSO

Yes, exactly.

PIERRE BONIS

The improved one?

ALEJANDRA REYNOSO

Yes. Well, the model itself, it's described. The amounts are still under review.

BART BOSWINKEL

Looking at this, first of all, it's interesting to note that, from the respondents, nobody thinks it is unreasonable. So, that's a positive thing. So, let's take that home. That's the first one. The second one is—because this has been around and we talked about it in Istanbul, this is the result from the longstanding process in 2013—is I would be, and I think the working group, is very curious to know why some people are not sure/don't know whether this financial shared cost is still reasonable. Is it not reasonable? You don't know if it's not reasonable at all, or it was reasonable but not reasonable anymore.

What do you need to know? Let me rephrase it. What do you need to know to take away your unease or your lack of information as not sure, don't know? Who wants to speak to this? Because that's interesting for the working group. Anybody? Put your hand up if you-- Because I would say around 18 to 20 people said they're not sure/don't know. So, who wants to talk to this? What do you need to know to make you sure whether it's reasonable? Nobody? Go ahead, Roelof.

ROELOF MEIJER

Just to clarify. This is Roelof Meyer from .nl for the record. I'm not in the right group, but since nobody is commenting, I thought I'll ask a question. Did the Secretariat or ICANN or the finance working group over all those years ever received substantiated comments on the existing models? Thank you.

BART BOSWINKEL

This was introduced in Istanbul as well. Nick, go ahead.

NICK WENBAN-SMITH

Yeah, thanks. I did put "not sure/don't know" because I'm not a financial expert and I don't know, in terms of the logic, whether it all still exactly holds true. And one thing in particular, and actually I suppose this is the comment I wanted to make, was that there's 39, I think, respondents to this. There's 316 ccTLDs in the route, so there's a lot of people who are part of the ccTLD community in the route who are not here to respond to that. So, you just need to take that into account when you're assessing it. I appreciate this is not a definitive, this is what we're going to do. This is more an input and feedback session, so I just put it in because I think it's useful just to make that point.

One of the arguments I've heard is that you could do it differently. So, say, for example, the naming function in IANA, which is going to be divided between the ccTLDs and the gTLDs on a straight-line basis, essentially. So, you've got 316 out of about 1,200, 1,300 total in the route zone, right? About 20% of the total cost. And I think there are some ccTLDs which are quite unfairly costed in that way.

So, I keep using this example of .aq, which is Antarctica. I just don't think they make very many changes at all to their entry in the IANA database, if ever have done. It's obviously not a major TLD in terms of volumes of name server records and updates and all the rest of it. And I had understood that the majority of the IANA work in terms

of day-to-day updating of requests was in relation to the gTLD world. The CCs world tends to not make requests very much. Lots of the ccTLDs are very inactive in terms of name server traffic. So, I'm not 100% sure whether the fairest way to do that allocation between the ccTLDs and the gTLDs is a strict straight-line basis, if that helps answer that question.

BART BOSWINKEL

It might be, but you can go both ways. So, what you say is more on a transaction basis, divided on a transaction basis. It could be an alternative.

NICK WENBAN-SMITH

Exactly.

BART BOSWINKEL

But then the underlying question is, is it the full IANA or just the naming function?

NICK WENBAN-SMITH

I think there's a number of different ways to do it. I'm not saying any of them is more right than the other. It's just not obvious to me that the model presented is for sure the right way to do it in terms of the unique solutions. There seem to be other alternatives, and I'm not sure how much effort's gone into exploring those because they could be equally valid ways of apportioning the cost. Any way

in which we do this, it's a model with a lot of assumptions in. So, there's not a unique solution to the exam question.

BART BOSWINKEL

That's why we asked the question.

NICK WENBAN-SMITH

That's why I'm giving the feedback.

BART BOSWINKEL

Anybody else? The reasonableness and the feedback? No? Then we'll continue.

ALEJANDRA REYNOSO

Well, thank you for the feedback. Here is what we have right now in the current guideline. It's the band model. This was developed in 2013. And, again, these are suggested voluntary contributions. And this is the result of that first finance working group. And if we can go to the next one.

Right now, we are looking into more data. And please be clear that this is estimated non-official data. We are now including, as Nick was mentioning, the full list of ccTLDs in the IANA database. In the previous, there were not all of them. And this includes the IDN ccTLDs. These numbers are estimated because they come from public sources but not from the authoritative sources. That's why I'm saying it's not official, but it gives us a little bit of guidance.

