EN

LONDON – ccNSO Members Meeting Day 2
Wednesday, June 25, 2014 – 09:00 to 15:30
ICANN – London, England

BYRON HOLLAND:	There's Oscar. This is the first test of the panel to see if they can actually sit in the order of their pictures and self-organize.
	Okay, good morning, officially, to Wednesday, day two of the ccNSO meeting. Our first panel of the day certainly promises to be a very interesting one, no doubt lively. For registries and registrars, can we standardize? Can one size fit all? I'm sure there are no strongly held opinions on that whatsoever.
	With that, I will hand it over to Crystal Peterson, who will be moderating this panel. Thank you.
CRYSTAL PETERSON:	Thank you, Byron. Good morning, everyone. It's very nice to see you on this lovely Wednesday morning. My name is Crystal Peterson, as Byron mentioned. I'm the Director of Global Sales and Channel Marketing for the .co registry.
	I would like the rest of my panel members to introduce themselves, if they will, right before we get started here.
OSCAR ROBLES-GARAY:	Hi, good morning. I'm Oscar Robles, General Director of .mx, ccTLD for Mexico.

GIOVANNI SEPPIA: Good morning. It's Giovanni Seppia, External Relations Manager of .eu.

HENRY CHAN: Hi, good morning. Henry Chan from .hk, Business Development Manager for the ccTLD for Hong Kong.

MICHELE NEYLON: Michele Neylon, Founder and CEO of Blacknight, a dirty, filthy registrar based in Ireland. I'm also the Chair of the Registrar Stakeholder Group within the ICANN GNSO and Chair of the .eu Registrar Advisory Board.

PETER LARSEN: My name is Peter Larsen. I'm also a registrar, a dirty registrar.

MICHELE NEYLON: Dirty, filthy registrar. Do it properly.

PETER LARSEN: Oh, sorry. Sorry, sorry, sorry. I'm also on Advisory Board for .eu. I'm Chair of the Danish Registrar Union and Board member of the Swedish and the Norwegian, by the way. I'm based in Copenhagen, Denmark.

TOBIAS SATTLER: Good morning. My name is Tobias Sattler. I'm from United Domains as a Chief Information Officer. I'm not part of any other things like other registrars – just trying to be nice.

CRYSTAL PETERSON: Thank you, gentlemen.

MICHELE NEYLON: Are you still drunk from last night?

CRYSTAL PETERSON: We are here today to talk a little bit about how can we standardize amongst registries and registrars, taking into account the fact that, as ccTLDs, we may have local policies that need to be in play from our local governments in order to run.

We want to set some of those policies aside and look at some of the potential ways – through marketing programs, through technical implementations, through others that may come up today – [as] how can we work together in a more unified fashion in order to be able to grow the Internet, proliferate our domains through our local markets and/or global markets, as well as help registrars help us in working all together.

I'd love to pose a question to our registrar guests first of what are some of the things that you would love to see from the ccTLD community, from a potential technical standpoint, to help standardize – I see all

EN

kinds of smiles here – from a technical standpoint of how can we help you work with ccTLDs better? Go.

MICHELE NEYLON: I'll go first, because the two of them are still half asleep. At the moment, one of the main challenges from the registrar perspective is that practically every single ccTLD has its own technical implementation.

Now, variety, I know, is the spice of life. But when it comes to us being able to integrate with you and offer your extensions to our clients around the world, you're not making it easy.

Sure, there has been a move more towards EPP over the last few years, but it's far from being uniform. I mean, I'm sure Peter could speak to some of the more technical details, but I feel, at times, that my technical team have to sacrifice small animals in order to integrate with some ccTLDs – and gTLDs, by the way. The gs are using EPP, but they keep on adding weirdness to it.

Just if everybody were just to keep it simpler, life would be so much nicer.

CRYSTAL PETERSON: You're saying basically it's being able to standardize around one type of platform system, like [inaudible].

MICHELE NEYLON:	Not so much platform. It's more to do with the standards themselves. In the gTLD space, everybody's using EPP. The problem is that some people have weird extensions.
	In the ccTLD space, you've got EPP, EPP's bastard son, EPP's bastard cousin. You've got e-mail-based systems. You've got systems based around Curl. You've got stuff using various APIs. You've got things which are web-based systems with no APIs.
	You've got registries that understand the concept of a registrar. You've got registries who don't understand what the hell a registrar is. You've got ones who think they understand what the registrar is but don't really understand what a registrar is, so they go, "You're a registrar." "Well, no, actually, you're not." "Yes, you are." "No, you're not." Oh God, help.
	It's this kind of mish-mash of in some cases crazy, in other cases, I know it's legacy. I mean, as a guest in the ccNSO, I'm trying to be polite about it.
CRYSTAL PETERSON:	Yes, it's early in the morning. We're polite for the first 30 minutes.
MICHELE NEYLON:	Hey, look, I've been up since like 6:45 this morning, so I'm wide awake.
	I mean both technically and legally, it's kind of messy, which doesn't help.

PETER LARSEN: All right, so, I don't know where to start. It seems to be – Michele said that the extensions are killing us. I wish it was only the extensions of the EPP, because what I see is a lot of ccTLDs that are using the whole – own design system and been doing that for a long, long time and trying to perhaps make an EPP server themself or buy software and integrate into their old system. It's simply not working for anyone.

There is a technical standard. There is a EPP – use it. We can still make it work around different kind of political models; whatever you do behind the screens is we don't care.

If you want to help the Internet Society in your local country or local area, that's fine. I don't know why we need to have a [SOAP] interface to make that justifiable.

Of course, there is other issues around the gTLD and the gTLD Program. But remember, there is a lot of gTLDs coming out. We only have 24 hours a day available for the programmers. They can only use that much time on old legacy system, compared to New gTLD Program.

I would really suggest that you think about technical implementations, make them straightforward.

TOBIAS SATTLER: Well, at United Domains, we have implemented more than 100 registries by now, [except] of the EPP thing. The thing is we need a good documentation to actually work with it and a stable version of your

system, because if it's going to change every two weeks or something like that, then it's nearly impossible to set up things right.

Yes, like Michele and Peter already said about EPP, we have seen so many different versions and types of how some registry can implement or set things up. In the end, we actually managed every time to set things up for all our customers.

But it would save you time and money, as well as us, and we can actually start selling the domain, from my perspective.

MICHELE NEYLON: The other thing as well, it's a little bit frustrating a lot of time, from a registrar perspective, that we are businesses. We want to sell domain names. That's basically what we want to do – not just domain names – we want to sell services, we want to sell hosting, digital certificates, value-added services, etc., etc., etc.

We approach things from a very commercial perspective. That's not a bad thing. At least, it isn't in our view. I like shiny objects, [inaudible] are you going to do?

At times, we find it quite frustrating dealing with ccTLD operators, because for a lot of you – not all of you, admittedly. Looking across, I look at Oscar, who's definitely on the more business-y side I think – at least, he wears nice suits.

For a lot of you, you don't approach [man] running your country code as a business. You approach it as something else. I'm not too sure exactly

what, but it's not being run with that kind of commercial view. It's being run as something else.

I do appreciate and I do understand that those of you who've dealt with me in the past know I am sensitive to it. But the fact that you're doing something maybe with a public interest idea, public good, maybe you're using it for a whole [road] of other different things. Maybe it's not your full-time job.

But just bear in mind, from our perspective, if you had more money, if you had more funds, if you sold more domain names, then you'd have more money to put into all those things that you'd like to do. But if you make it difficult for us, then you're self-limiting.

PETER LARSEN: Michele mentioned we sell other services, yes. Actually, for a lot of the ones that sell other services, the domain part itself is a very, very tiny, tiny part, taking up huge amount of time. I think you've got to make that point, so I just wanted to mention it.

MICHELE NEYLON: Thanks, Peter.

CRYSTAL PETERSON: Thanks, you guys. Being able to segue from that into the fact that as registries looking to grow our domain space – maybe not all strictly commercially, as you mentioned, some in the public good, some for a various host of reasons – I'd like to turn it over to the registries that we

EN

have and through integration with the differing registrar partners we have.

We have reseller-type partners who have a whole host of resellers – but when you're talking to that partner, they don't have direct retail services – to talking to other registrars that have retail services. Actually, we have both represented here at the table – resellers that have mainly retail focus and registrars that have reseller and retail focus.

What are some of the things, through working with the differing registrars and your ccTLD that you have found could be a better type of relationship? It's a really open question.

OSCAR ROBLES-GARAY: When we decided to make the EPP implementation and work with the registrars, we decided to make the basic implementation with no EPP extensions – at least, not compulsory. But that took us like three years, because we have to move not only systems but also procedures and policies.

That takes a long time, because we used to have our own implementation, like Michele said, at the beginning. We have a very specific business model, so we have to move that in generic kind of a business.

The challenges that we are facing is that we have two different sets of registrars: the local ones – I mean the domestic registrars – and the global.

Those are two different challenges: first, how we make it into the shelf space of the big registrars. The other one is how we developed the domestic registrars, because those are two different sets of registrars, at least in Mexico. What we have found that what may work at the global level, at the global registrars, not necessarily works at the domestic level.

Those are very specific challenges. I could talk a little bit more about that, but I will let Giovanni and Tobias talk about it. [inaudible]

GIOVANNI SEPPIA: Thank you, Oscar. Yes. As many of you know and as all our registrar know, we are quite a special registry in the sense that we have, let's say, two quite strong regulations at the basis of our work. Those are European Union regulations.

What we have been trying to do in the past years is to listen to our registrars and try to please them as much as possible. Recently, I'm very delighted to have two of my registrar advisory board members here in the panel with me, so they can check what they say.

But recently, we had a discussion with them on some specific areas, where it might be valuable to investigate if there could be a standardization. The main area we recently discuss is the domain name statuses, because many of us, many registries at some point, even those who have implemented EPP, sometimes they customize the different domain name statuses. That's because, of course, we all have different needs.

What we have done after having discussed this matter with the advisory board is to launch a survey at registry level in the [CENTR] community.

The very first report of the survey shows that basically, out of the 24 respondents to the survey, 61% of the registries have implemented the statuses of the domain names in accordance to the RFC 5731. But some say that clearly they have customized those statuses, depending on their needs.

What surprised us, as a response from those who have participated in the survey, is to read that few of the registries who responded to the survey stated that they had received similar requests from their registrar community.

This was quite surprising to us because some members of our registrar advisory board who are quite vocal about the need to standardize domain name statuses.

This is something that we will farther discuss in our advisory board and also in the [inaudible] community to see if there could be – you don't remember? Okay. We'll make sure the next advisory board there are more vitamins in the room.

MICHELE NEYLON: Well, thanks, Giovanni.

GIOVANNI SEPPIA: I'm not finished.

MICHELE NEYLON: It's always good that he worries about my vitamins.

GIOVANNI SEPPIA: But this is something that we'll continue to work on. Again, I think each ccTLD serves a community, mainly the local community. At some point might be – it's always difficult to balance what are the needs of the registry, what are the expectations of the registrars. I believe that we are all doing our best to make sure that there's good compromise.

Of course, at some point, it's quite hard for anybody in this circle to be always 100% happy, but I do believe there's always an effort at the registry level to make sure that we address the concerns that – and we also do understand that at the other end, there's a business partner.

There is somebody who, in our own interest, also, promotes the dot. Therefore, we are doing our best to make sure we are in the same business. We are embracing the same business concept as our registrars. Thank you.

HENRY CHAN: For us in Hong Kong, .hk, we have had this registrar program for more than close to three years. So far, I think that – as far as I can tell – our registrar quite – those who sign up to support .hk are quite happy. But as well with EPP, and they are happy to implement slight difference in our EPP system with the gTLD standard.

Of course, the [inaudible] registrar, who are start discussion with us for implementing the EPP, will say that, "Oh, why did you use a .com or .net EPP standard?" But a lot of those differences has to do with a registration policy, which we're happy to [inaudible] see they're changing those.

But as the ccTLD, we have to appreciate that changing the registration policy takes a long process. Local community, we have to do a lot of consultation with the government and then Internet users in our community. There's no quick solution to that, but we will try it.

What interests us is how we can approach a standard in our new technical implementation, how we can help to make the job of our registrar easier. We will have to say that for .hk, we are not-for-profit.

But then, we'd still have to make reasonable profit to support, like paying my salary and then paying for the infrastructure. We do run that as a business. As Giovanni has said, we [consider] registrar to be our business partner.

I think this is a very good location for us to start the dialogue on how we can approach a – I don't know if I should use the word "standard" – but a easier framework or guidelines for us to work together. I think this is a good start.

CRYSTAL PETERSON: Excellent, excellent. I'd like to touch on an – I'm not sure how this one is going to go, so it's going to be exciting. We have registries here, some who have their own reseller and/or registrar services that sell their

products, along with also going down through the traditional method of through the registrar channel.

From both the registry and our registrar guests' perspective, some of the touch points that have worked well with that: one, I can see when a registry is selling their own products, they can sell that exactly the way they think it should be sold. But is that getting to the broadest community that you want it to at the same time?

From the registrar perspective, having a registry that you know who also offers their own product, how do you connect in with that and then make sure that you are also gathering customers? Because at one point, you might be stealing customers from each other.

Where does that customer go and where is that customer's best fit? How do you connect through that? Because I know Oscar, you have both, right? You are solely – .co is solely through the registrar channel, except for some small events, [loss-] leading efforts that we then transfer back off to a [registrar].

MICHELE NEYLON: That's not entirely true, Crystal. You've also got [POP.co].

CRYSTAL PETERSON: As Neustar, no we don't anymore.

MICHELE NEYLON: Okay. Well, you did.

CRYSTAL PETERSON: It was something that was being explored but is a potential method and something that we were proud of developing to look into that specific – and these specific issues.

OSCAR ROBLES-GARAY: Yes, that's true. As I was mentioning, to sell our product or services through the global registries is very easy. You just have to have a very good service or product and that's it. But of course, that doesn't depend on the registrar but on your efforts as a registry.

But then, at the next level, at the domestic level, you have to develop your own registrars. But regardless of what you do, we have found that everything could fail, or they won't necessarily will understand the industry market or the domain names industry.

What we have come up with is to have a registrar, but that wasn't created by design – I mean we evolved from a monolithic approach to have a registry and a registrar.

That has turn out to be a very good channel of understanding the market, not only to sell our services but also to understand the market, the needs of our market and doesn't rely on the reseller channel.

That's been very interesting, because we can have our registrar channel while we have our own registrar with no competing prices – only competing on service quality, not in prices.

HENRY CHAN: For us in .hk, we maintain a registrar function in-house. That is the legacy reason. Because we were quite new, it is our model. We are asked to keep that registrar as a backup.

I think, when we start, more than 50% of the names under our own registrar account where some of those moved from our reseller to registrar. It's more than 50. We are obliged to keep that function in-house as a support.

We deliberately set the retail price of our own registrar higher than most of our registrar. But some of them, still, manage to sell more than we do. We're happy about that. I think for us, the registrar, we position our registrar as this.

There's some new initiative and services that we want to provide to the Hong Kong Internet community. That may not necessarily be profitable or make commercial sense [inaudible] registrar. We want to use that as a vehicle to promote those. For example, DNSSEC, we have not implement that yet but we will plan to use that as a vehicle.

I think the question for us is if our registrar happy to implement all this new initiative and new services as a partner, then I think we're happy to keep our own registrar in a low profile. We're happy with that. I think we would need the support from our registrar on all this new initiative.

CRYSTAL PETERSON: Got it. I'm going to just take it back for just a moment. That brought up a couple of goods points, Henry. Thank you.

I just wanted to pull back to the .co perspective. For .co, we actually do own a registrar beyond the reseller services that we were looking into and exploring, which is a great way to, as Oscar mentioned, be able to own the customer data and be able to do a lot of research in how customers buy.

But at our local level, we have our restricted domains. We are the registrar partner and the sponsoring registrar for all of the restricted domains that go out to the Colombian community. That was put in place by our ministry. That is something that we have and we've put policies around.

Both from looking at being the registrar of record for all of our restricted domains, all the domains that go out to the government, but also being able to really realize that full circle.

Looking at being able to implement certain securities, first, such as Henry mentioned, such as DNSSEC, to be able to look and test that before rolling that out across the registrar channel, as well as to be able to do some research and really be able to own that customer data from end-to-end – each piece has certain pieces of the customer data, but being able to see that end-to-end has, I believe, really helped us in being able to then offer the best types of products and the best marketing that we can to the full channel.

I think it's interesting that both Oscar and Henry, you mentioned that you didn't want to compete on price. There was certain things that you were looking for, but it wasn't necessarily price and stealing – not that

it's stealing – but stealing a customer; it's more what can we do to be able to offer that.

Now, from another perspective that we were looking at, that Michele brought up from the [POP] perspective. We were looking at that of how can we offer the best service and a different type of service that potentially other partners weren't offering and being able to seed that into the marketplace.

Was that drawing customers or did they not care? We were competing a bit on price in that, because it was a different product. That was exciting.

I'd like to turn it over to our registrars to see some of their thoughts on what they have there. Michele? No?

MICHELE NEYLON: Oh, I could. It just depends on how much blood we want to leave in the room after this one.

Okay. I've always had very mixed feelings about registries playing the role of registrar. Now, in the gTLD world, we're now seeing more and more new TLD operators that are vertically integrated. There's some very valid reasons why vertical integration can make sense. I'm not totally opposed to it.

What causes issues is when the vertically integrated entity or the registrar arm of the registry gives itself an unfair advantage. For example, if you have a nice set of policies that you apply to everybody

except to yourself, well, then, as far as I'm concerned, that's just plain wrong. That's the kind of thing that causes headaches.

Also, as well, generally speaking, most registries that try to act as registrars kind of suck at it, anyway. I don't worry too much about it.

The kind of thing where the registry offers registrar services in order to be able to "innovate" and "offer new and shiny services" that, let's face it, nobody actually wants, is fine. But a lot of the time, that doesn't really work too well.

If you're looking at it in terms of not competing on price but then that's – then, fine. I don't have an issue with it. But if you're going to start competing against your own partners, then you're becoming more and more like Microsoft. If you want to become a Microsoft, well, okay, but you're probably going to end up playing a little by yourself.