If we can go to the next one. What I want to introduce to you now, it's all the information that we've been gathering. And there are no conclusions yet. It's just what's out there. Can we go to the next one, please? So, looking into the recent contribution reports for ccTLDs, you can see how it has fluctuated through the years. Most of the contributions are below 2.5 million. And we're supposed to reach the 3.6 million. You can see that with each fiscal year, there are differences in the number of ccTLDs that are contributing. And the contributions themselves vary due to this.

If we can go to the next one. Now here it's another way of seeing the data we have. We have 309 ccTLDs in the IANA database. It's a distribution per ICANN region. And on the other side, on the other set, you can see 138 ccTLDs have contributed over time, but they are not consistent. As in, we don't have them consistently contributing every year. It's at a point in time they have contributed.

Next slide, please. This is another way of seeing the information we have. We have the ccNSO membership. So, from those who are ccNSO members, 63%, rounding up, to contribute. And from those who are non-ccNSO members, around 20% are contributing. Next slide, please. Here ccTLDs, some ccTLDs, 91 of them, have some sort of agreements with ICANN, whether it's sponsorship, MOUs, exchange of letters, something. That's what the agreements mean. And from those, around 75% have contributed at a point in time.

The next slide, please. This is another way of looking at this, and it's on the nature of the ccTLD manager. Again, this is very high-

level. Looking at the entities, at the managers, we classify them as academic or government regulator or contracted by governments or as private. Of course, we do need to remind that the diversity of the ccTLDs is wider than this. And if we drill down, we will need to have exactly 309 models. But this is just a way to group them a little bit and to check what's the behavior with this.

So, if we could go to the next slide. Now we will, again, solicit your views. And I'll pass it over to Bart.

BART BOSWINKEL

So please check in, again, in Mentimeter. Now we can go to the next question. So, this is, again, a way to connect. So, I'll give you some minutes to check the QR code or go through the-- Yeah, let's go to the next slide and the next question.

So, if you think about voluntary contributions, there are various reasons why you want to make a voluntary contribution. And I think the working group really wants to understand which statement applies in your particular case. And you have multiple choice options. And there will be a slide next one. No, only one? No, we need to change it. You need the priority. But there will be a follow-up question with open responses. So, if your reason is not included. I'll give you a few more seconds. Yeah, go ahead.

ROELOF MEIJER

It seems to me that the last one, my ccTLD value, ccTLD representation in the ICANN Board is not completely correctly phrased. There's no representation in the sense that the ICANN

Board member that we vote on represents the ccTLDs in the ICANN Board.

BART BOSWINKEL

That's true, yeah. But it's to capture, in fact, the line item in the shared cost model is that the ccNSO or the ccTLD pays for 2 out of the 16 Board members. Go ahead, Eberhard.

EBERHARD LISSE

Technically speaking, Roeloff is wrong. It's the ccNSO that is not represented, but they do represent the ccTLDs. The ccNSO selects and sends, but they represent the ccTLDs.

BART BOSWINKEL

Thank you. Let's go to the next slide. I think this one was very excellent. So now this is more multiple choice. So, you had the five or six reasons. Are there any other reasons why you would make and what is currently not captured a financial contribution? So again, this is open. I'll give you a few seconds or a minute to provide your input. I can see already one response. And that's another line.

ALEJANDRA REYNOSO

While you are typing your responses to give you some time because you need to formulate it, I would like to tell you in advance that the working group will launch a survey because this is just a field of the people who are now in the room. But we would like to open it to all ccTLDs and to confirm what we are hearing here to see if it matches

when we consult the whole community. So be expecting that coming to you in a couple of weeks or so.

BART BOSWINKEL So maybe just a few observations. I don't know who's typed it, but I'm always curious of some of these responses. So, who said this is a waste of time? Yeah? No?

EBERHARD LISSE It's not me, but I agree with it.

BART BOSWINKEL So, I'm very curious. So at least you take out some prejudice. Take out some prejudice. Who submitted "this is a waste of time"? Because I really would like to know why you think it's a waste of time. And I think the working group as well. They are more in favor of benign dictatorship, maybe. No? Okay. That's the nice thing.

ALEJANDRA REYNOSO Would you like to share why you agree?

EBERHARD LISSE No.

ALEJANDRA REYNOSO Okay.