The concept in some cases is that the registry can act as the registrar of last resort – or put another way, it's the back-up registrar, the registrar that will pick up the pieces in the case of, say, registrar failure.

Because, unfortunately, in the ccTLD space, you don't have a lot in place, a lot of the time, to handle registrar failure. You don't have proper escrow set up in many cases. You don't have any of those kind of things.

Now, sure, your thick registries, most of the time – of course, what "thick" means is open to interpretation. We could be talking about WHOIS, we could be talking about something else, but that depends how nasty I want to be. Okay, sorry, Crystal. I'll behave.

There's a mixed bag. But I think the one thing that I would feel quite strongly about it is it should be a level playing field, in terms of policies. You can't have it that if the registry does it, it's to one set of rules, and when the rest of us do it, it's to a different set of rules.

HENRY CHAN: In .hk, we are very conscious of that problem. We try very hard to make sure that our registrar are playing in a level field with our so-called external registrar.

I'm the business development person in our registry, and so I'm the first person to present all these new services or ideas to our registrars. The very first question they will ask would be, "Are you going to offer that as a registrar? How are you going to offer?"

I think we try very hard to communicate with them. Before we launch all these new services, no matter at the registry or the registrar level, we try very hard to get them together and talk to them about all this products, all this policies and how our registrar is going to play the same game. I think that would be very important. We are very conscious of that.

I would suggest that if any other of our fellow ccTLD using registrar and then they have their own registrar and trying to do all this, they will have to have a very good communication plan before they do all this new initiative.

CRYSTAL PETERSON: I think that's a good point. I think, as Henry mentioned, as registries, if you do go down that path, making sure you have someone on your team that is the champion for your whole registrar base within your company so any new implementations from the registrar side can have that question: is this A. offered to all of our other partners? Is this B. something that is completely competing and cutting them out or giving ourselves an unfair advantage, making sure that it all plays nice.

Yes?

MICHELE NEYLON: Just one other thing as well is registries should be registries. You shouldn't try to start offering all sorts of crazy extra services that other companies offer – this kind of thing where registries decide, "Oh, we'll start offering digital identification or certificate-authority type services."

It's like, really? You really want to go down that route? Stick to running what your registry. Don't go throwing on extra stuff just because you think it's a "good idea." It probably isn't.

There's some very, very big registries. I mean, if I look around the room, I see Roelof down there. SIDN, they're pretty big. I see DNIC. I assume Nominet is in here somewhere. Those are big registries. They can do things that some of the smaller registries simply can't.

Some of the smaller registries, the numbers they're dealing with, the volumes they're dealing with are minuscule by comparison. They probably got other challenges that they need to deal with.

Just the thing that I've seen happen so often in the past is that smaller registries feel obliged to spend time, energy, and effort rolling out things like DNSSEC and other things that are expensive to implement – and expensive both in terms of computing time, expensive in terms of infrastructure, expensive in terms of development time – when they probably would be better off investing their resources elsewhere.

I'm kind of wary of that, when you're looking at some of these things. From our side, on the registrar side, all of these things, it's like, "Yes, crap, there's no real demand for it."

What there is demand for a lot of the time is a quick and easy ability to register a damn domain name, get a website, e-mail, and other things up and running quickly and easily, without having to hand over a blood sample and a sliver of my kidney.

PETER LARSEN: Well, this is kind of a luxury issue for me, since where I'm operating from, I'm not considered [a] registrar. I do not have the privileges of being a registrar for my own country code, simply because it's differently based in policy.

I can relate to the other Nordic countries, where recently have been changing from other models to a registry/registrar model. I see this backup registrar things for security. I can live with that. I'm very liberal on that, because I simply do not have that at home. If I could choose to have a registry as acting as a registrar, as a backup registrar, I'll definitely choose that.

But then again, it should not be competing in any price with the registrars, because that will only make the markets a bit strange and price regulated.

And, well, if there is anything that you want to make as a registry, start making full-featured test systems. That will be nice. That will simply be wonderful.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: Nothing to add.

MICHELE NEYLON: He's very happy just to sit there and just agree with us. And be honest, Crystal, we didn't coordinate this, okay? For the record, we didn't have a pre-meeting to coordinate what the registrars were going to say. We've been saying the same things for years. This is not news.

CRYSTAL PETERSON: Fair point, fair point. Yes?

GIOVANNI SEPPIA: Okay. First of all, I like to point you to the lights in the corner of the room, because anytime that Michele says a bad word, they turn into almost red – pink or red. I think they are some sort of emotional lights. Those close to [inaudible]. They are changing and I just noticed that anytime he says something really nasty, they were completely red. I think they are emotional lights. They help to –

MICHELE NEYLON: No. Giovanni –

GIOVANNI SEPPIA: Thank you, Michele. It's my turn, thank you.

MICHELE NEYLON: No, Giovanni, nasty? Hold on, there. Critical.

GIOVANNI SEPPIA: Critical.

MICHELE NEYLON: Critical.

GIOVANNI SEPPIA: Constructively critical.

MICHELE NEYLON: Not always constructive.

GIOVANNI SEPPIA: Okay. That [inaudible], thank you.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: Open-minded?

GIOVANNI SEPPIA: Open-minded, okay.

I'd like to go back a bit on the – I'd like to go back to the theme of this panel, which is if – because I see that there's a – it shifted to a competition between the registries and registrar.

I believe that there's no competition, let's say. We are the same. Yes, we are just work in the same direction, to promote the top-level domains and making sure that we are all happy and pleased with the results of possibly growing in the domain name market.

As Michele said, registries should be registries. Crystal, I don't want to take over your role, but I just want to ask my beloved registrars three bullet points, really, with three things that you believe that we all – because we really ought to listen and have this open dialogue with you. We should work together in the registry community so that registrars are happier.

CRYSTAL PETERSON: Thank you, Giovanni. That was my next question.

GIOVANNI SEPPIA: Okay, good.

CRYSTAL PETERSON: Well, actually it wasn't [inaudible], but that's okay.

GIOVANNI SEPPIA: I told you I was going to overtake.

MICHELE NEYLON: What was the question?

CRYSTAL PETERSON: Oh, no, no, no, it's okay. Because you are in front of a room full of registries that are all ears, what are, as Giovanni put it, what are three things that, as registrars, you would like to see from the registry community? Just three things that you believe that would help you to help your customers.

GIOVANNI SEPPIA: Watch the lights. They're already red.

MICHELE NEYLON: I am definitely going to be saying plenty of nasty things to you after this session.

I think simple technical integration options, that would be good – Ideally, EPP. EPP is what we're used to. EPP is something that means that we can get you up and running quickly and easily.

I know that for some registries, that's a big transition, but there are plenty of solutions out there. There's open-source, there's companies

happy to offer you services. Some of them will stand up now and go, "Quick, we'll sell this to you." There's option's there.

In terms of policies, simple, clear policies. If you have a restriction of some kind, please make it clear that you do, rather than burying it 25 pages deep in a footnote. I've had this kind of thing where you spend hours trying to decipher policy documents. I think, "Oh, that policy's straightforward," but it's just not clear at all.

Simple FAQs on the documentation, both technical and policy, payment options, look at terms of being flexible – ultimately, if you want us to sell your domain names, we're more than happy to tell you the kind of things that will help us with that, but please, don't make it painful.

There's some registries here in the room who we work with as a company that are fantastic to deal with. There are others that, if I had the option, I would stop offering their extensions in the morning. I would stop. I would turn it off and I would not turn it back on.

PETER LARSEN: Three points?

CRYSTAL PETERSON: If you want one or two, that's okay, too.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: [off mic]

CRYSTAL PETERSON: Let's stop at three.

PETER LARSEN: My first point will be asking for more.

Well, again, feel like I'm repeating Michele and feel like I'm repeating what I've been saying the last few years – many years. But yes, easy integration is definitely a key point and a sell point for us. Easy integration can be EPP. Can also be other measures, but we do prefer EPP in a standardized way.

Documentation is always nice. If you happen to have very nice local language that I do not speak, please provide it in English, as well. That will be very nice. Keep it up to date, always.

Talk to your registrars. Interact with them, ask them, invite them for a meeting, visit them. Try to understand their business models. That will be, I think, helpful for you to better understand what's going on.

HENRY CHAN: No, I just wanted to add something to points that Michele and Peter already raised. An easy accreditation process would help a lot, because sometimes it feels like we are doing an accreditation for months because we have to fill plenty of paper, provide insurance paper and stuff like that. It takes forever.

At some point, well, [either] going to lose interest and say, "Okay, if they really don't want to have us as a registrar, okay. We will look at that in some future or even none."

MICHELE NEYLON: To add to that, I fully agree. Sometimes getting on board with a registry, it's like – I don't know. I could think of other ways of spending my day.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: A journey.

MICHELE NEYLON: A journey, yes. It's not a pleasant one. Some registries make it really, really, really hard. I don't know why. It's as if you don't want any registrars. I mean, if that's the case, fine. Don't have any, then. But stop pretending that you want registrars when you make it so damn difficult.

PETER LARSEN: Actually, it's trying to continue. If you have special – you want to accreditate your registrar in a special way, for a local registrar, I feel that will be okay if it is not an international working registrar.

If the registrar is ICANN-accredited, they kind of know how an EPP system works. They have interacted with other registries. They know law enforcement. Don't test us in every kind of question in local law in your country. That will be nice.

CRYSTAL PETERSON: Excellent. Thank you, gentlemen. That was excellent.

EN

What I've gleaned from some of our talk here and, Giovanni, as you mentioned, we delved down into a tangent which I still felt was important. From the subject of standardization, there are a lot of differing things that we do.

To be able to acknowledge and still, then, look to where can we standardize while still working with our different models, the different ways that we do business, to still come back to that point of standardizing as we work with our registrar partners.

Oscar had a very good point in differentiating between sometimes working with our local partners that may or may not understand the full ecosystem, to also working with global partners.

I think a lot of what we were talking about today was mainly standardizing around those global partners and how we can all work together to get to the end goal in our end missions, which is to get domain names out there – I believe, is to get domain names out there, because if we're working with our registrar partners, that is a goal that we are stating that we want by putting our products with those partners.

Some of the outcomes that I think we've heard today are simple technical implementations, EPP or the like; the fact that we have clear policies.

We all acknowledge the fact that as ccTLDs, we may have local policies that do need to be implemented, but helping to make those clear to all of our partners. If we do have a local language, also helping to provide that in English to all of our global partners.

Then, one of my favorite ones is follow up and follow through. Get to know the channel. There are so many different types of businesses.

As I mentioned earlier, from registrars that have only resellers, registrars that have retail businesses, registrars that have both, they all work differently but they all work well. Getting to know those different types of businesses and how we can all learn to work with them a little bit better.

Then, from the accreditation process, which we touched on lightly – I didn't want to get too much into that because I know that goes into some of the local policies and things of that nature – but you have, if it's not short, at least a clear process.

Whether it's written down so that as you're sending your registrars their first set of documentation, to be able to have a process that's defined so that they know what's coming versus being surprised by every piece of new document that comes in order to get fully accredited.

Anybody have anything else to add? Sure.

OSCAR ROBLES-GARAY: Yes. I would like to talk about what Michele said, the fairness issue. I think that this is a very sensitive issue. Try to be fair among your registrars and your own registrar, because it's easy to do this through the policies and through the system, but the day-to-day information and the day-to-day behavior of the business is not that easy.

We decided to create two different business units, one for the registry and one for the registrar and to limit the amount of information that we share among those two different business units.

Actually, we decided to rename the registrar business unit to a more neutral name, because it used to be called NIC Mexico Registrar. We felt that that was a disadvantage to our registrars – local registrars, at least – and that we rename it to some neutral name. Now it's called Akky, which doesn't mean anything. It could be a sushi bar or something else.

MICHELE NEYLON: It's intentionally obscure?

OSCAR ROBLES-GARAY: I'm sorry?

MICHELE NEYLON: So it was intentionally obscure?

OSCAR ROBLES-GARAY: Yes.

MICHELE NEYLON: Okay.

OSCAR ROBLES-GARAY: It was on purpose.

MICHELE NEYLON: I thought it was some kind of in-house Mexican joke or something that made sense in Mexico.

OSCAR ROBLES-GARAY: No, not at all.

MICHELE NEYLON: Okay.

OSCAR ROBLES-GARAY: That's a very sensitive and important thing. Don't give information to your registrar that you can't share with the rest of the registrars.

CRYSTAL PETERSON: Thank you. Oh, yes. Michele?

MICHELE NEYLON: I think a lot of us are more than happy to engage with a lot of the ccTLDs. If the ccTLDs that are looking for registrars, talk to us. A lot of us are more than happy to engage with you.

                          But I think we've all said that if you make it incredibly hard for us to onboard with you, to integrate with you, to sign on with you, then don't expect too much.

But at the same time, from my perspective at this juncture, if I can onboard with a registry relatively quickly and easily and integrate quickly and easily, then, yes. Grand, we'll offer it, why not?

If we manager to register a load of domain names, we all make loads of money, well, that's cool, too. I like that. We're open for business if you are.

CRYSTAL PETERSON: Thank you. Gabriela, I don't know if you wanted to have time for questions at all. But I believe we have – I'm not watching the time – about five minutes or so, if there are any questions from the audience. Oh, we have one minute.

JAY DALEY: Hi. Jay Daley from .nz. Going back to your original point about EPP and the differences and the variants of things, when EPP was designed, it was of course designed without any input from the cc community. That's a fault of the cc community, not a fault of the people who designed it.

If there were now to be a redesign of EPP that were to take out the fixed business process that goes into EPP and make it something that is more described within EPP so that each one of us that has a slightly different process could have a standard version of EPP that explained that – I could explain what the means to you technically – but if we were to come back with a new version of EPP, version two, that solved

this issue of lots of different extensions and lots of different ways of doing it, how would registrars feel about implementing that?

Because currently, we have a choice, really, which is your choice is effectively suggesting that we must – well, not "must," but strongly recommending – that we change our business processes to fit with a specific standard of business processes, or we change the technology so that we don't have such clumsy technology to represent those business processes.

MICHELE NEYLON: I do always enjoy interacting with Jay. He does manage to encapsulate the most complex things into a deceptively simple question.

Have a chat with Scott Hollenbeck, who's wandering around the halls here this week. Scott and a few other people are talking about stuff around EPP extension registries, because at the moment, there is a lot of variety out there. That may not be entirely what you're talking about, but it's one of the things that registrars and some of the registries are looking at pretty closely.

Would we implement EPP version whatever-the-hell if it was being used widely? Then, yes, I suppose we would. But speaking personally, [I] suppose we would implement it. I mean, I'm not sure exactly what the – I don't know –

JAY DALEY:	It's being implemented widely, then, someone else has already done the implementation. No, I mean about your willingness to invest in something.
	Let me give you an example. The Add Grace Period is generally a fixed period and then you can, from an Add Grace Period, some people allow you to do a deletion within a certain amount of time, okay? Different registries have different rules about that. Some don't let you do deletions. Some do that.
	If EPP no longer fixes those rules, but within EPP there is a description of those rules – so your client connects to an EPP server, gets a description that says, "We allow you to go from this state to this state within these days and do these changes," that's a completely new version of EPP that self-describes the different business rules within EPP.
	My question is if someone does that, are you, as registrars, willing to take the financial risk to implement that and be the first people there – not wait for everybody else to do it? But are you willing to join with us and take that risk so that if we would do that, you would do that at the same time? We could all move together on that.
PETER LARSEN:	Again, I would be happy if I only had EPP as my main concern, issue, but I have providers that only gives me e-mail forms, only gives me web forms, only give me anything else than just EPP with an extension. If the extension was my only problem, I would probably just relax a little more.

We develop our platform all the time. I cannot see why it should be an issue to add new features that come up that has potentially good value for us and for you. I don't see that as an issue.

GIOVANNI SEPPIA: Should I say something, too? Well, if there is a new version of EPP, I don't see the difference if there would be the same EPP and change of extensions. If there is a version, we would implement it.

CRYSTAL PETERSON: Thank you. Is there any more questions? Doesn't look like it. Well, we are just a few minutes over. I want to thank all the gentlemen on the panel. I have been enlightened and I hope our audience has, too. Thank you very much. I will see you guys in the hallways.

[break]

KATRINA SATAKI: Are you ready for more interesting stuff? Now the really interesting thing's coming – the legal and policy. Yes. Wake up.

Good morning, everyone, and welcome to the Legal and Policy Session. We will have three presentations this morning and hopefully sufficient time to ask the presenters at least some questions. Ten minutes each.

I think we go with the presentations first and then we take the questions in the end. Can you present yourselves first so they know who you are, all of you?

STEPHAN WELZEL: Yes. I'm Stephan Welzel. I'm General Counsel to DENIC, the .de registry.

NEIL DUNDAS: Neil Dundas, the Chief Operating Officer of the ZA Central Registry.

LISE FUHR: I'm Lise Fuhr from .dk registry.

ANNEBETH LANGE: I'm Annebeth Lange from .no, the Norwegian registry.

KATRINA SATAKI: We start out with Stephan Welzel from DENIC, the German registry, talking about the [contentious issue], are we really responsible for what people put out on the 'Net, the content? The floor is yours.

STEPHAN WELZEL: Thanks. The answer to question are we responsible, of course, is no. The real, legal question is, are we liable?

EN

When I was asked to give a presentation here, I suggested this topic because some interesting and I would say weird things are going on in this instance, as you will learn in a few minutes.

To give you the answer at the beginning, are registries liable for content? The answer is no – hell no. In fact, that would conclude my presentation but I have to fill ten minutes, as [Annebeth] said, so I give you a bit more than just that.

The old topic that probably all of you are familiar with was, are liable for domain names? This issue seems to have been solved in the last years – at least, in Germany and as far as I can see, in the whole of Europe, it's not really an issue anymore.

The answer is, at least in principle, the registry is not liable for domain names that infringe upon trademark rights or any other intellectual property rights.