BART BOSWINKEL

Okay. What is just as important, not more important, is there is a lot in these responses around supporting the multi-stakeholder model, etc. I think maybe that's a way for the working group as well. It is captured in the generic cost model. It is also that the ccTLD community itself does a lot in support of the multi-stakeholder model. So, that's really the mutual exchange part of it. If we would go back, it's the third generic cost bucket where this is really about financial contribution. So, it's something to consider. I saw another one which was fairly interesting. Can we scroll back up again? And then we'll move on to the video. Pierre, go ahead.

PIERRE BONIS

Pierre Bonis for the record, fr. I just wanted to quickly say that I really want to commend the work of the group and remind those who think that it's a waste of time, that it's a time that is given by the community and by the staff. And there is a lot of work behind that. So, I really don't understand why these things should be written and not defended. And I think we all have to acknowledge that people are not wasting their time but investing their time for the community. And I say that very quietly because I'm not a member of this group. Thank you.

ALEJANDRA REYNOSO

Thank you very much, Pierre.

BART BOSWINKEL

There is one which I find, I think the person who wrote it, can you go back? It's one of the first ones. Yeah, security and stability of the DNS. Who made that comment? Go ahead.

JORDAN CARTER

Jordan Carter, .au. I mean, obviously in terms of the DNS's security and stability, the IANA function is quite important. And so, by helping make sure it has resources, we help contribute to that stability.

BART BOSWINKEL

Thank you. And everything around it as well, yeah. Anybody else? I see and then "the responsibility to pay our fair share". Who made this comment?

CHARLES NOIR

Charles Noir, .ca. That was a comment I made. Similar to what Jordan was saying, clearly this is ICANN and the work that's done, and particularly with IANA and the rest of it, we completely depend on in terms of having to coordinate the system. So, it doesn't happen for free, and we have a responsibility to meet the commitments that we made previously. It's my understanding we're not necessarily meeting them now, and it's CIRA's position that we should be meeting those responsibilities.

BART BOSWINKEL

Thank you. I think we can go to the next question. This is more so for the working group to understand the pattern and also probably,

and I can't speak on behalf of Xavier, but he expressed something like this. One of the major issues is the unpredictability of the financial contributions of the ccTLD. And as you all know, the unpredictability makes it very hard to budget and everything else. So, that's one of the reasons we included this question. So, this is more if you have contributed or not have contributed, how did you contribute? Have you the flow of your contribution? Go ahead.

ALEJANDRA REYNOSO

I see your hand, Eberhard. I just want to say something first. And this is also to let you know that even though we have a band model and it's voluntary, not everyone is in their band, but those who are not in their band are not necessarily below. There are some that are actually in a band that it's above what they are supposed to be, what is suggested to them. So, it's just to let you know that it's a myth, that all that are not in their band are below them. With that, Eberhard, you have your hand up.

EBERHARD LISSE

I don't know what stared means. I have stared at ICANN a lot, but I don't know what this is. What does it mean?

BART BOSWINKEL

It misses a T. Started.

ALEJANDRA REYNOSO

Yes, started. So here, what we are trying to understand, not the reason, but if the financial contribution of a ccTLD has changed

over time, whether it has stayed the same, it follows the guideline, it has increased over time, decreased over time, we don't know, or maybe you started contributing or you stopped. So, that's the purpose.

BART BOSWINKEL

Because the reasons will come now. Can we go to the next slide, please? The next question. So, this is the obvious one. Why has it changed? This is an open question, and this is probably the most important question for the working group.

ALEJANDRA REYNOSO

With this information that we are gathering from you, it's for the working group to be able to suggest any improvements, other ways of helping, or check how we can make this process more fluid, if any. Yes, in the back.

SONGO NORE

Thank you very much for giving me the opportunity to speak. For the record, I am Songo Nore from Papua New Guinea. I'm an ICANN fellow, a newcomer here. But I developed a special interest on ccTLD. I just want to know how much does it cost to register a ccTLD? And another question is, how much does it cost the country to maintain annual fees or quarterly fees over time to maintain their own ccTLD?

BART BOSWINKEL I think you raised some very interesting questions, but they're a bit out of scope of this meeting.

SONGO NORE I know it's out of scope, so I'm just dropping in.

BART BOSWINKEL Eberhard.

EBERHARD LISSE In scope, the answer is nothing.

BART BOSWINKEL Scroll down, please. I think what is an interesting one is, I don't know if the person wants to speak to it, is unhappy with ICANN chasing rare resources within our staff, asking them not to tell us before leaving us, and to adjust your financial contribution. Who is the person who-- Pierre, go ahead.

PIERRE BONIS I think we're unhappy with some behaviour of ICANN towards ethnic, and we decided to reduce our contribution because of that. Which means that it was some time ago, so maybe we will increase it now.

BART BOSWINKEL It's clear it has nothing to do with the model itself or the basic. It's really sending a signal to ICANN, don't do this, so it will have that-- Yeah.

PIERRE BONIS We were very strictly aligned with the guidelines before that. So, we are very supporting the guidelines, but it was the only way we found to, with money, show that we were very unhappy.

BART BOSWINKEL Maybe as a question, you used it as a signal. Did you have any response that would make you revisit that decision? Because it's--

PIERRE BONIS No one has been chased since, but that's all I can say.

BART BOSWINKEL Thanks. Anybody else wants to speak?

ROELOF MEIJER I'm the one who wrote-- Oh, it's no longer there. It's somewhere up. The one on the right middle now. We increased to follow the guidelines, so we did that after we launched the new model in 2013. At that time, I said, okay, I will increase to that new level, but if I'm one of the few who does so, then I will decrease again.

So, that happened, in fact, because we were one of a small group who increased to the level of the new model. And in addition, we

decreased because, well, a bit like what Pierre just said, we had a discussion on this from the center perspective, but it was about the interference of ICANN with our local governments without telling us, and the reaction we got from the then CEO when we brought that discussion.

BART BOSWINKEL

Again, a question for you in that case is, did this as a pressure made-- It's a signal. I appreciate this. But did it work as you envisioned?

ROELOF MEIJER

That's hard to say. We have a new CEO. I don't know if that's an outcome, but probably not. But before that time, we got no tangible positive reaction. In fact, we got a pushback and said, no, no, we will just continue to do that and we will not inform you and will not consult you if we want to interact with your government. But I agree, if that's your point, but it's not the best way to put a point across. But my theoretical defense of this is that I don't want to fund part of those activities.

BART BOSWINKEL

That is, in that sense, it could be made more visible. Maybe that's the way to do it, but that should be. Also, what I like to know, the inconsistent invoicing. Who has-- Yeah, Sean, go ahead.

SEAN COPELAND

Obviously, I've had registry issues over the last couple of years in terms of my billing process and the people that were dealing with

that. However, I have updated, I think, all of my contact information, but we never get the invoices over the last three years.

BART BOSWINKEL

Thank you. No, the reason followed, that's why I think in 2018 there were a lot of complaints about the invoicing process and it was addressed. Probably there are still some—I almost hate the word—glitches. But that's probably to look into. That one is a waste. So, thanks. Yeah, go ahead.

ROELOF MEIJER

On the other hand, I think we can complement ICANN with this, because before we had to send out an email to get an invoice, and I remember we had to do that sometimes several times. I always called them my \$185,000 email. But over the last years, and I think that's also because of your interventions, Bart, we first get an email if it's okay that ICANN sends us an email or a bill with this amount on it, or do we want another amount. And then if we reply, we get the invoice exactly the way we want it. So, that process has definitely improved.

BART BOSWINKEL

So, that's no more an issue. It was an issue at the time. Anybody else wants to talk to why they changed their contribution or why they don't contribute? Go ahead, Nigel.

NIGEL ROBERTS

Yeah. Thanks, Bart. It's a couple of years ago now. It may still be relevant. We started to pay. And we started to pay because we'd gained some trust in ICANN after a very, very, as you remember, you long-term memory, a very shaky start. So, for many years, we were not members of the ccNSO. And for many years, we didn't make any contribution.

The invoicing side of things, I hear issues of, oh, we didn't get an invoice when we asked and so on. With us, it's the opposite way around. We want not to be seen to get an invoice. We will make a voluntary contribution. If it's a voluntary contribution, it's a contribution from us to a nonprofit organization, what's known as Public Benefit Corporation in California. And you don't send us an invoice making it serve like services. If you want to send us an email saying do you want to make your annual contribution, that's great. But making it look like an invoice makes it look like we are in some kind of agreement, which goes into the whole legal thing again.

Over the years, that's not been the major issue. The major issue was we didn't trust ICANN. We gained trust in ICANN, so we started to pay. Now, if ICANN does anything that might cause us to lose trust, we, like France and the Netherlands, will always look in the future. But at the moment, we are paying what we paid when we started to pay. So, we haven't changed that.