A new question – relatively new, at least, when you look at the whole picture – new question is, is the registry liable for content?

Actually, the immediate thought one has – or, at least, I have when I hear that question – is that this is a rather surprising proposition because if registries are, in principle, not liable for infringing domain names, how could they possibly be liable for content, since content is way farther away from the registry than a domain name?

A domain name is registered with the registry, so you could argue that perhaps the registry can be liable. Content is something totally different.

Still, that seems to be an issue that gains more and more importance, as we can see from some developments in Europe, at least, that we also discussed within CENTR.

For example, PirateBay.se – that was a case where a prosecution authority thought that it would be a good idea to make the Swedish registry liable, if you will, for the content that could be reached under that domain name.

Obviously, that's a file-sharing site. Obviously, that's illegal. The prosecutor thought, "Well, it's difficult to get hold of the people that run the website, so let's try our luck with the registry." It was not very successful, but the idea was there.

Another case, Cartier has brought legal action against Nominet because there's some website that can be reached under .co.uk domain names where you can buy fake Cartier watches. The domain names are fine. The domain names are something like MyWatchesShop.co.uk, but the website, the content is the problem.

Cartier says, "Well, we would like to hold Nominet, the registry, liable for this." This case is still ongoing. There's no judgment yet, but Cartier has already stated that they brought this case because they want to set a precedent to be used also in other countries - in particular, E.U. countries – afterwards.

Another case, BAF versus the Belgian registry: BAF is the Belgian Anti-Piracy Federation. They sued the Belgian registry because they didn't like the content of some websites that could be reached under .be domain names.

EN

In this case, a judgment has been handed down already and the court said, "Yes, the registry is, under certain circumstances, liable for content."

At the same time, at least, the BAF also had the funny idea that the court should oblige the registry to delete any further domain name that BAF might not like in the future. That, of course, is nonsense and the court said no.

But still, the concrete domain names that were subject of this case, with respect to those domain names, the court said, "Yes, the registry is liable."

Then, a recent case from Germany, H33T.com: in this case, a German court a few months ago said the .com registrar is liable for the content of the website. Registrar, when it's a gTLD registrar, then there's a role similar to ccTLD registry role. In this case, the registrar was indeed just the registrar, not also the host provider or anything.

The court in this case said the registrar, who didn't do anything else but registering the domain name, is liable for the illegal content that could be reached under this domain name.

There are cases like this. There are attempts to hold the registry liable. So far, DENIC doesn't have this problem, because we had this problem already in 2001 when we had our first case where someone tried to hold us liable for the content of a website.

That was a case where, under this domain name, which is totally harmless, as you can see, where the customer of a bank voiced his

dissatisfaction with the services of the bank. Among other things, he incited on this website the general counsel of the bank and called him the "coyote of Frankfurt."

The coyote of Frankfurt didn't like this, so the bank sued DENIC and said, "Hey, the domain name is okay, but the website is not. DENIC has to do something."

Also, we had two cases under administrative law where authorities ordered us to disconnect domain names. That's a specialty of German law and in German law, authorities can give orders to anyone – after all, it's Germany. If you don't like that, you have to take the authority to court. That's what we did.

In all three cases, we won in court. I would say we obviously won, because when you look at it from a legal point of view, it's pretty clear. Obviously, we don't provide the illegal content, and also, we don't contribute to the provision of the illegal content, and we cannot remove the content, so how could we possibly be liable?

Of course, you can say, "DENIC doesn't provide the content, okay but DENIC could disconnect or delete the domain name." But the point is the domain name is not the issue. The domain name is harmless. Disconnecting or deleting the domain name would not remove the content. Actually, with that, the legal assessment is finished. It's clear the registry is not liable.

Then, unfortunately, however, there's another question, and that is whether the registry is an intermediary. That's a word that plays a role in two E.U. directives, which basically say that there has to be some

means to take action against intermediaries whose services are used by third party to infringe a copyright or related right.

These directives are not self-executing, so they are actually not applicable law. But still, they can be used to interpret national law and they have an impact.

The question is, is the registry an intermediary? Are registry services being used to infringe rights when there's illegal content at a website? The answer – you're not surprised to hear that from me – the answer, in my view, is no. However, the Belgian court, for example, said, "The answer is yes" – in that case, BAF versus .de.

I would say at best – or at worst – the registry services are used to make the infringement easier to find, even though I'm not even sure about that, because there are search engines.

When you look at the case of H33T.com, it's not that someone who wants to do some illegal file sharing says, "Oh, I'm sure I will find that under this domain name." You will only find it if you know that this is the domain name.

But if you have to know where to look, then it would also work with the IP number. Even if there was no domain name, if you knew the IP number, you would also find it.

I think the registry is not an intermediary. An example I like to use is the publisher of a city map. If I run a shop in Frankfurt and sell fake watches there, of course if the street where my shop is was not in the city map

EN

of Frankfurt, the tourists can't buy. It would be harder for them to find my shop.

Still, would anyone ever think of suing the publisher of the city map? Of course not. Would any court ever say, "Yes, the publisher of the city map is liable"? Of course not. Why would it be any different in the case of a registry?

Indeed, the answer is the registry liable for content in my view is no. Again, some courts have a different opinion – or at least, one Belgian court has a different opinion. Still, I should add a little disclaimer and say this is the legal assessment.

Of course, it's a whole different issue whether a registry wants to do something about the content. That's a political question. That's a matter of taste. Personally, I would vigorously advise against it, because I think it's a slippery slope.

But before you even start thinking about political questions, you should be aware of the legal situation. As I said, in my view, the legal assessment is clear: the registry is not an intermediary and not liable for content. Thanks.

KATRINA SATAKI: Thank you, Stephan. As you know, we have been really interested in this for a long time and I made some guidebooks about it. I think we wait for the questions until after.

Lise, it's your turn, next out. You're going to talk about the new Danish Domain Act and the implications for the registry.

LISE FUHR: Yes. Good morning, everyone. Well, why tell you about a boring act? That's because it has a lot to do. It has a lot of influence on how we have to run our registry. This act came into force earlier this year. I'm just waiting for my slides.

My name is Lise Fuhr, I come from .dk registry. I'm the COO of DIFO and DK Hostmaster. Part of this is shown in the slides, but I can just quickly walk you through that.

DIFO is an association. We have member organizations. I'll see if this fits. Our members are – it's free to become a member, but you just need to be an organization. DIFO's nonprofit. DIFO is the sole owner of DK Hostmaster, the registry of .dk.

You can see we have a little more than 1.2 million domain names. According to our size of country, we have quite a few domain names per inhabitant.

The administration of .dk is put out to public tender. The tender was issued in 2009. We got a six-year permission to run .dk. But now, they changed the law.

The key principle of the new law is still that the registries has to be nonprofit. It has to be transparent, accountable, nondiscriminatory administration. That's all what we demand of ICANN to be, so I think it's fair that we have to be that, too, in Denmark.

It's self-regulation and the registry has to pay for the Domain Name Complaint Board. That means that every complaints are very cheap.

They cost like $20 U.S. dollars, or euro, you would say €20, a bit less. We pay the rest of the costs for the Complaint Board.

What was changed in the new Domain Name Act? There's three major changes: one is regarding new gTLDs, one is about validation of the registrants, and the last is about the tender.

New gTLDs, before the law came into force, there was no one that had the authority to decide on new gTLDs with relation to Denmark, like .copenhagen. If anyone wanted to run .copenhagen, no authority, no government authority could send in a letter of support or that they didn't go against it.

That was actually a problem for the Danish state, so they put this into the law, that now it's the Danish Business Authority that has the right to support a domain name with relation to Denmark.

The other one is the validation of the registrants. Here, we're really going to change our business procedures in Denmark. Luckily, we have a year to do it, but it's going to be a lot of work and it's going to be a lot of trouble for our registrants. We have had meetings with [our] registrars about this.

We're in the process of finding out how to deal with it. Before this law came into act, it was the registrant's obligation to ensure that their datas was correct. Now, it's our obligation.

Furthermore, in Denmark you have the rule that when you have the right to be anonymous in other databases, you should be anonymous in our database. Before this law, it was the registrant who should send in

and tell us, "I am allowed to be anonymous in your database." But now, we have to find out when they become anonymous in the Danish Civil Registry Service.

We have to link to this database and we haven't done that before, but to do that, you need to know the registrant's personal number. In Denmark, that's a quite sacred number.

We are going to need to ask the registrant for a lot more data than they've been used to – and of course, this is only the private users but the companies will need to ask for a lot of data about their business number.

We need to link to a lot of databases. But, to make it clear, no business could be anonymous. It's only the private users, but we do have quite a lot of private users.

Then, if it comes to registrants from other countries, well, we can't do any of this validation. We told the authorities this, but we've been forced to do it for our own Danish registrants.

A small addition to this is that if a private registrant in another country has a right to be anonymous in that country, we shall ensure that, too. But then, they have to tell us and prove it to us.

But still, it's a lot of work. It's going to be very costly for us. It's going to put more pressure on our registrars, because they are the one that has contact to the registrant when they're registering the domain name.

Furthermore, the tender: that's an improvement, we find, that there's a new model for appointment of the .dk registry. Beforehand, it was per

se that there should be a tender. Now, instead of a public tender, per se, we'll have a public consultation asking if there's any strong indications that a public tender is needed.

Actually, we've just had this consultation. We are waiting for the response. I think we'll get it within the next few days, so maybe we'll be able to tell you during this ICANN meeting – we don't know, but they told us we would get it a year before our permission would expire, and that expires the 22nd of June, 2015. We're a bit overdue. I think that we'll get the message one of these days.

It's the Minister that takes the decision. That means that we will not have the reason why he's chosen either to prolong our permission or to put a tender in place. We will only get an answer.

The hearing, though, all the comments will be public. They'll be published when we have the result from the Minister. This is some very, very interesting days for the .dk registry.

That was all from Denmark. Thank you for listening.

KATRINA SATAKI: Thank you, Lise. Gabby? No. Christina, have you managed to do it for the next – yeah, okay. Shall we take some questions while we wait for that? Yes, I think that's a good idea.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: Stephan. Yeah, here.

EN

In the case they were liable, the [BE] case and others, it's because the registrant was unreachable or there were no policy for suspension or revocation of a domain name if the registrant were unreachable with the data collected by the registry?

STEPHAN WELZEL: That's a very good question. As far as I know, there was no problem with the registrant's data in the Belgian case. That's the only case so far where a court said the registry is liable.

That was not the point, but that gives me the opportunity to emphasize that of course it's very important – and apparently that's the background of your question – that the registry makes sure that the registrant's data is correct.

We keep telling people, "Leave us alone. If you don't like the domain name, if you don't like the content, turn to the registrant." Of course, that only works if the registrant can be reached under the data that is registered. In our case, we don't do anything about content or illegal or infringing domain names.

Still, if someone turns to us and complains about a domain name or even about content and also claims and can even show that the registrant's data is not correct, then we will look into the matter and either we will get the registrant to provide correct data or, if he doesn't do that, we will delete the domain name because the data is not correct – not because the content is illegal or the domain name is infringing, but because the data is not correct.

In this Belgian case, that was not an issue, but in general, the data of the registrant can also be an easy way out for the registry if the data is not correct.

In Nominet's case, in some cases, the data was not correct and Nominet in fact, even before Cartier went to court, deleted some of the domain names because the data was not correct. But Cartier wasn't interested in that. They want their precedent.

KATRINA SATAKI: I think we have to leave the questions until afterwards. Neil Dundas, do his presentation first and then we come back to the questions afterwards.

The last presenter is then Neil Dundas from ZA Central Registry, talking about additional rights protection mechanism. Here you go.

NEIL DUNDAS: Thank you. I will keep it very short, ladies and gentlemen. As I mentioned earlier, my name is Neil Dundas. I'm the Chief Operating Officer of the ZA Central Registry. We administer various second-level domains in the .za ccTLD.

We're also an applicant for four new top-level domains. Three of them are city domains and relate to three South African cities: Joburg, Durban, and Cape Town. We are looking to launch those names as from the 1st of July. We've had the 1st of July approved as our sunrise date.

Just some quick background: our company is a nonprofit organization previously known as UniForum SA. It changed its name and its business operation to the ZA Central Registry upon it being appointed to that position by the [Regulating] South Africa.

Historically administered the co.za namespace with just around 930,000 registrations. Subsequent to that, we've been transitioned to provision domain names in web.za, org.za, net.za, and of course, the three new generic top-level domains that are coming through.

From a legacy perspective, our policy position has always one based on the first come, first served principle.

As a registry, we took a hands-off approach on any abuse and conflicts, referring them to alternate dispute resolution processes, which are established as independent processes in South Africa, or of course, the judicial processes, the courts.

That's worked fairly well for us since we've been doing for the last 18 years. We've dodged a few bullets here and there, but generally, the process stood up quite well in terms of the ccTLD space.

Our registry/registrar agreement was also very .za-centric. We made minimum use of reserved name lists.

With the new gTLD process that we participated in, essentially we were thrown in the deep end, especially when it came to rights protection mechanisms. The new gTLD process, in terms of how ICANN set it out, is a conglomeration of various rights protection mechanisms that persist

throughout the application phase all the way through into general availability.

The reality on the situation is, as a ccTLD, we had to address these new Rights Protection Mechanisms. I would need much more than ten minutes to go into any of these Rights Protection Mechanisms, all of them, in any degree of detail.

What I'd like to single out to you are a few of the Rights Protection Mechanisms we foresaw transitioning into the ZA namespace as well.

These are essentially a marked departure from the first come, first served principle. We needed to start looking at what ICANN terms these "priority rights," and how do we address them not only in the new gTLDs that we're busy launching, but also in the ZA namespace?

The two that I want to focus on in terms of these priority rights are priority rights relating to stakeholders, such as governments, which were a very important aspect in terms of our TLDs and are a very important aspect of our ccTLD, and then also commercial rights, such as trademark rights and business rights.

Very brief, in terms of the reserved name lists, it ends up to be quite a complicated, complex, time-consuming matter, resource-rich, intensive process, because if you're trying to coordinate the establishment of a reserved name list, whether it is a registry reserved name list or premium name list or a government reserved name list, it takes some coordination to make sure that the various levels of government or the various stakeholders are aware of the policies surrounding what names

they can put on the reserved name list and what ultimately we are promising them in terms of those reservations.

The government reserve name list in itself was a tricky challenge for us. Our policy was essentially split around four types of names that governments could reserve: geographic indicators, cultural and linguistic indicators, names that are of substantive economic interest to government or to parastatals, and then, of course, our list of offensive names, which we've maintained over the years, but it's something that is also dealt with in terms of our alternate dispute resolution process.

I'm not going to go too much further on the reserve name list because I've got limited time, but in terms of the TLDs, we've actually developed a lot of tools and resources around coordinating the input from different government sectors, whether they're local, provincial, or national governments – or even regional, in terms of .africa. We've put in place a lot of processes and tools to ensure that we can coordinate the input of these names onto our lists and how we moderate them.

One of the processes relating to the protection of commercial rights or priority rights for the private sector has been the establishment of a new service that we call the "Mark Validation System." Essentially, this Mark Validation System is a process that is really a localized version of the Trademark Clearinghouse.

Of course, we looked at this from the perspective of .africa in particular, but we also foresaw a means of us to add value back into the ZA namespace by establishing a mechanism that reaches out to the

trademark community, to the brand community, and gives them some level of interaction with the registry itself.

We've established this Mark Validation System. It applies across our new TLDs and it also applies towards our ccTLD second-level domains in ZA.

There's a whole host of policies that go together with this. All of it is well-documented, available on our website, if you want to go have a look.

In essence, though, the Mark Validation System provides three services to the [brand] community. The first and most obvious one is Sunrise Services.

This enables someone with a trademark to have this trademark validated. This doesn't need to be a registered trademark. It could be a common-law trademark, a trademark established through use. They could have that right validated on the face of it and based on that validation, participate in a Sunrise.

Obviously, this has an application to the new TLDs we're looking to launch. It also has an application on the re-launch of certain of our second-level domains.

We've actually used this process for the re-launch of our web.za second-level domain. We are going to look at a re-launch of our org.za and net.za names using this service.

Claims services, the [inaudible] of a lot of registrars out there. We've taken a slightly different approach to claims services.

For those of you that are not aware, a claims service is essentially a notice that is sent to the registrant informing them at the time they're trying to create a name that an existing right has been identified that matches their domain name string. They're then essentially notified of those existing rights. They can then decide to proceed with the registration or not.

The problem that we faced in the past is a lot of registrars had to interface with the Trademark Clearinghouse in order to provide this service. In terms of our Mark Validation Service, we're not going to require that integration from registrars. We will provide an out-of-band service to ensure that the claim notice is displayed to the registrant before they can complete the create.

The last service, the one that I think has a longer lifespan and a [longer-term] value is the Watch Service. Essentially, here again, the trademark holders will be able to list marks in the Mark Validation System.

When the domain names are registered in the registry, in the backend, we are busy comparing these lists. If a domain name matches, we then inform the mark holder that a domain name that matches a trademark that they've had validated has just been registered.

They're then welcome to make use of any alternate dispute resolution or judicial process that they deem necessary.

Just a very, very quick overview of it. We need to understand that the Mark Validation System is a separate system, although it interacts in real-time with the registry system. The Mark Validation System is there to basically capture and qualify these rights.

It translates the word marks to actual domain name strings and based on those domain name strings, those lists that are then produced, we interact with the registry to see if anything is happening that match those particular strings.

If instances in the form of claims, someone would try and register a domain name string that matches a trademark, because it's in the Mark Validation System, that registrant will receive a claims notice that they would have to acknowledge in order to proceed with that create.

The create goes into a pending state. It is unlocked by the acceptance of their claim notice. As soon as that claim notice is accepted and the domain name is registered, the backend registry then informs the Mark Validation System of that registration. The mark holder is informed of that registration.

It's a bit of a watch service. We think we can develop more value in this as time goes on. But essentially, it's a means for us to reach out to the brand community in South Africa – more importantly, to the brand community in Africa when we launch the .africa TLD.

Thank you very much, ladies and gentlemen.

KATRINA SATAKI: Thank you, Neil. Very interesting, and kind of a new presentation form, even if it caused some problems. Interesting. Questions? A lot. Carsten?

CARSTEN SCHIEFNER: Yes, Carsten Schiefner, .de. I have two questions – one goes to Stephan and the other one goes to Lise.

The first one to Stephan is, if you attempt to look into your crystal ball, is that something – or other way around – would you see a trend of lawsuits or the attempts to held registries liable for content, or is that something that is a certain level for quite a bit of time already?

STEPHAN WELZEL: As I said, there have been some attempts recently, and I don't think these attempts will stop very soon.

CARSTEN SCHIEFNER: Will they get more?

STEPHAN WELZEL: Possibly. It depends on the outcome.

As I also said, Cartier explicitly stated that they wanted to set a precedent to be used by them in other countries. If they win against Nominet, then they will try the same in other countries.

Then, of course, other copycats will show up and other companies will say, "Well, if they can do that, we can do it, too." I mean, that's what always happens in these cases.

So yes, it seems to be a new fashion at the moment and pretty much obviously depends on what the courts will say.

CARSTEN SCHIEFNER: You would say it's a recommendation for all the registries to be better prepared or to be –

STEPHAN WELZEL: It's always good to be prepared.

CARSTEN SCHIEFNER: Yes, I know. Okay.

The other one goes to Lise. If I've understood the timelines correctly, then your, say, contracts is about to expire in June or the five-year thing you have with the government is about to expire in June, and the new directive on privacy is about to get into force by March next year. Is that right?

LISE FUHR: Our permission expires in June next year. The validation process we need to do is March, also '15, yes.

CARSTEN SCHIEFNER: The interesting thing is eventually and essentially, you need to deploy something that might be worthwhile only for like two months, in terms of DIFO is concerned.

LISE FUHR:	If there's going to be a tender. I hope not, but if there's going to be a tender, they'll prolong our permission one year, because it's too short time for another to go into a bidding and then go.
	But it would be for a short time and it would be very costly, because if you have a new registry or a new administrator, they'll make their own system, obviously.
CARSTEN SCHIEFNER:	Okay. Thank you.
ERICK IRIARTE AHON:	Thank you. Erick Iriarte, .pe. In the last December, the government decide in the Intellectual Property Office that we are liability of PirateBay.pe. They decided to make a suit against us and take decision of immediately suspend the domain name PirateBay.pe.
	If not, we have demands including jail to the ccTLD administrator – [Rolando], I don't know where are you – and also, $250,000 because don't accept the suspension of the domain name.
	We're appeal that decision because the ccTLD is no responsibility for the content of that website. The Intellectual Property Offices don't said nothing about that, but change the resolution and said the suit is not against ccTLD .pe, it's against the owners of the domain names.
	In that situation, they change the liability, not to the ccTLD but continued the order to suspend the domain name. If we don't appeal, the liability and also the next liabilities will be related with the

intellectual property law that said that all the institutions related to the infringent about copyright rights, including public or private organizations, could be demands in suits in any case.

Finally, at this moment, we continue the trial, but the ccTLD is no more responsibility about the content so we don't have liability in this case.

KATRINA SATAKI: We are over time, but it seems like it's a lot of interest in this, so coffee is out. Do you want to continue five minutes to take a few more questions? Okay. Over there, because he started.

[DAVE]:   Dave [inaudible], I'm a information security person. Unfortunately, this week clashes with the Internet Security Group [inaudible].

A lot of the time, if you walk into a building and the doors are open, the law says, "Tough. You can go anywhere." We've keyed DNS, ever since Randy Bush [then] signed off the top-level domain a while back.

Is it possible that the legal interpretations will change significantly? It seems a bit naïve that some of the assumptions you're making now, on the open-box Internet, wouldn't necessarily be viewed as different in the court, with strong cryptographic associations.

I just get the feeling that that's the sea changing. You'll see more of this legal deliberation sponsored by nation-states with, perhaps, a rep in every overseas embassy to install enforcement of IPR. They'll come knocking on your doors first. What's your feeling?

STEPHAN WELZEL: That was very difficult to understand. If I got that right, the question is, do I think that what I said would hold in court? It's better to understand without the microphone.

[DAVE]:   [off mic]

STEPHAN WELZEL: I don't see why that would change anything, so I guess the answer would be no.

KATRINA SATAKI: We are a little short on time. I'm sorry to interrupt, but one last question and then you can discuss afterwards in the coffee break. After that question, it's back here again after coffee, five minutes over eleven.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: Thank you. Question goes to Lise. Wanted just to find out the requirement that the application for Danish gTLD goes through the registry operator. Does the law say its parameters of what kind of names are considered to be Danish? Are those geographic names and cultural names?

Two, is there a requirement, as well, that such names are operated locally by the registry?

LISE FUHR: No, it's not defined by law. But ICANN ask in cases of TLDs that has a relation to countries, like .copenhagen, they would ask for a letter of non-objection or support. These letters, they were not even able to send if anyone has applied in the first round of new gTLDs, because they didn't have the authority to do so, but that has been implemented in the new law.

KATRINA SATAKI: Thank you, everyone.

[break]

KATRINA SATAKI: Good morning, dear colleagues. Please take your seats for the session, which is session ccTLD News.

I'd like to start with major news. As many of you probably know, today is the birthday of the soul of ccNSO. Gabby, it's my pleasure to wish you a happy birthday.

Now, with less important news, even though I hope the day will be very interesting. We'll start with a presentation kindly prepared for us by Nominet – Eleanor from Nominet - that's about their activities on the second level.

Actually, I have to tell you that – I think it was four years ago – one guy told me, "When will you start offering .co.lv?" "What? You can registry directly under .lv." "No, no, no, no, that's not good. You have to do like U.K., offer .co.uk. That's the real stuff." Now you're –

ELEANOR BRADLEY: Now we're catching up with you.

KATRINA SATAKI: Please, the floor is yours.

ELEANOR BRADLEY: Thank you. Thank you very much for inviting Nominet to give an update this morning.

I wanted to talk to you about two specific areas. Firstly, a bit of background on what we've recently been doing around launching domains at the second level, which has been a major change for us, a bit like tinkering – with a register the size of .uk, it's a bit like making changes to the engine of a jet while you're in full flight. It's been a major work program for us.

I also wanted to talk about some of the activities that we're currently involved in around raising standards associated with .uk domain names and enhancing trust in .uk.

It's perhaps helpful just to step back a minute and perhaps provide a bit of context for the changes that we've been involved with recently.

One of the things that we are very aware of is the changing market in which we're operating in .uk. We've seen some really interesting figures in the first quarter of our financial year, where our registration volumes have reduced by around 15, 16%.

We've been experiencing really significant growth over recent years. We think that's a good thing. We want people to be registered in .uk because of all the good things we do around the domain name. We've seen some very significant market pressures, now.

For the first time, as long as I can remember, we've also had an absolute reduction in the domains under management in .uk. I'm trying to understand the factors that cause this are really quite challenging.

There's no one single issue, but certainly we've found, over the years, that the global financial crisis has caused huge challenges for other industries. But actually, what we've seen around domain name registration is actually people get more creative. They want to get online. They have new ideas.

Throughout the financial crisis, we actually saw very strong registration rates. That is changing now. Knowing what's causing that – whether that's the market, new gTLDs, change in economic circumstances in the U.K., or whether it's one single thing – I think is very challenging to get to the bottom of.

We're also operating in an environment where our stakeholders have different expectations of us as a registry. Their expectations are growing. Some of the work we've been doing around trust and raising standards is a direct response to that.

In terms of how we've responded, well, if you've been out of the hotel, you may have seen some of our marketing, you may have seen our stand.

We, on the 10th of June, after two years and two full rounds of public consultation, made .uk domains available for the first time. In that way, we're conscious that we're actually catching up with a lot of ccs who've been doing this for a long time. It is challenging when you have a register of 10.5 million domain names in place.

We went through a major process of consulting with our stakeholders. We have ended up launching .uk that looks very different to the one that we first set out consulting on two years ago.

At that point, we were looking at a quite differentiated domain name with value-added products that went around the proposition. We have arrived at quite a different place, in terms of what we're doing now.

Also, with making a change of this nature, it's taken some time for the decision at the end of last year to actually put that program in place and make sure that we did everything we needed to to ensure that we could have a successful launch earlier this month.

I'm really pleased that it did go well. We had around about 50,000 new registrations on day one, which was really great to see. We're continuing to watch that closely.

In terms of the key features and where we got to in terms of the .uk proposition that we have gone to market with, we've very much recognized the rights of existing and loyal customers within U.K.

We have a "right of refusal," we've called it, for existing registrants of .co.uk domain names. They have a significant amount of time to exercise that right.

We've also introduced a requirement, which is new for us, around a U.K. address for service. It's possible in .uk to register from anywhere in the world, and you do have to provide good quality data. But now, for the first time, you also need to provide a U.K. address for service – so a postal address in the U.K. associated with the name.

We've also linked the launch to higher expectations around the quality of registrant data that's provided. I'll talk a bit more about that in a minute.

I think, so far, the take has been strong. We're pleased with that. But obviously, we're very conscious that we're launching a new option in what is already becoming an increasingly crowded market, so we'll be watching closely to see how registrations go.

Another aspect I wanted to talk about was the work we've been doing over the last year so around raising standards. This is four-pronged.

The four areas that I'm going to touch on relate to the actual registration policy we have around .uk domains, criminal use of .uk domains, the quality of registrant data that we require to be provided for domains that are registered, and also work that we've been doing with our channel and how we're refining the relationship we have with our registrars to ensure that we continue to raise standards and expectations around how they work, as well.

The first one is the registration policy review. This is something that we kicked off last summer. There was quite a lot of noise in the U.K. press, which is very much on the back of a more general theme around aspects of child protection online and the responsibilities of different actors in this space – particularly Internet service providers, at that point – and debates around filtering.

But then this also moved into some press coverage, specifically around whether there should be restrictions on what you can and cannot register as a domain name under .uk. We had, until that point, had no restrictions in place. We accepted any string, any domain name at all.

What we did was we commissioned a review by a former director of public prosecution. He looked closely at our registration policy and looked at how we could develop a proportionate response to the issue.

What we arrived at, after a full public review, was that we would no longer permit domain names that, in our sole discretion, would indicate or promote a serious sexual offense and where there could be seen to be no legitimate use.

Within U.K. law, there's some quite tightly-defined terms that then would be prohibited, but we wanted to also ensure that we didn't have issues around false positives.

For example, a serious sexual offense, of course, would be rape, but we would in no way want to cause issues for rape crisis centers or rape counseling groups or, indeed, the many thousands of therapists that we found, now, we have in the U.K., who should perfectly legitimately be able to register domain names.

What we did was we accepted the outcome of that review. It was a major change for us – the first time we'd ever put any prohibitions in place. We retrofitted that policy to our database of 10.5 million domains and identified nine registrations that would fall foul of the policy.

We think it was a pragmatic and proportionate response to growing concerns and actually that sometimes stepping forward and meeting these things head-on is actually a more effective way than simply holding up a barrier and not wanting to engage on these issues.

The other thing we did at the same time was we made a change to our terms and conditions of registration. We've, in the U.K., worked for some years with law enforcement agencies to deal with criminal use of domain names, but we have, until now, done that within the context of our terms and conditions that require good quality data.

What we find is that usually the criminals don't provide accurate name and address. We've managed to work within our existing terms and conditions. What we've done now is bring that more to the fore and we have a specific term within our Ts and Cs that relates to the domain name being used for unlawful purposes.

Another change that has come about – we've had a quite busy 2013 and '14 – another change that we've been working on is the relationship we have with our registrar channel. We have around 3,000 registrars for .uk. We've had a one-size-fits-all agreement with them since we set up in '96.

EN

What we wanted to do was start to acknowledge and recognize those registrars who are committed to achieving higher standards of service and also find ways to incentivize that and encourage them.

What we've introduced is – as well as maintaining an existing channel partner relationship with us – a registrar can also go for an accredited status.

Also, we've recognized that a lot of our registrars are registering domains on their own behalf, so we have corporate registrars who are not really registrars. They are businesses that want to maintain a direct relationship with us.

We also have registrars who want to hold a warehouse – a lot of domains – and sell those domains or maintain them for other commercial purposes. We wanted to recognize the different types of registrar that we had in our channel and find ways to provide a more refined service that was more appropriate for them.

We now have about 8 million domains out of our 10.5 million domains now covered by accredited registrars, which is really positive.

We've also just turned up the dial a little across the board, so that even if you want to maintain a standard relationship with us, there's still slightly higher expectations around the quality of the service you provide.

The final thing to mention is the work we've doing around data quality. Now, I know this is a quite contentious topic. I'm not for a minute suggesting that high standards of data in some way is a silver bullet for

dealing with all the issues that one might see around domain names or criminal or vexatious use of domain names, but we do think that it is a reasonable and basic requirement to provide accurate and up-to-date information for who holds the domain names.

It's reasonable for Internet users to be able to go to an authoritative source and find out who has a domain name.

We've been working, for the last couple of years within Nominet on dealing with domains where the data is of poor standard. More recently, we've published a specific policy that now sets out our expectations around the information that's provided for domain registration.

What that means is we have already been suspending and deleting domains that don't meet that standard. We will be doing that more as we go forward and we'll be working with our registrar channel on that, as well.

We've also linked that, to bring it full circle, into the work we've been doing around the launch of .uk, so that if you want to exercise your right to a new, shorter .uk domain name, you need to make sure your data is of a high enough standard before you can do that.

It joins up the pieces of the jigsaw and hopefully will ensure that, as we go forward with .uk, we're meeting higher standards of data.

That was it for me – just a whistle-stop tour of some of the changes that we've been making around .uk.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: [off mic]

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: - domain names. They went down the next day.

ELEANOR BRADLEY: We're certainly very aware of the issues around the Olympics and worked with law enforcement agencies where we could. Also really conscious that we recognize the limitations, as a registry, that we're only removing the signpost. We're not removing the shop or the content or the issue.

One of the things we've done over the years is try to work with law enforcement so that they understand the limitations of working with a registry versus the company that's actually hosting the content.

A lot of what we've done has been around counterfeit, fraudulent use and also medical. We've worked with the MHRA in the U.K. around medicines online. But it's something we're continuing to work on. It's an ongoing education process on both sides, I'd say.

KATRINA SATAKI: Thank you. Just a remind, please introduce yourself when you ask a question so that the audience knows.

[DAVE]:   I'm sorry. I'm a newbie. My name is Dave [inaudible]. I'm an information security professional who lives locally. That's it.

KATRINA SATAKI: Thank you. Annebeth.

ANNEBETH LANGE: Annebeth Lange, .no. Eleanor, that was interesting. I have one question for you about the validation of the data. The registration data, when they change – for example, administrative contact and these things [inaudible] – whose responsibility is it to check it up, that it is accurate all the time? Just like Lise said, that they have to check and be responsible for it all the time, all the registrations, period – and that's quite a task.

                           Do you take that responsibility yourself or do you put it in the terms and conditions that they have, as a registrant, they are responsible to send you possible alterations?

ELEANOR BRADLEY: Absolutely. For many years now – I can't actually recall exactly when the terms and conditions were changed – but for many years, we've required registrants of .uk domain names to provide accurate and up-to-date contact information.

                           We have always reactively dealt with complaints. There's an option on our website to actually report bad WHOIS data. We have, on a case-by-case basis, dealt with it.

More recently, we implemented a more proactive program within the organization. The latest change is to actually tie this into the initial registration of the domain names.

But it has never been – we dealt reactively with complaints. We've always suspended and deleted domains where we couldn't validate data. But this is more about stepping it up, and actually, I think by publishing a clear policy, being more clear around our expectations and the different roles of the registry, the registrar, and the registrant in that.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: There you go.

JÖRG SCHWEIGER: My name is Jörg from .de. Question is more or less going in the same direction as Annebeth's was. I'm wondering about how you really do a validation, because you said you enforce it at the registration or registry level. How do you actually do that A. in the first place, aside of posting a policy, and B. how do you make that validators stay valid over time?

ELEANOR BRADLEY: So we have a –

KATRINA SATAKI: Quick answer, please.

ELEANOR BRADLEY: A quick answer. We have a process. We work with a third party to validate data in the U.K. We have an automated process. We flag – and we flag the confidence level, recognizing that this is not an absolute. We set a specific confidence level that we consider to be acceptable for the registrant and the registrant's name and their address.

Then, if we are not able to validate automatically, we then start communicating with the registrant and the registrar to actually look at ways to do that outside of an automated process.

No, it's almost impossible to maintain that. The minute the domain is validated, the data degrades. There has to be a level of pragmatism about that. But that obligation and that requirement remains with the registrant. If we receive a complaint or there is an issue, then we will be back in touch and deal with it.

We used to say it's like painting the Forth Bridge. It's an enormous bridge in the U.K. You start and then you just come back around and you start painting it again. It's such a big task.

KATRINA SATAKI: Thank you. Our next speaker is so nervous about his presentation that he wants us to postpone it by asking question.

GIOVANNI SEPPIA: I just like to thank for this very interesting short overview of the launch of .uk, which I found really, really interesting.

What I like to ask you, if I may – and if I may ask the Chairman for just a couple of minutes – is about the slide where you have introduced us to the registration policy review and the criminal user.

I like to ask you, what was the reaction of your registrars, in the sense that there's a – if I have read correctly – there's a sort of discretionary power that is in the registry hands? I just wanted to ask you, what was the registrar reaction to this?

ELEANOR BRADLEY: Taking the registration policy review, first of all, I think quite mixed. I think there's a lot of understandable concern about interfering in or making value judgments about what is or isn't appropriate, particularly when you have a long history of being an entirely open registry.

I think in practice, what people have seen is that the policy is pretty sensible and quite tightly defined and in practical terms, just doesn't really interfere with their business or cause issues for them. I think, generally, maybe there was a concern at the outset and actually the people are pretty comfortable as to where we got.