BART BOSWINKEL

Go ahead.

UNKNOWN SPEAKER

Well, just a quick comment. We have signed accountability framework, and I actually would echo the statement that probably shouldn't be invoice for the payment we were paying. We just wasn't paying for the last few years because of Ukrainian government policy of prohibiting transfers to foreign entities because of the fiscal controls. But we are planning to pull up on that once we have this restriction lifted. So meanwhile, I'm really appreciative to all of the effort ICANN is making with regards to its mission, and I'm glad to be here in ccNSO and be able to speak to you. Thank you.

BART BOSWINKEL

That's probably something to take into account more in the procedural point. Yeah, we have some CCs who are restricted by all legal and financial restrictions in-country. Yeah, let's go to the next slide, please. Oh, yeah.

So now we're going back to the banded model. We had some discussion about it. In the background, you see the banded model as it currently stands, which was developed and which has been in use since 2006-something, one way or the other. So, the question is, do you think is it still a fair model to distribute the financial contributions? So, we talk about ranges of domain names under management and related financial contributions, and these are the old numbers, but more as a mechanism. So please go ahead.

ALEJANDRA REYNOSO

Jordan?

JORDAN CARTER

Jordan Carter, .au. I've just got a question which occurred to me when I was reading the numbers, and it might be lost in the mists of time. But the step between C and D, D and C, is a 300% increase, so it's like a bigger jump than most of the others. Obviously, the last one, the 500 to 10,000, was the biggest percent. Is there a reason why it was a big jump like that?

BART BOSWINKEL

No, if you look at the guideline itself, this is the current one, and if I recall, what you see is there is a way of stepping in. You grow into your next banded. That was the idea, but you need to set the boundary somewhere.

Okay. We go to the next slide, and thanks for responding. So again, whether you're not sure or have alternatives in your mind, what would you change about the contribution model? So please type in. Let me just see if others are typing. The person who said "nothing", I don't think the model is the problem. Who submitted this? Yeah, Roelof, go ahead.

ROELOF MEIJER

Yeah, because I think the model is not the problem, because back in 2013, we found that the model was fair and everybody committed, and not everybody lived up to that commitment. You haven't heard any feedback, structured feedback on the model itself, so that seems not to be the problem.

So, there's also a recommendation for the finance working group. I would be very, very careful to start work on new models, because you risk getting commitment on a new model or an improved model, and then I predict that we will find out that we, in 10 years' time, we will have the same talk, because we didn't live up to our commitments.

BART BOSWINKEL

That's a fundamental issue.

ALEJANDRA REYNOSO

And while you are typing, I wanted to say also that we've heard different feedback from different CCs, and we all know diversity in our community. And I believe that the ICANN finance team has the flexibility to accommodate different approaches, as in one size does not fit all, and we know this for our community. So, Shani, I don't know if you could speak to that.

SHANI QUIDWAI

Yes, thank you. Just to echo what Alejandra said, we don't want the invoicing aspect to be the reason people aren't contributing, and if there's things we can do differently to help accommodate situations, please do reach out, and we're flexible on those.

BART BOSWINKEL

Thanks. Next slide, please. So, next steps. Go ahead, Alejandra.

ALEJANDRA REYNOSO

Thank you. So, thank you so much for all the feedback you have provided today. It's super valuable. Now we will take that over, and as I told you before, we will launch a survey so we can reach to everyone, not just the people who happened to be today in the session. We will try to find alternatives and suggestions to improve if necessary, and we will come back to you with something in Prague.

And with that, if we could go to the next slide. Just a kind reminder, to rate this session. This is super important for the meetings program committee, and also for the finance working group in particular, as in to check whether this was the right way to present the information, to get their feedback, and to start the conversation with you. We will take it further, as I said, by email, so we will develop the survey and circulate it over. Bart, do you want to say something else?

BART BOSWINKEL

Yes, I have two more announcements. Those of you who do not have tickets for tonight's cocktail, go to the back. I see people smiling, so please do. And for the newcomers, tomorrow morning at 9:00 a.m., a couple of people want to get to know you a little bit more closer and assist you in getting more involved in decision as well. And the meeting is in room 301 for the newcomers, starting at 9:00 a.m. And that were the two announcements from my end, so thank you. Go ahead.

ALEJANDRA REYNOSO

And with that, we close this session for today. Thank you so much. We go to a break, and please come back to the Policy Gap Consultation at 4:30 in this room. Thank you so much.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]