On the criminal use side, we've always worked with our channel and over the last few years as we've worked with law enforcement in the U.K. A lot of our registrars already have actually really broad, as you often see within the registrars, the options do, quite frankly, what they need to do at any point in relation to a domain. A lot of registrars have well-established relationships with law enforcement already.

I think there's a sense of they don't want things to too much mission creep in these kind of areas. I think the data quality side is definitely more controversial and more challenging for registrars, actually, than the registration policy and the criminal use aspects.

KATRINA SATAKI: Thank you very much, Eleanor.

The [tactic] didn't work. Just still have to give your presentation. We've all been following very closely to the fight – maybe not "fight," but for the process that .eu had to go through. We all recognize the good work you're doing. Giovanni.

GIOVANNI SEPPIA: Thank you, Katrina – especially when you hijack my laptop.

Just to give you a quick head up about what we have gone through in the past year. The current scenario is that EURid was chosen by the European Commission following a call for expression of interest in 2002.

The official appointment was in 2003. We had in 2004 the signature of a five-years contract, which was renewable only once. The expiring timeframe of the current contract is in October this year.

As you know, we are a quite heavily regulated registry, which means that at the basis of our work, there are two European Union regulations.

The first one setting the basic principle for the registration procedure, the accreditation mechanism of our registrars and the way we should

have basically translated, operationally, the wishes of the member states who, at that time, supported the introduction of the .eu top-level domain.

The second one is the European Commission regulation of 2004, which has amended at least three times in the past ten years to reflect changes in the policy procedures and especially changes in the quite long reserved domain names list for European institutions and member states.

This regulation of 2004 basically, it gets into more details of what are the different elements of the life of a registry, including, again, the accreditation procedure of registrars, the way domain names should have been reserved and the way it should have been activated, the way domain names should have been transferred and/or deleted, and much more.

This is the current scenario. As for the regulations, that will not change, about the European Commission will continue to amend the regulation 874 whenever necessary to make sure that changes at procedural level are also reflected in this regulation.

Last year, we had the pleasure to be informed, like anybody else – because basically, the European Commission suspended any kind of talk with us for about six months – we were informed like the rest of the world that at the end, the European Commission wanted to go for a call for expression of interest for the selection of the .eu registry.

That was published on the Official Journal on 14 May, 2014. It's quite a monumental call for expression of interest, as it's divided into six sections.

The first one is the invitation to submit the application, with very specific reference to the [EC] regulations.

Then, there are several annexes, first one being the eligibility criteria for the applicants. The second is a declaration of honor, which is a conflict of interest policy for the applicant.

Then, there is the submission of application, which is the most, let's say, bureaucratic part of the call for tender: the way we should have submitted the application, how many copies, electronically, not electronically, CD and much more. Fortunately, they didn't write floppy disk, but they were close to.

The minimum services to be delivered and the draft service concession contract. It's basically our contract with the European Commission. It's already public because it was published as an attachment to the call for expression of interest.

The deadline to submit the application was the 20th of June last year. To submit the application, basically you should have looked at the selection criteria. There were basically seven selection criteria. I'm going through them quite quickly.

The first one was the quality of service. As a sort of preamble, the call for expression of interest was requesting the possible registry to present a response to those criteria, thinking about a sort of timespan

about between 5 and 15 years, thinking about what the registry would have implemented in a timeframe, which is between 5 and 15 years.

We had really to think over a lot of elements, a lot of details, to see what we should have and the way we should have served the .eu registrar and registrant community for quite a long timeframe.

The first one being the quality of services, so how we should have monitor the service we deliver, what KPI we should have in place, what extra KPI we should enforce in the future.

Second one being the human and technical resources. There was a strong reference to the EC regulation, because in the regulation, there is written that we should work at cost level. As you know, anything that we do not spend is sent back to the European Union budget.

We were recommended in the regulation to pay quite a lot of attention to the cost-benefit analysis whenever we were thinking about human and technical resources.

Financial standing is referring basically to the grounds – how we should ensure the financial stability and continuity of the .eu top-level domain.

Consultation mechanism is a bit lighter. It's referring to what kind of, let's say, what ways we should consult our community, being the registrant and registrar community.

Representation is how we should get involved at international level, how we should see ourselves in international environment, what kind of farther engagement we might think about.

Then, there is a tricky one, which is the impact on the domain name marketplace. We all know that the domain name marketplace is going through special years.

[inaudible] was quite difficult to assess a possible impact, a possible scenario of the domain name marketplace between 5 and 15 years from now. That was the most, let's say, tricky part to answer in the call for expression of interest.

Then there is the last one, which is relating to how the registry would have cope with the possible enlargement of the European Union.

As you know, one of our, let's say, duties is to make sure that we support the 24 current European Union official languages and to make sure that we have registrars in at least each of the European Union countries.

Recently, there's been the enlargement to the European Economic Area countries, which are Iceland, Liechtenstein, and Norway. The .eu is now available also to the residents in those countries.

The call for expression of interest was asking us to foresee how we should have managed a possible future enlargement. That includes, for instance, not only supporting more languages, supporting more registrars, but also supporting more scripts at the level of domain names registered under .eu, because that's also something we have to look into whenever there is a new language that is added to the official languages.

There might be characters under the script that is in the alphabet of that specific country that are not supported and therefore, we have to introduce those new characters and eventually even a new script.

So, the EC decision – the European Commission decision was published in the Official Journal on 12 April 2014. Basically, it was written that EURid was reappointed as the .eu registry manager and that we were the only applicant who fulfilled all the criteria.

That is from an eligibility perspective of the applicant and also from the perspective of matching the responses to the seven evaluation criteria that I just listed.

As I call them, what has been the good and the not-so-good of the entire process. Let's starts from the good.

What we found quite good, although, again, was quite a huge effort at the registry level, was that it gave us the opportunity to assess what we had done so far and also see what our strengths, our weaknesses – what would be the opportunities. It's really like was a SWOT analysis exercise.

At the end, it was good for us to get into this although, again, as I will say, it was very time-consuming. But it was good to see what we could have done better and what we are planning to do better in the future.

One element of the call for expression of interest was that basically it was asking the applicants to think about their past experience and see how this could have been improved.

This is the exercise then that we have done at multiple levels – so not only thinking about the registration platform, marketing initiatives, but also any level, including how we get engaged at the international level, how we consult our stakeholders. It was a very interesting exercise.

It's also good that one of the evaluation criteria was referring to the domain name marketplace, because, again, it came during a special timeframe of our life – the domain name system, let's say, environment.

That gave us, again, the opportunity to have a broader understanding of how the domain name marketplace might be in five years' time, might be in ten years' time, might be in 15 years' time, because this is what we were requested.

Although we didn't have any crystal ball to look into, we tried to get some projections about what could be the future scenario, what could be the response of the candidate registry to the future scenario. It was really like anticipating some challenges and anticipating the response to these challenges.

But we were quite open and transparent when answering this. We stated that while we are able to assess part of the domain name marketplace at present, it's going to be tough for anybody to anticipate future scenarios, because again, it's a very dynamic landscape.

What could be the scenario in 15 years' time, that's something that is going to be really hard to anticipate, both from a registry, registrar, and registrant perspective. That is also in view of the launch of the New gTLD Program.

It also helped us to have a long-term planning. That's something that we always – we have always produced a strategy plan covering about three years.

That gave us the chance to produce a 15-year high-level strategy plan, again, with the assumption that it's an adjustable plan, depending on the market. But it's also something that give us some sort of guidelines to all the departments.

The not-so-good? As I said, it was a very time-consuming process. Most of the resources of the registry were dedicated to answer the call for expression of interest.

We might have done different things, more things in the past year, but we were fully absorbed by the answer to the bid and also by the entire process of the audit, which followed the bid.

We were fully audited by the European Court of Auditors. Our, let's say, entire staff was hijacked for about one month in September last year by a group of auditors that were at our premises to investigate any little detail of our work.

The last not-so-good was it was an extremely bureaucratic procedure, especially to submit the application, because we were requested to print a certain number of copies, to put them in a box. The box must have gone in another box, including an electronic copy. There was a special seal on the box.

We were a bit in panic because there were interpretation of how the box should have liked, what kind of seal, what kind of binders we should

have used. There were some hints in this call for expression of interest, but hints, they are just hints.

We had to be and use our discretionary to understand and make sure that we were, let's say, right in submitting the application in the right format, right number of copies, right seal, right boxes, right color of the pen to sign it, and much more.

But we made it. I'd like to spend the last ten seconds to thank many of you who supported us last year during this process, which was, again, quite a big challenge. But we are very happy that we succeeded. Thank you, again.

KATRINA SATAKI: Congratulations, .eu. I think you've been very diplomatic, because I could go on with a list of not-so-good things, being in this situation, myself.

Any questions? Yes. Yes, of course.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: Giovanni, do you know how many applicants there were? Was that information public?

GIOVANNI SEPPIA: Sincerely, we believe we are the only one. Sincerely. But this is something that we were not fully disclosed. Again, considering that the process was very bureaucratic, we don't want to read more papers.

KATRINA SATAKI: Thank you. Anymore question? Yes.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: Thank you. Were there any particular changes in terms of contributing
                       to a financial contribution to E.U. in this review? Currently, do you do
                       contribution to the E.U. finance?

GIOVANNI SEPPIA: Thank you for – it's a good question. We are a self-sustained registry, in
                       the sense that the resources that are coming from the new registrations
                       and the operations and the domain name, they are covering our cost.

                       We do not get any funds from the European Union, but whatever is left
                       at the end of the year goes back to the European Union budget. I'd like
                       to underline that it's European Union budget, so it's not any specific
                       budget line of the European Union. It's really the big budget of the
                       European Union.

KATRINA SATAKI: Okay. Last question from Lise. Last question to Giovanni, not [last
                       question].

LISE FUHR: Hi. Lise Fuhr from .dk. Well, being in the same situation as you are, I'm
                       curious to hear if you think the letters of support that different

registries and registrars sent for you, it made a difference for the Commission or they just kind of didn't care?

GIOVANNI SEPPIA: It's a good question. I think that made a difference at the end. We had over 20 letters of support by our colleagues and about over 150 letters of support by our registrars. That indeed makes a difference when it comes to the evaluation criteria like consultation mechanism, how you engage with the international community, and with your stakeholder community.

I believe that made a difference. Again, we are very much grateful about the support we receive and we really felt it when we were going through the process.

KATRINA SATAKI: Thank you very much, Giovanni. Our next speaker is from .tn and .tunis. She will going to tell us about the ways they work to promote the two ccTLDs.

WAFA DAHMANI ZAAFOURI: Hello, everybody. I'm Wafa Dahmani from ATI. I'm from Tunisia. I'm head of Internet Resources Department in ATI. I'm very pleased to be with you here today. But at first I would like to thank the ccNSO Council for giving me the opportunity to speak about our .tn ccTLD and share with you our experience in IDN ccTLDs.

For those who don't know Tunisia, Tunisia is in North Africa. It's a little country. We are 12 million people. I'm please to invite you to visit Tunisia and enjoy our beach and very beautiful [sand]. I will go on with my presentation.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: [off mic]

WAFA DAHMANI ZAAFOURI: [off mic]

I divide my speak into four parts. For the first part, I will have a little introduction. Then, I will speak about the [formal] regulations and the registration process. After that, I will detail our technical and administrative reforms. At the end, of course, I will conclude.

ATI is the technical registry in Tunisia. We are also the only Internet exchange in North Africa. We also work as the public ISP in Tunisia for the government and public societies. Our .tn was delegated to ATI in 1996. Our IDN .tunis was delegated to ATI in 2010.

As follows, you can see how are the .tn is structured. You can have your domain name directly under .tn, but it was allowed only for ministries and national projects, ISPs. There were many restriction directly under the .tn.

We have the other [inaudible] domain names, I will mention, for example, .rnu for the university community. We had also .info for

newspapers and .org for organization. Of course, .gov for the government.

Our previous regulation defines ATI as technical registry and INT as a regulator. We began before the regulator. There was the Telecom Code in 2001 that defines the INT as a regulator.

The validation of .tn domain names were as follows: if you wanted the domain directly under .tn, it will be validated by the regulator. If you want the domain name under second-level domain, it will be validated by ATI.

This was the formal registration process. As you can see, it's a very complicated one. I'm really sorry for the registrants here. He seems so sad. We had to ask for his domain name from one of our ISPs. The ISP verifies the documents. He has also to provide many documents.

The ISP [will] transfer the application to ATI. ATI re-verifies the application. If it's a second-level domain, it will be under .tn, it will be validated and activated in our DNSes by ATI. If it is a domain name directly under .tn, the work will be done by the regulator, and then notifies ATI and ATI will know if it's accepted or rejected.

Of course, this procedure has many limits. There are many delay of registration caused by ISPs. The registrants have to provide many documents. The validation can take 24 hours. It was normally 24 hours in ATI but it can takes one week if the application is missing some documents.

If it's no domain name directly under .tn, it will takes about three working days. Of course, this obviously clear that we need to change the laws and make it administrative and technically for [us], we can't none of the work as follows.

These were the two main Ministry decisions made to boost our .tn. The first one defines the domain name structures. We are no longer speaking about domain name under .tn and the second-level .tn name, we speaks now of .tnn domain names.

This decisions defines also the registration procedure and the dispute resolution procedure and the registry accreditation procedures.

The second sets the domain names registration maximum fees.

This is the actual registration process. It isn't that we want to reach, but there was some problems. Now we have registrant, registry, and registrar – sorry, registrant, registrar, and registry model. We have the regulator.

The registrant is more happy here. He can ask directly to the one of our registrars. The registrar will validate and verify the documents. He will have also delegation of the domain name by ATI.

The regulator have only to do regulatory works. He has to establish the registry/registrar agreements, the dispute resolutions, and ATI has agreement with the regulator to technically manage the .tn domain names.

Normally, we should have today our online registration with the registrars, but since we are still waiting for our [registrars] to establish

their website [versus], to test our website if it's already developed in ATI.

We should normally have since 2012 our online and payment registration in our [registrars]. But unhappily, this didn't happen. We have now 19 registrars but we are testing the platform with only two, who will soon perhaps launch their online and payment registration.

This slide sums ups all the reforms and administrative and technical reforms that we have done. In fact, in July 2010, we totally liberalized .tn ccTLD and we have established our first naming charter.

In May 2011, there was a first reform through a public consultation. We reviewed our naming charter. We legalized the activity of registrar.

We [liberalized] .tn into three sunrise periods, from February 2012. In May 2012, there was a second reform. Of course, there were public consultation where all this Internet Society and so Internet community in Tunisia were involved.

We have set up our first arbitration guide in 2012. We also liberized our IDN, .tunis, in 2012. There was also another third reform for the two-letter and character codes at the second level and also for the special characters.

These are the details of all the reforms. Sorry, but it doesn't appear clearly here. The first reform was about the naming charter. There was no a priori control of the documents. The registrants has only to give correct administrative and technical contacts.

There was also the removal of the list of banned and reserved words. Thank you. We introduced the arbitration for dispute resolution.

The second reform was about the registry/registrar agreement. It was approved and the approved of the first arbitration guide.

The third reform were the two-letter character and special characters were at the second level were allowed. We reduced the minimum capital required for registrars and the wholesale retail prices. We have also revised the arbitrations fees.

This slide sums up what you have to do to become a ccTLD registrar in Tunisia. The possibility is given to any natural and legal person established in Tunisia, according to the Tunisian law and specialized in the registration of Internet domain names.

For financial condition, you have only to provide 100,000 dinar, which is about $65,000, the minimum of capital of 20,000 dinars, which is about $12,000.

Also, you have some security [inquiries]. You have to perform at least one full external security audit per year. You have to give a good quality of service and sufficient and reasonable technical skills and means.

Registrars have some opportunities and challenges that I think goes together because they have to provide professional services, packages, offers with when you offer domain name with hosting and other services.

They have to provide their online sales, which is not the case today. We are really waiting for them to establish their online sales. I think this somehow hinders the development of domain names in Tunisia.

Of course, this allows the development of a local business and reinforce the national identity, create added value, and enhance the local commercial competitivity.

I'm not going to detail too much for the arbitration procedure. These are the steps that should be taken when there's a dispute. It's the work of our regulator. But all what I want to say is that it takes at most two months, plus five days, but the decision, you will have a decision after two months of your complaint. These issues are well detailed in the website of our regulator.

As you can see here, we can clearly see the impact of our reforms [done] from 2010 until 2013. The number has considerably increased but it isn't really what we wished to reach. Okay.

These are the number of our IDN .tunis registration per registrar. We think we have to focus with them. It's not really encouraging, but we have to focus with them on how to boost our IDN.

These are the domain name status evolution. In green, you have the maximum retail tariff. In purple, you have in the average retail tariff for registrar. You have in red and blue the registry and the regulatory fees. As you can see, it's not expensive to have a .tn domain name in Tunisia.

This, as you can see, we have made many decision in order to boost our .tn and our IDN. You can find all these in our regulator website. I will conclude.

All I want to say that despite all the regulative framework updates and the reforms that we have done, we didn't reach our goals. We expected to have 15,000 .tn domain names in 2012. It isn't the case. We think that what happened in Tunisia in 2011, the revolution has somehow hindered the development of the domain names – people who are focusing on politics and economic issues.

We have also to push our registrar to promote the .tn, because they're not still now doing their work well. They have to give their online registration, good [market], have to go they give many services and packages offers.

I want to say what are we are seeking for after, behind all this, is to have a really an interest in Tunisian content. We hope that one day we will speak about domain industry in Tunisia. You can find more information in these websites. Thank you for your attention.

KATRINA SATAKI: Thank you very much. Are there any questions? I just loved how you said that "small country, only 12 million." I come from a country with only two million. Giovanni, please.

GIOVANNI SEPPIA: Thank you so much for the interesting presentation. Just like to ask you one. There was a chart with the registration growth over the time, the

years. I would like to ask if you if that chart was aggregating the .tn and the IDN version data, or just .tn?

WAFA DAHMANI ZAAFOURI: It's [updated] to .tn and our IDN domain names.

GIOVANNI SEPPIA: Can I ask you, what's the percentage of the total that are IDNs?

WAFA DAHMANI ZAAFOURI: We have 325 IDN domain names. Also, we have 218 2-character second-level domain names and 80 special characters domain names.

KATRINA SATAKI: Any other questions?

Now, I have a question. You said that you did not reach the goal. What do you think were the main obstacles, main mistakes, perhaps, you made during the plans?

WAFA DAHMANI ZAAFOURI: As I said before, there were the revolution that somehow have hindered the evolution process.

I'm sure that registrars are not doing their work well, because it's a matter of registrars, not registry, now. They have to do their marketing strategy. They have to boost, to sell .tn domain names. I think it's the matter of registrars more than other thing.

KATRINA SATAKI: Yes, [inaudible].

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: Hi. Thank you. Have you engaged with the – I think it's North African/Middle East ICANN Strategy Team – to develop? Because I see that some of the problems might be interesting to incorporate into this ICANN regional strategy for your region.

WAFA DAHMANI ZAAFOURI: Unfortunately, no.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: Maybe it will be a good opportunity to –

WAFA DAHMANI ZAAFOURI: Yes, yes.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: – engage with them and seek help –

WAFA DAHMANI ZAAFOURI: Yes, thank you.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: - because it looks more like a context [inaudible].

WAFA DAHMANI ZAAFOURI: It's a good recommendation, thank you.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: You're very welcome.

KATRINA SATAKI: Yes, one more question.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: Thank you. I just wanted to make a quick comment that in my opinion, it's the obligation or the job of the registry to create the demand and then for the registrar to offer those extensions. Because you mentioned for IDNs, now, it is the job of the registrars to market the TLDs [inaudible].

I think it's probably a good example would be Coca-Cola. Coca-Cola is the registry. They create the demand for the product. All the supermarkets out there, they offer it. For us, it's – we can't market and create the demand for every single extensions out there.

In my opinion, it's definitely the registry – you need to create the demand for the domain names, for the extension. Thank you.

WAFA DAHMANI ZAAFOURI: Thank you.

KATRINA SATAKI: Yes, thank you very much, let's thank [inaudible]. The next speaker, Michiel from .nl. If you remember, two years ago in Prague, he gave a very interesting presentation about the survey run by SIDN. So now, another interesting survey.

MICHIEL HENNEKE: Thank you, Katrina. And now, for something completely different. My name is Michiel Henneke, Marketing Manager for SIDN, the registry behind the .nl domain.

My presentation is about the market position of your ccTLD – [inaudible], yeah, whew – ccTLD and why it is very relevant today. I'm going to be talking about a study that we did for the position of .nl in the Dutch market.

There's an awful lot I could tell you about that, but as interesting as the Dutch market is, I'm mainly going to focus on why we choose to investigate our position now, how we, as a ccTLD registry, went about it, and what you can learn from that for your ccTLD.

First of all, to start with, what is the position of .nl? On the surface of it, it is excellent. We have a domain count of 5.477 million registered domain names to date in a country where barely 17 million people live. That's a really high penetration rate.

If you go to the market share that we have in the market, we have 73%. This percentage has been stable for the last five, six years and has even been slightly increasing.

Why should we look into our positioning? Because if I were to describing our position right now, it would look like something this: strong. If anybody says, "I'm a threat to your position," my reaction would be something like this: "Sure, you will."

Why did we decide to look at the perceived position? Because we are talking about the position of .nl and the perception of the Dutch Internet user here.

Basically, two reasons. Both of these may seem familiar to you. We are in a market where the growth is slowing off – a market that's slowly reaching maturity. That's global. It's global, it's in Western Europe and Netherlands is no exception. At the same time, we see that there are more competitors entering the market in the form of new gTLDs.

We feel that – no, no, no, no. Sorry. I'll just keep my left hand in my pocket, here.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: Exactly. I don't understand your [inaudible].

MICHIEL HENNEKE: I feel that knowing what distinguishes your ccTLD is going to be very important in years to come. Of course, this begs the question, "Well, don't you know this already?"

Let me put the question to you, in the audience: Who in this audience can explain what makes his ccTLD unique? Please raise your hand if you

do. Only one? I'm not actually going to ask you, so don't be afraid. Oh, great. Thank you, David.

No. Well, very few people. The fact is that the reason many people don't actually know this is because a lot of TLDs in the current market sell themselves.

If you go to the site of your biggest registrar and look for the answer to the question, "Why should I register this ccTLD?" chances are, you will not find it there – at least, I did that for all 25 of my largest registrars; we have 1,500. I didn't. Why? Because, well, it's an obvious choice: we're from the Netherlands, we choose .nl. So obvious, it's actually quite valueless.

Nevertheless, we set out to give it a bit more body, our image. We set up a survey with two main questions. How do Internet users really perceive .nl and other prominent TLDs in the market? How would they perceive – and this is an interesting addition – new TLDs if they were here?

We used an e-mail survey. We got over 1,000 respondents and – next slide, please. We had three degrees of questions, and I'll explain why.

For the ccTLD, one is not enough. The first and most obvious is, "What do you associate with" – then followed by the name of the extension – ".nl, .com, etc.? What is your first association? What comes to mind?"

Then you ask, "Okay, listen, here's a value. Do you associate .nl or .com with this particular value?" It's more of a leading question, so it's scientifically less [responsible].

Then, the third one: "If you have to choose between extension, which would you prefer?" That's the most interesting one.

What we did is that we asked these questions and mixed existing and not-yet existing TLDs. In retrospect, we could have even used completely imaginary TLDs that don't exist and that haven't been applied for, either, but the point of the exercise was to see what could happen.

Now, to start with the first question – next slide please. The problem with studying the position of your ccTLD is that it can be pretty generic to the average user. It's no surprise.

You have a very broad user base in your home country. Companies often, if you allow it, consumers, small companies, big companies, not-for-profit, for-profit, they use it for different purposes. Perception of a TLD is a very generic, broad thing.

This is an English translation of the Wordle that we compiled from the answer to the question, "With what do you associate .nl?"

What struck me immediately when I first saw this is it doesn't really contain any values, any specific image. Yeah, it's the Netherlands, of course – figures. But nothing like good or bad or anything you can attack a value to: reliable, consistent, cheap, expensive. It's not here.

Basically, .nl seems to be almost synonymous with the Internet in the Netherlands – which in itself isn't bad, but what is it that really triggers people? It makes you wonder.

We went to step two. We formulated a number of values that we thought were fitting or less fitting for .nl, feasible or less feasible. We then asked people, "Okay, do you associate .nl with this particular value?"

The result was, well, spot-on, in terms that the highest associations were with those values that we think are most fitting for .nl and one we considered less feasible – doesn't mean they're bad, we just think they're not really the .nl values – were ranked lower. They didn't have that association from respondents.

As the agency, with its survey, stated quite briefly and quite well: "I've never seen a company where the desired image fits the perceived image so well." That was good news.

Then we added the associations with some other TLDs. I have an example here, which compared the perceived associations for .nl with the perceived associations of an existing and a new gTLD – existing .com and .amsterdam, which we'll probably be seeing by the end of this year, beginning of 2015.

By the way, we at no point told the respondents filling in the survey that they were talking about a non-existing TLD. We just presented them as one.

Now, .com has a very strong position when it comes to business and global – even more so than we expected. Multinational companies, for example, even if they originate in the Netherlands, like Philips, the electronics company – when asked, people say, "Well, I associate that more with .com than with .nl."

But that's a clear difference, a clear distinction, from the position that .nl itself has. The Netherlands, .com is global. We can live with that.

What we did find – and we had from over 1,000 respondents – there were about 100 to 200 who lived in the greater Amsterdam area. Quite a lot of them felt familiar – which is strange for something that doesn't exist yet – with .amsterdam. Close by, local.

This is interesting because it tells you something about where a local geo-TLD or city TLD could affect a position of your ccTLD.

This was interesting, as well, but actually the third one, the third degree of questions we had, was the most interesting – the multiple choice. Let me just explain this. This is my most important recommendation: if you ever want to do a positioning survey yourself, use these, multiple choice.

It's easy to say, "Yes, I associate this domain with –" sure. I can say that. I mean, if I fill in the survey, I can say that. But if people are forced to choose – if they really have to choose, where do they go?

What we did is this: we compiled a number of questions, 20 in total, based on certain values and themes. In this case, it's e-commerce and the value cheap, value for money.

We then asked multiple-choice questions, saying, "Okay, where would you go for –" put them a number of options. The options were always the same, but the order in which we presented the options were randomized per respondent. Some respondents saw the options with

.com on top, but others with .nl on top or .org – this in order to prevent that from influencing the outcome.

It gave us quite an interesting picture – because here, again, we didn't tell respondents if they were dealing with existing or non-existing TLDs – about their perception.

Now, question here: Who in this audience thinks that .nl is the most given response in answer to this question? Oh, you're right. That's true. Who thinks .com is second? Okay, that's wrong. Next slide, please.

This was what one of the questions that surprise us – there were more, but I'm just showing it as an example: .shop, a non-existing new gTLD which is, I think, intended and up for auction somewhere in May 2015 – it's a year from now – outclassed .com here. That's surprising.

None of those respondents can ever have visited a .shop. They couldn't have heard about it. There's no publicity about it. Nevertheless, they had no problem whatsoever going there. That was our takeaway. Next slide, please.

Basically, what we got out of this, as IDN is, it confirmed the perceived position, our desired image, for .nl. It also taught us that, well, new gTLDs may get adopted easier than expected. Users may get used to it easier than expected.

We definitely intend to use the outcome of this in our communication and share it with registrars. The last is very important.

What we always do with studies like this is we make an executive summary. It's available in Dutch and English. We publish it on registrar

website and send it to all the known marketeers that we have in the registrar channel. It really gets well received.

But what's your takeout? That's my last slide. I think, based on this, my own experience, learning more about the image of your TLD now, before those new competitors arrive, may be a very beneficial exercise.

But my advice is: remember your product, your service, is a very abstract and sometimes somewhat generic thing. You need to use multiple layers of questions to really get the in-depth results that you want.

Even if the position that you have in the market right now is very strong, my advice, based on what I've seen with users showing preference for some new gTLDs, is don't grow complacent. Even the strongest castle can turn into a ruin if you don't watch it. Thank you.

Of course, just to finish off, anybody wants to have a copy of this report, just send an e-mail to marketing@SIDN.nl and we'll provide you with a copy.

KATRINA SATAKI: Questions?

ANNEBETH LANGE: Hi, Michiel. Very good. Really interesting. Just a little comment. It could have been perhaps even more interesting if you had put dot-shoes. What would have happened then?

MICHIEL HENNEKE: Sometimes you hear ideas, you think, "Why didn't I think of them beforehand?" But yes, that's actually a very good one. Yes. You mean, the one if you go back two slides or three slides, yes, that one.

Yes, though you would have had to – that would have actually [been a] good idea, though I would have had to change the name of the second level, because shoes.shoes would have seemed silly.

But I would've had to use the brand of a well-known Dutch shoe store, or brand, or something like that. That would've worked. But, yeah, that's a great suggestion, Annebeth.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: I have really two questions. First, what is should be the word "shoes" be in Dutch?

MICHIEL HENNEKE: Schoenen.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: Okay. What if instead of "shoes," you put "schoenen"? Would that change? Because I think people would tend to think of impacting in one language. Would thinking Dutch change people's perceptions?

MICHIEL HENNEKE: Sorry if I wasn't clear on that. I've translated this.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: Ah, okay, okay.

MICHIEL HENNEKE: The original questions were asked in Dutch, of course.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: Right. Which would skew things towards NL. If you had asked question in English, it may have changed, right? Because most Dutch people do speak English.

MICHIEL HENNEKE: They do, but in this case, all the questions we asked –

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: Were in Dutch, okay.

MICHIEL HENNEKE: - were, if they were nouns, separate keywords, we used the Dutch term, a generic Dutch term.

We also used brand names, like, for example, "Where would you go for the website of Microsoft or Philips?" In that case, it doesn't matter what language you use. But generally, Dutch is the preference.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: Okay. My second question is maybe the one you didn't ask. How would you look for shoes without giving this? I think many people would say, "I would just type 'shoes' into Google." I know that question wasn't really asked here.

MICHIEL HENNEKE: That is an interesting thing. Of course, what you leave out of this is this is a two-dimensional study in the sense that it positions your TLD against other TLDs.

It would grow more complicated and I think you couldn't do it in a survey if you wanted to make them choose both between a domain name and a substitute for a domain name and, at the same time, between different extensions of a domain name.

Theoretically speaking, that would be the best way. Like, A. how would you go for shoes – online, offline? B. If you're online, okay, a Google, social media, or domain name? Okay, C. if it's a domain name, what extension would it be? That would be the most complete people.

The presentation Katrina mentioned, which I gave two years ago, was about exactly that – namely, the relationship between those different forms.

But combining them in one survey? I gave it some thought, but I ended up with the problem that it made the survey extremely complicated.

KATRINA SATAKI: Yes, thank you. And the last question, Eleanor.

ELEANOR BRADLEY: Thank you. That was very interesting. I've just wondered how or whether you would now try, having measured those attributes or those characteristics, whether you would now look to try to influence that? I recognize it's already very good, but would you and could you change this?

MICHIEL HENNEKE: I wouldn't change our position, but that's a very interesting discussion I had with a number of other registries already. If you have an existing position which is relatively strong and you see that there's competition coming at you and that growth is slowing down, I would not recommend changing your position unless you have a very good reason to do so.

I would mainly invest in strengthening your position by making sure that in your communications – more importantly, when we're talking about registration, the communications by your registrars – the values that you now have, that people associate with you, are communicated more strongly than ever.

But changing your position is a very risky thing because it means you try to attach new values to your TLD. You may, in the process, lose existing values or associations.

Whether the net result will actually pay off? I would only do that if there was a really urgent reason for me to do so. I haven't seen any one from this survey.

KATRINA SATAKI: Thank you very much. The next presentation of this session is, again, about the survey, this time from .au and a bit security-related this time.

JO LIM: Thank you, Katrina. Thanks to all the speakers so far. It's been really interesting. Hopefully I can keep that going for just a little bit longer before we end this session. Slides coming up? Yes.

Yes, as Katrina mentioned, I'd like to speak to you today about a couple of recent developments in .au, one being a survey that we have run, which overlaps quite well with your survey.

Secondly, I'd like to talk to you about a security standard that we have introduced for our accredited registrars as a mandatory requirement of accreditation.

All right, I'll just run ahead. Okay, so before I start, though, I just wanted to give you a little snapshot of auDA and the .au domain, because not all of you may be familiar. I hope you all know where Australia is – we're at the bottom of the world.

auDA is a membership-based, not-for-profit organization. We're not a government agency, although we do have the Australian government's endorsement to be the administrator of the .au domain space. We have a board of 11 directors and we have 13 staff, so we're quite a small organization. There we go. [inaudible]

We currently have 2.85 million domain names registered under our second level, so we don't allow direct registrations under .au. That's not bad, given we have a population of around 24 million.

Our registry services at the second-level domain are provided by a company called AusRegistry, who some of you may be familiar with – or ARI services, they call themselves, too.

We have 43 accredited registrars in our market and around 4,500 resellers also selling .au domain names at the moment.

This year, we have just completed a survey understanding the Australian Internet user, which is follow-up to a benchmark survey that we conducted last year. There was a representative from AusRegistry at the Buenos Aires meeting last year who presented the results of that survey.

Our intention, similar to .nl, was to start doing some market research around .au and what users think of it in preparation for new gTLDs coming in and possibly changing our market.

This year, we ran a smaller version, an abridged version of this survey. It ran for one month, in March and April. Our methodology was a slide-up survey, which went out on 208 general websites, our website, and the AusRegistry website.

We got some responses from the general public or the general Internet user and also the industry user – so people who are already familiar with auDA and AusRegistry.

We collected just over 3,000 responses. As you can see, we got many more responses from the general network. But in terms of the female/male split, it was pretty much 50/50.

What we found – some key findings: pleasingly, we saw an increase in overall domain holding from last year to this year. Similar to other ccTLDs here, we have been experiencing a slowing growth rate in .au – say, five years ago, we were experiencing around 20% annual growth; our forecast for the coming year is more like 3%. That's a pretty dramatic reduction, but this survey suggests that it's not all doom and gloom.

In the general network, those who had previously said that they did not hold a domain name at all, that proportion reduced. We can see that more people are starting to register domain names. Importantly for us, more respondents are adding .au to their portfolio.

One thing we noted there is an increase in the number of women holding domains from last year to this year. That's quite substantial: 13% to 19% and 53% to 57%. We've speculated as to the reasons for this, but given that we're pressed for time, I won't go into them.

This graph just illustrates those points – the overall domain holding between industry network and general network respondents and female/male.

We also asked some questions around regulation and the registration process for .au. We found that more respondents this time around believe that regulation of the .au space is about right. This time around, fewer respondents believe that there was too much regulation, which

again, is a nice finding for us and certainly validates the work that auDA has been doing.

Similarly, this time around, the registration process for .au domain names was perceived as easier. Again, these graphs just illustrate those points.

We also asked questions around security. This, I think, was the most important finding coming out of these results. There are high levels of security mindfulness among Australian Internet users.

Pleasingly, only 2% of respondents said that they don't worry about online security at all. Around two-thirds are more likely to provide accurate personal information, including credit card details, to a secure website. Again, two-thirds are more likely to trust a website ending in .au. Those were some good results for us.

This illustrates that question, so you can see there, the "I don't worry about security online" is very low. Pleasingly, people also weren't taken in by the "It looks professional" or, "A friend has vouched for the website." People were more likely to look for it being a secure site or an organization they trust or using their security software to help them make that decision.

Here, this is about zone preference for security purposes. Again, you can see the preference among the respondents was very much for .au, .com coming second by a longshot. We threw in there a false TLD, .te. We were pleased that people largely ignored that. That was quite good.

Now, I think there has been distributed on the tables copies of the report and also an infographic that we produced. This is just a copy of that infographic with some pictures and colors, but that basically goes to illustrate what I've been just talking about.

Some things there, in terms of the reasons why Australians choose .au: we see that most respondents said things like, "It best represents Australian organizations," or, "It's the most popular domain type in Australia." Then, "regulated or trusted" was also a top reason for people choosing to register .au.

We also saw that the majority of .au domains are used as business websites. com.au, which is our business second-level domain that accounts for around 85% to 90% of our registrations and has done historically. That doesn't change for us.

Okay, so moving on to the second thing that I wanted to talk to you about, which picks up a bit on the security aspect and the attention that we're giving that at the moment.

We have introduced an information security standard for our accredited registrars, which, as I mentioned, we've now made a mandatory requirement of accreditation.

You may be asking why we've done that. We believed – until I saw the Tunisian presentation just before – that we were only ccTLD that had security requirements on their registrars.

The genesis for us was a couple of high-profile security incidents that occurred in the .au domain space a few years ago.

One of them resulted in our deciding to terminate a registrar's accreditation, not because they had experienced this security incident, but because one, they failed to notify us, which they are required to do under their contract with us, and two, they failed to take appropriate action to address this security issue, so we terminated their accreditation.

The second one was quite a sad case. One of our registrars was hacked. That resulted in the loss of their business. They just couldn't recover from it and they had to sell out of their business. That caused a huge upheaval in .au at the time.

After that happened, we held consultations with our registrars. The overwhelming feedback was that our registrars were looking to auDA to do something about security.

They all recognized that it wasn't just the registrar who was hacked that suffered – it was an industry-wide experience, as consumers and registrants were confused about what had happened and were turning to other registrars to try and help them out. It really affected the entire industry.

We did some consultations and we ended up coming to the assumption that the current security practices of most of our registrars were deficient. This was not a criticism. This is an observation.

We recognize that there are high compliance and audit costs involved. Many registrars, particularly our smaller registrars, just lacked in-house knowledge and experience of how to apply security practices properly.

We had a couple of objectives going into this. Our first was to assist registrars to manage and improve the security of their own businesses and to try and develop a security culture among registrars, and secondly, to protect .au registrants and the overall integrity and stability of the .au domain. Those were our guiding principles.

The development took over 12 months. It was a very length process. We started off with a group of registrars who volunteered to be part of a drafting committee. They put together the first draft of the standard.

That then got handed over to an industry panel, which was a much broader stakeholder group, which included resellers, consumers, government, law enforcement, and so on.

We consulted with all of our registrars individually. Aside from those that had volunteered to be part of the process, we also reached out to all of our registrars to make sure that they understood what was happening and that they had an opportunity to provide input to the process. Plus, we went through two rounds of public consultation, as well.

Through all of that, the result was universal support for a mandatory security standard in .au.

What is the ISS? It contains 15 security controls. It's aligned to international standards, ISO 27001 and PCI DSS, which many of our registrars already met or were in the process of meeting.

It's flexible. We recognize that there are different registrar models – retail, wholesale, a combination of both. Registrars also provide other

services, such as hosting and so on, so it's designed to allow the registrar to scope their registrar operation separate from any other operations they may have. The ISS only applies to that part of their business.

It's also risk-based. Registrars are required to do their own risk assessment and select the appropriate security controls that the standard outlines. It's possible for a registrar to say, "Security control number 12," for example, "doesn't apply to my business," for whatever reason. It's then up to the assessor to determine whether that's an appropriate response or not.

AuDA has appointed a single assessor to provide all of the assessment services for registrars. The process is a self-assessment by the registrar on an online portal. Once that's done, there will be an on-site assessment by our appointed assessor.

Compliance is then signed off by an ISS committee. It's not the assessor who actually makes the final decision to certify a registrar. That report then goes to an independent committee. Compliance is valid for three years.

Importantly, all of these are being borne by auDA, apart from what a registrar needs to spend in order to meet the standard internally. But the assessment process and all of this overhead is being met by auDA.

We introduced this last year in October. From that date, any new applicants for registrar accreditation must be ISS compliant before they are granted a full accreditation. We've now built the ISS into our provisional accreditation process.

Existing registrars, as of October last year, have to be ISS compliant within 24 months of that introduction, so by October 2015. Non-compliant registrars at that date may have their accreditation suspended and ultimately terminated.

So far, we have six registrars who have met ISS compliance. They have provided positive feedback about the benefits to their business. But, obviously, if you remember I told you before, we have 43 registrars in our market. So far, we've only managed to get six across the line. We have a lot of work ahead of us before October 2015.

That concludes my presentation. Thank you.

KATRINA SATAKI: Thank you very much. Are there any questions in the audience? Yes, Danny.

DANNY AERTS: Hi. Danny Aerts from .se, Sweden. Could you give me some indication of the cost per registrar you have?

JO LIM: Yes. The cost of an on-site assessment per registrar is around $12,000 AUD. That, though, doesn't include the overheads of providing the portal and running that, so it's probably closer to $15,000 per registrar.

KATRINA SATAKI:	Thank you very much. I'd like to thank our panelists, Eleanor, Giovanni, Wafa, Michiel, and Jo, for stepping up and telling us more about their news. Thank you very much.
	I have to apologize to Chris – we're a bit late. I hope you have time.
	I'd like to invite our regional organizations to take the stage and give their updates, if you're ready. Presentations are being uploaded. I would really appreciate if you'll be brief.
KATRINA SATAKI:	[off mic] We'll start with Don.
DON HOLLANDER:	My name is Don Hollander, I'm the general manager of APTLD. I'll be very brief. This is very much what we talked about in Singapore. These are our plans for the year.
	Already this year, we have produced a report on Anycast, which includes a list of Anycast providers. This is on our website or if you ask for it, I'll be happy to send it to you. We've also recently released a report on models for introducing new services and potential new services that ccTLDs will produce.
	We have in the pipeline a registrar accreditation criteria report, registry solutions, and DNS best practices.
	The topics for our various meetings, we have a DNSSEC deployment, a layman's guide. That's planned for Delhi at the beginning of August, as is

a justice sector engagement. We'll provide that also in Brisbane, very much along the lines of what Dave Piscitello talked about yesterday. Security for registry and registrants, we talked about that in Malaysia.

IDNs, universal acceptance and deployment – we had a very good session on that in Oman in May, where we had a couple of people from Google, somebody from Microsoft, and from some of the ccTLDs that run IDNs.

The question was, is universal acceptance a barrier to adoption of IDN ccTLDs or is it an excuse for the lack of adoption? The answer was yes, but there is enough tools that allow people to make use of them, but there's still a need for broader acceptance.

This is our plan for the year. We had a meeting in Malaysia, meeting in Oman, workshops in India in August, and a meeting in Brisbane in September, where we will talk about the NTIA transition in detail, as well as the FOI Working Group.

That should be very interesting and I encourage everybody to come to Brisbane – if not for the weather, then the content of our meeting. Thank you.

KATRINA SATAKI: Thank you, Don. The next presentation? No, no, no, wait a minute, we'll see who.

MARY UDUMA: Thank you and good afternoon, everyone. I'm not the manager of AfTLD. I'm one of the board members. My name is Mary Uduma. I'm just doing this on behalf of Barrack, who was unable to be here due to some visa issues.

But quickly, what we have is the highlights of what has happened since the last meeting. We successfully organized the Advanced Registry Operators Course in Djibouti and participated in the African Internet Summit from 26th to 30th of May 2014.

We are doing the observatory of ccTLDs in our region so that we can have clear, strong figures and confirm figures of what we really have in the region. This project has been supported by Internet Society and ICANN. There's been a lot of [inaudible] on DNSSEC in the region as well, which we are grateful to ICANN for.

Our flagship is the 2014 African Domain Name System Forum that we'll be holding 7th to the 9th of July 2014. I've approached some of you here to support us, and when I know that we'll have some support to the AfTLD so that members of the ccs in that region will be able to attend.

What we are looking at is monetizing the ccs in the region, because some of the ccs are being managed by government and they don't see it as a business. We're trying to see how we can stimulate the business sense in the domain name industry in our region.

That's what we'll be looking at for 2014. Also, to our [inaudible] general meeting. The DNS Forum is being support by Internet Society, is being hosted by NiRA, my cc registry – that is, Nigerian Internet Registration

Association, the managers of .ng – and is being supported in collaboration with Internet Society as well as ICANN.

We're grateful for those that have accepted to support us. We are expecting more support. Those that want to come to share with us would, like everybody – anybody that is chanced to be able to be in Abuja from the 7th to the 9th of July to attend the DNS Forum.

I think that's all I have for now. The other thing is just information. It's not necessary. Thank you.

KATRINA SATAKI: Thank you very much.

PETER VAN ROSTE: Hi, everyone. My name is Peter, I'm the General Manager for CENTR. In the two-minute slots that we have, it's impossible to do justice to the work of the CENTR members and the secretariat. The same goes for the other regional organizations, of course. But let me have at try.

Just highlighting some key points and a follow-up on something that I promised you last session. Last time, I told you that we were launching a – well, potentially launching – a project on registrar authentication and identification. In order to support that and to see where were going, we launched a survey. I'll share some details on the next slide.

The other big chunk of work is on Internet governance. We have published a paper that provides some backgrounds on IANA. That was

EN

quite recently. I circulated it to the list yesterday. Feel free to comment on that. We'd be very interested in your thoughts.

We also published, together with CIRA, a paper on the impact on the Internet governance landscape of the ITU. Links are available on our site and via this presentation.

Together with the other regional organizations, we are organizing a workshop at IGF, which looks at ccTLDs and how they are a crucial partner in developing local Internet governance literacy, so how the ccTLD is your step-stone to participation in the more global debate, as well.

Obviously, you're all very welcome to participate in that workshop. If anybody of you has papers that could be part of the contribution that we provide to the Internet Governance Forum, feel free to contact us.

I mentioned the registrar survey that we did. What was the goal of that? It was to find out how registrars felt about the current authentication and identification systems and whether there was a need for ccTLDs to look into a joint platform, joint mechanisms, a common approach.

We received 91 responses. We do realize that this only covers a fraction of the registrars out there, but at least it gives us an indication of what they would be expecting from our community. I think it's a nice follow-up from the panel discussion that we had this morning. It fits in quite nicely.

The results of that survey will be analyzed. It just closed last Friday. Results will be analyzed in the coming weeks. They will be shared and will be available for those interested.

But one thing that I think already jumps out from the preliminary results that we saw from that data is that most registrars will keep on preferring user ID and passwords over much more secure authentication and identification systems because of the user-friendliness of those methods.

We have much more details, but time does not allow me to go any further. But as I mentioned, in a week's time, two weeks' time, the report will be available. If you're interested, contact me. That's it. Thank you.

KATRINA SATAKI: Thank you, Peter.

CAROLINA AGUERRE: Okay. I'm Carolina Aguerre from LACTLD and I will be providing a really, really short update on our recent work. Some of it has already been highlighted by my colleagues before, so I'll be really, really brief.

Just wanted to let you know we had elections last month – board elections. Victor Abboud and Clara Collado have been renewed in the positions for another three years.

In the past months, we have been heavily involved in the NTIA stewardship over IANA functions. Basically, we've been covering this in our meeting in Cancún.

We are still following up this thing we mentioned during the last meeting in Singapore, where we are organizing webinars for our members. We did hold a webinar, one in Spanish and one in English, on April 11th about what the transition means. We really need to get our community involved and very much on-track on what this implies for them. We also worked on this jointly at the meeting in Mexico, Cancún.

What are we actually doing and working? And it is really, it's very much what you've heard in other ccNSO comments from Byron –trying to really engage in these issues that really take up a lot of our time.

We are involved in several Internet Governance Forums as well –that I will develop in my last slide – and the regional Anycast cloud project, which we've already been mentioning, is taking shape and will take its final form now during the second semester. That's why it's still on for future projects.

We are part of the program committee of the regional IGF in El Salvador. Please engage and please disseminate. Even though it's a regional event, everyone is welcome to participate and join.

This is the rest of the meetings and agenda that we have for our work. I'm really, really trying to be brief because I know we have unprecedented talk now, but any comments, feedback, whatever, this presentation will be there, so you can ask me. Thank you.

KATRINA SATAKI: Thank you very much. I really appreciate your briefness. I really understand it's hard to do justice to the work done by regional organizations in such a short timeframe. Thank you very much. Chris and Mike.

BYRON HOLLAND: While Chris and Mike are making their way up here, I just want to remind everybody that we have a very important session after lunch, starting at 2:00.

It has been necessarily vague in the agenda due to the fluid nature of the topic, which is around the Coordinating Committee and how we as a community are going to select people to be on the Coordinating Committee and the various other work streams.

This session will be very dynamic and critical to giving us a sense of, as a community, how we're going to select the people to be on the Coordinating Committee and what we're going to be looking for. Your input is critical here.

This is your chance to be involved in how we select the Selection Committee and what we're looking for in our Coordinating Committee members. Please be ready to voice your opinion on that, back here at 2:00, after we have Mike and Chris. Welcome, gentlemen.

CHRIS DISSPAIN: Thanks, Byron. Afternoon, everybody. Thanks for sticking around. We're here to really answer any questions that you have or talk about anything that you particularly want to talk about. I know you've got a number of things running right now, so maybe we should just let you tell us what you want to hear, unless no one has anything to say, in which case, we can all go for lunch.

MIKE SILBER: Chris, can I maybe just jump in there? Just to remind people, Chris and I are the ccNSO appointees to the Board, obviously. As a ccNSO appointee, we are not there to represent the ccNSO, but rather, we bring a background and a perspective from the ccNSO. We also provide a useful channel for input from the ccNSO, so if there are any concerns or questions, we can raise them in the Board.

What it does mean is that if it comes down to the vote, we have to vote our conscience and the best interests of the organization, rather than receiving voting instructions from the ccNSO. At the same time, I think it's a very useful conduit.

What we need to know though is what are your views firstly? Secondly, are there questions, concerns, instructions, requests? Because it'll be very useful and we can act as an additional filter besides for the formal writing of letters and submitting of comments.

We can provide a useful filter-through of some of the feelings of this community into the Board and making the rest of the community more aware of them.

This is really to try and gather that. Tell us what's bugging you. Tell us what's irking you. It's really helpful for us to understand where the temperatures are and where the friction is so we can raise it.

CHRIS DISSPAIN: I can see Keith laughing in the background there. Sure. You're on.

BYRON HOLLAND: Hi, guys. Thanks for joining us. Maybe while others are formulating their questions, I'll just ask to get a temperature take from you on what you're hearing about the current process around the Steering Committee, interactions that the Board's had with the GAC or GNSO – just a temperature take of the community and the issues that you're seeing arising that might pertain to us or that we should be aware of.

CHRIS DISSPAIN: Thank you, Byron. On accountability and the stewardship transition, I think, as everybody knows, there are two sessions tomorrow – two public forum sessions tomorrow – on those two pieces. I think that will be an excellent opportunity for everyone to hear from everyone. I suspect that that's at least part of the issue.

I want to acknowledge that some of the things that have been in the documents could perhaps have been better put. Speaking personally, I think that you won't be surprised that everyone's stress levels are fairly high.

We had a huge amount on our plate before we suddenly had to deal with this transition and accountability. That's added to it. I think, to some extent, the stress levels have led to perhaps responses that may not be the most helpful.

Very specifically, I know that the ccNSO has expressed concern about the apparent top-down process, in respect to the accountability piece.

I want to make it absolutely clear that irrespective of what interpretation you may quite justifiably put on the words in the document, it genuinely is the case that it is not set in stone that there would be a working group. We think it's probably the logical way to do it, but we really are genuinely open to other ideas of doing it.

I also want to make it perfectly clear that if we do end up with a working group, a coordination group, whatever it is we're supposed to be calling it this week, it's not intended that that working group committee would actually be the final arbiter of what comes.

Rather, their job would be to coordinate and to produce a document at the end of the day that would then be open and subject to community input.

On the IANA side of things, I wanted to make a very specific point, which is that – [and] I've said this to some of you personally – I think there's a little bit of confusion in the community, generally –perhaps not so much the ccs but in the community generally –about accountability.

My view is that the IANA side is about the ccNSO coming up with an acceptable solution to the transition of the U.S. stewardship of IANA. That includes accountability mechanisms for that process itself.

The accountability piece – the bigger piece over on the other side, if you like – that we've set up is actually about ICANN's accountability generally.

A couple of people have said to me, "I'm very concerned that this accountability one will come up with a series of accountability mechanisms that would overarch the IANA process for ccTLDs." That is not the intention.

The intention is that each of the customers of IANA creates their own scheme that covers the way that, in our case, delegations, redelegations are dealt with, including its own accountability mechanisms. I think that's very important to remember.

I'm going to stop for now and see if anybody has anything that they want to say or Mike wants to add anything.

BYRON HOLLAND: Any questions for Chris or Mike?

BECKY BURR: Thanks. Becky Burr, .us. Can you see me? Can you hear me?

CHRIS DISSPAIN: Yes, Becky.

BECKY BURR: Just on that last piece, Chris. I understand what you're saying about accountability for the IANA pieces, the IANA function.

But there's this kind of funny overlay which is that, for example, if there was to be a change to current policy, i.e., RFC 1591, that would go through a ccNSO PDP. So there is – right? Then that would have some ICANN accountability.

CHRIS DISSPAIN: Absolutely. Yes, yes. I'm not suggesting that what happens within the ICANN model isn't subject to that ICANN accountability. It is. Obviously, we all need to make sure that from our point of view, that's acceptable. But the discrete piece of IANA that we're talking about would be a separate issue.

BECKY BURR: Right, so [SLAs] and that kind of thing. Got it.

CHRIS DISSPAIN: Yes, yes. No one is suggesting that, for example – at least, I'm not suggesting – that an accountability mechanism set up in ICANN, which is community-wide accountability, would be the right one to be used by .au in respects to a redelegation. Those two things are different, I think.

BECKY BURR: Got it.

CHRIS DISSPAIN: Anyone else? Sorry.

MIKE SILBER: Just picking up on it – I think if you build a resource and the resource is appropriately designed, it could be used across multiple platforms, but the reality is that the process is significantly different.

We need to look through the design process to decide. If you're creating a technical review mechanism, can that be used across the board, or is the specific knowledge required to deal with IANA issues really different from those required to look at policy or implementation concerns? Similarly, with some sort of appeal mechanism, if one is required.

That's something that we should go into, but I think Chris's distinction is very important because the rest of the community has forgotten about that, that there needs to be accountability internal to the IANA processes. Then, what we happen to make ourselves more legitimate and more accountable in the broader context is, to me, a different issue.

CHRIS DISSPAIN: Any other questions on that or anything else?

I wanted to pick up on something that Mike said about giving us input. I speak to quite a lot of you and we chat and we talk about stuff. I wanted to make sure everybody understands that – I know, for example, that the community generally – the ccs specifically, for example – have

issues with some of the way that things are done, with the way that Fadi does things, etc., etc.

I think it's important everybody is aware that we do have regular sessions. The Board does have regular sessions with staff and with Fadi to talk about, to give feedback, to make suggestions for tweaking the way that things are done.

It is very important, if you have an issue or something that's bugging you, it's perfectly fine to let us know, to e-mail or to talk, because we do have opportunities to actually feed into the – to feedback to staff and to Fadi.

You all know that one of the things that's happening right now is that there's a concern in the community that things are happening too quickly. Part of that is just a function of, as I said earlier, we're not always in control of what is put on our plate.

But I can tell you that the Board is providing feedback to Fadi, that maybe things are happening a little too quickly, maybe things are perceived as being top-down.

The message I want to deliver is, do not think that the Board does not pick that stuff up. It does and it does pass that on. It does attempt to ensure that there are incremental changes based on the feedback that we get.

MIKE SILBER: It seems we're having a conversation with each other.

CHRIS DISSPAIN: It's nice to talk to you, Mike. How are you?

MIKE SILBER: What I did want to point out – and again, I'd appreciate it if anybody feels vehemently differently, please let us know. I think we are in a very different situation than we were four years ago, in terms of the CEO.

We felt that – particularly from the ccs, but in other parts of the community, as well – that there was an adversarial relationship with the CEO.

I think at the moment, there are some concerns that he may be running a little too far ahead and we have to catch up, that maybe he's not stopping to get some input. Those are positive messages, as far as I'm concerned, that we need to deliver – and in terms of the staff, as well.

I'm not talking about our very dear ccNSO staff but I'm talking about the staff generally. The impression that we have on the Board is that they're a lot more responsive. The community is regaining some of the trust that had been lost under the previous dispensation.

Again, feed it through. Constructive criticism is valuable. If it's not constructive but you feel is an adversarial issue, tell us that, as well. It's really helpful for us to have this input when we go in, rather than just a statement about a general feeling or having to read the Council lists or the members lists and trying to pick up nuance from what's being said on the list.

CHRIS DISSPAIN: Unless anyone has anything else or you want to hear from us about something specific – which we're happy to talk about. See, Nigel's left the room. Normally, I would expect a question or comment from Nigel. Peter?

[PETER]: Hi, Mike and Chris. Question's not about the ccNSO, but because we're typically stuck in this room for a couple of days and you were having all the fun outside, some of the things that we read are on Twitter and some news reports.

We read that the GAC is getting upset about a couple of things. Is the Board looking at the relation with the GAC? Is there anything that –

CHRIS DISSPAIN: Yes.

[PETER]: – that will change or are you concerned about anything? Is there something that this room can do, since we typically have quite good relations with the GAC?

CHRIS DISSPAIN: Well, yes, I think in the sense that you have good relations. Let me try and answer that a couple of ways, and I'll be specific, because you all

know that one of the big issues that's run for a while is the .wine and .vin applications.

I believe that we have, over the last few days, finally got an understanding in the GAC from most of them – not all, but most of them – that this is their issue, not our issue, and that if they give us advice, we will treat that through the process, etc.

But what they cannot do is provide us with lobbying from individual governments – well, they can do it, but they won't have an effect – and also, advice that is unworkable.

To give you an example of something that might unworkable: "The GAC advises you to please consider the comments made by the government of X." Well, frankly, that's not really much use to us, whereas advice that says, "Please do this," or, "Please delay," "Please don't delay," etc., is.

And I think we've reached that point. I don't know how many of you were in the GAC yesterday when we met with the Board, but the GAC representative from Spain said, "Thank you for the letter, the response to the Spanish government on .wine and .vin. We recognize your point" – I'm paraphrasing – "we recognize your point that if you receive GAC consensus advice, you will take it into account."

I think that's a huge step, because part of our struggle has always been this GAC view – is this, "We just tell you stuff. It's up to you to fix it." I think there is a developing relationship there, which is good.

I think the other issue they have is timing. We all know this. They struggle – we all struggle with timing, but they struggle more than most. They think that they can wake up today and suddenly say, "All of your contracts should be green, and that's okay." [And] that isn't okay, because 327 of them already been signed and they're pink.

I think they're learning that, as well. It's growing for all of us. We're learning how best to communicate with them. They're learning how to best communicate with us.

Part of the issue is that they're still not used to dialogue. They're used to reading or saying a statement and then nothing happening and not being asked any questions. They don't like it when someone says, "So, I'm not entirely sure what you mean by that," because no other government ever says that to them, but we do. Does that give you a flavor? Mike, do you want to –

MIKE SILBER: Well, I think most of you have similar experiences in country, is when you can move out of a formal setting and notes are not taken and things are off the record, you can have a very constructive dialogue and engagement.

But in a formal setting, governments and government employees are generally reticent to deviate from the prepared and the instructed and look for more creative solutions.

Part of the reality of ICANN is that we're all here trying to look for creative solutions – well, we're here to represent our point of view, to learn, and, when we get stuck, to try and find the creative solutions.

CHRIS DISSPAIN: I can see Keith – Keith is waving in the background. Well, he's waving his arms in the background. Keith is not actually waving.

KEITH DAVIDSON: I might well be. Just a slightly related follow-up to the comments: when the ccNSO met with the ICANN Board, Steve promised to take forward the seriousness of the FOI Working Group's work to the GAC and make comment on it in the GAC room.

Unfortunately, I didn't make that meeting, but can I ask if it arose and what the reaction was?

CHRIS DISSPAIN: No, it didn't come up. It's unfortunate that, as is usual with the GAC, we had a long list of topics that they wanted to talk about and the FOI was not one of those. We ran out of time.

However, afterwards I spoke to Steve and he has undertaken – and I will, as well, and so will Mike, too, actually, but especially Steve – to talk individually to GAC members. I do know that at the cocktails that the Board with the GAC, that that happened.

It wasn't formally done in the room, Keith, but it is going to be done in the corridors and halls.

KEITH DAVIDSON: Okay. Could I just add a comment, too, that my personal observation is that the GAC does tend to shuffle everything it doesn't like under the carpet. Then, as you say, they get overwhelmed because everybody else's deadlines come up and they still haven't considered things.

CHRIS DISSPAIN: That's right.

KEITH DAVIDSON: They really need to find a way to adjust their time allocation so that they are on top of everything along the way. Anything that you and the Board can do to convince of the need to do that I think would be appreciated by us all.

CHRIS DISSPAIN: We will do our best.

KEITH DAVIDSON: I think as we go forward in this IANA transition process and GAC participation on a group like that, I think it's imperative that they don't lose sight of that. It seems like they're not even really familiar with what is ahead. It's quite worrying.

CHRIS DISSPAIN: Oh, yes, absolutely. We're going to have to work really closely with them to make sure that they work, if you see what I mean. I think we might even need to – what you've just triggered in my mind is an idea that maybe we should put a special GAC support team together that actually works closely with them, ensuring that they stay on track.

But of course, part of the problem is that some of the ones who can be the most difficult are actually – just disappear intersessionally. You can't talk to them, you can't find them, which is a real challenge.

All right. Stephen?

STEPHEN DEERHAKE: Stephen Deerhake, .as. To either one of you, do you have any sense, from your discussions with the GAC members, any read, with regards to the FOI work? Because that document's getting close to being finalized. I'm just wondering if there's any sense of preparation for that review and what your sense is where they might be leaning on it.

CHRIS DISSPAIN: Stephen, the answer is, I don't think as a Board member, we do – I do because I work with the working group itself. But I actually think Keith's probably a better person to answer that question, as to what's the level of readiness in the GAC or what's his sense of readiness.

I think it would be fair to say that there is some delicate discussions going on right now, but Keith, if you wanted to grab the mic and – is there a microphone shortage? Is that the issue?

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: [off mic]

CHRIS DISSPAIN: Okay, all right. That's fine. Anything else? Because you guys need to go to your lunch, I think. Well, thank you very much, indeed. Hopefully, we'll have a bit more time next time and we'll actually maybe work to put together a list of topics [inaudible].

MIKE SILBER: Just as Chris, we're on the mailing lists. You've got our personal e-mails, if you need them. Please feel free to communicate, to raise any concerns, issues, items that you'd like to see or not to see on agendas. You're most welcome to provide that feedback through to us.

CHRIS DISSPAIN: Thanks, everyone.

[break]

BYRON HOLLAND:	Because of the necessity of the content of this situation, or this session rather, which is around the NTIA transition and recognizing that the overall situation is relatively fluid, we wanted to make sure that the panel or the session that we conduct today is going to be of the most value possible, hence it's been a work in progress up to, well, before lunch.
	Anyway, with that, I'm going to turn it over to Roelof, who will be chairing our session.
ROELOF MEIJER:	Okay, thank you, Byron. My apologies for being late either correct [riskily] or incorrect [riskily].
	My role will be to give this introduction and what I'll also try to do after each – and Byron said something about it – after each speech session, I'll try to give a wrap up and I'll try to feel the temperature of the room – I know this is kind of a charged phrase – but to see if we have a rough consensus.
	There's quite a bit of work coming towards us. What we are dealing with this afternoon in this session are the two main things: it's the IANA oversight transition or the IANA stewardship transition and it's the ICANN accountability process.
	We've quite a few working groups and a coordination group coming up, and this session will mainly focus on the latter. How do we get ccTLD participation or appointments into that coordination group for the IANA stewardship transition?

I think with that, I'll hand over back to the moderator. Byron?

BYRON HOLLAND: All right, thank you very much.

ROELOF MEIJER: Sorry – what I think I should also do is – so we're going to have three panels and the first one will be about what is going to be the mandate or how are we going to establish the mandate for the ccTLD representatives in that coordination committee?

The second one will deal how are we going to run a selection process? And the third one will be about the selection criteria. Back to you, Byron.

BYRON HOLLAND: Thank you very much. So just to reinforce, there will be three separate, short, subject-matter panels.

We will be trying to take the temperature of the room and to get both input – so spoken input – but also make sure you have your cards – red, orange, green cards – nearby and that will help us get a sense of where the community is at on some of the topics.

As Roelof mentioned, there's a considerable amount of work through a number of different work streams to be done, all of which we are going to have to participate as ccTLD managers and operators, ccNSO members, regional organization members, etc.

Making sure that we are appropriately resourced across the different streams is part of the important work that we have to do here today to give the council some guidance on selection, etc., later this afternoon and into the near future.

To give us a little bit of a sense of where we're going and provide an overall picture, Bart has done a little work and he's going to walk us through what this is shaping up to look like.

BART BOSWINKEL: Unfortunately – not unfortunately – some of you [all] have seen it on a Sunday afternoon session, so bear with me. This is a mind map of the processes and the needs for capacity for the workload and activities of the ccNSO and broader ccTLD community.

I've separated two: the list of working groups and other activities we already are undertaking, not directly related to the IANA function process and/or the enhancing accountability.

That includes, for example, the work of the SOP and ongoing work from the FOI, future work like the retirement of ccTLDs, and there will be some other – or the cross-community working groups and the user country and territory names. That's all under other requirements and working group and the [list of] working group.

So I'll drill down a little bit in what is all the related processes and activities regarding the IANA function and their related processes.

The first one is very clearly, is the IANA oversight transition process itself. The second one – and this is just the high level overview – the second one is around enhancing ICANN's accountability.

The third one – and this is more an internal process for the ccNSO and the regional organizations – is how do we engage the community, the broader community? We have done some calculations and around 50 plus ccTLD managers who are neither member of the ccNSO or the ROs.

And finally, knowing these different processes, how are we going to coordinate all our efforts between these two?

So now I'll drill down a little bit more into the IANA oversight transition process. First of all, you will have the ICANN process, which is currently running, and secondly, and some of you have heard it already, you've got this CCWG, a new cross – a SO and AC initiative – to deal with these topics.

You'll have the same structure around the accountability process.

BYRON HOLLAND: Whoa, whoa, whoa, whoa, Bart. Bart, Bart, Bart. How much deeper are we going here?

BART BOSWINKEL: I can go as deep as you want – four or five layers.

BYRON HOLLAND: Time out, time out. My mind is about to blow apart, like those. I think I have a simpler way to view this.

BART BOSWINKEL: Okay. I'm sorry. You know how I do this.

BYRON HOLLAND: I think what we're going to see right here is how Bart's mind versus my mind. And I can assure you, mine is definitely simpler. Here, can you put up the way I look at it?

BART BOSWINKEL: Yes, we're trying.

BYRON HOLLAND: I think one thing we can take away, and there will be no test on this, there are a lot of streams of activity for us to be engaged in – and not optional streams, either. We must participate in all of them.

I've put up something here that is just the buckets of work that I believe, in consultation with many colleagues and counsel, are the key streams of work that need to be resourced by people, by this community, the ccNSO, RO, and let's call "unaligned" ccTLD community members.

And if we just take a look at the top blue box, we have the IANA Stewardship Transition Coordinating Committee, where we have four seats at that 27-seat table. That in itself is expected to be a material

amount of work for the cc members who participate there. Early estimates are maybe ten hours a week-ish. It's a material commitment to be one of those four people.

And of course, it's not just speaking on that coordinating committee about cc-related interests but it's also very much bringing back to the cc community what's happening at that committee, both to the ccNSO and to the ccTLD community and RO community at large.

That's one of the key buckets of work that we have to participate in. Second level, there is the already commenced Cross Community Working Group on Internet Governance. It specifically carves all IANA-related activities, but it is definitely a relevant and related stream of work that we must participate in to some degree, even if it's only reporting back into this community.

We have the Cross Community Working Group on ICANN Accountability. That's still taking shape so we don't yet know what's going to be required, but that will be a level of effort that needs to be resourced by us.

We have the Cross Community Working Group on IANA transition, second level, third from the left. That is a Cross Community Working Group that has been spearheaded by the cc and the G community coming together with the other directly affected parties of the IANA functions, which include the root zone maintainer, today Verisign, as well as the root operators.

That group came together to make sure that the directly affected parties had a strong voice into the process, but have also invited other

communities to participate. I know that ALAC has already said that they will participate, as well as SSAC.

Last box on the right is termed the "Nominating Committee" – let's say it's more a selection committee for the four candidates who are going to go to the ICANN Coordinating Committee, determining how we're going to best represent ourselves there and select those members, given the assumption that more than four people put their names forward.

In addition, there's more internal work here. The ccNSO Internet Governance Review Working Group, that's something that's already happening here and needs to continue to happen in some way, shape, or form.

The middle bucket on the bottom, ccNSO Working Group on IANA Transition, that doesn't exist yet but with all of these different activities in play, we will probably need some kind of coordinating group and group that is feeding into the four candidates on the coordinating committee to make sure they're being provided with the kind of information they need.

And then also there is a short-term need for a drafting team to draft the charter for the Cross Community Working Group on IANA Transition. That in a sense is really just on the IANA transition side, for the most part. We know that when the accountability piece starts to get cleared up, there'll be work required over there too.

I think this, as much as possible, simply reflects the different work streams that we will be required to participate in. We know there's four

members at the top; Cross Community Working Group is probably four members, as well.

And as you can see in this community, we'll have to make sure we're strategic about getting all of these resourced in a meaningful way.

That's just to give us a sense of the lay of the land. Obviously I would encourage you to also look at Bart's mind map in a small, dark and quiet room where you can focus, because it does go into much greater detail. When you have the time to review it, it gives actually a better sense of the overall picture. I know it's posted on our site.

BART BOSWINKEL: It's already posted as part of the presentation.

BYRON HOLLAND: Thank you, Bart. So with that, we're going to move into the three distinct sections of this session that we wanted to talk about or that we wanted to present.

As I said to begin with, we do need this to be interactive. The conversation today, right now, is literally going to feed into the thinking within the council meeting just following this as we try to wrestle with how are we going to set up the selection committee, what are some of the criteria going to be, and what are the types of things that we're going to take into consideration when making those selections?

The first panel we have is with Lise and Oscar. It's around the IANA Coordination Group and what the mandates or the requirements of the ccTLD appointees should look like.

The idea here is for this session, for us to have that conversation, for you to provide feedback and input and help give all of us a sense as to how are we going to best affect those decisions.

Probably just leading into that conversation, it's important to note that those four folks, they're not going to be free agents. They're not going to be able to go up to the coordinating committee and speak on their behalf or their interests, per se. They need to be reflective of the broad community interests.

It's going to be important when putting names forward and when selecting that it's not one's personal interests or organizational interests that are going to be reflected at the coordinating committee – it's the ccTLD community's interests that are going to be reflected by those four participants to the best of their ability.

So that's what we want to talk about with the first speed panel, which is Lise and Oscar. Thank you very much. I guess one of the first questions that we wanted to ask is, how best do you think we can start to define what that looks like, being representative of the views versus representing the views of the community?

LISE FUHR: How what?

BYRON HOLLAND: No, I just wanted to get your take on when those candidates are put forward, how are they best going to be able to think about representing the community's views, I guess in a sense disassociating from their own perhaps personal organizational views?

LISE FUHR: As you say, if you're not a free agent, you need to have a framework to work within. I think it would be very nice if the ccNSO and other of the regions would form a framework for wishes for the IANA transition.

I think what this going to be very tough because in the beginning of a process like this, it's always very slow and then it speeds up. And then it's when it speeds up, you want to be agile and you want to be able to really communicate with the community.

I think this is a two-way thing, so the candidate, of course, should communicate, but it's also very important to have a group that will feed those guys, because I was on the ATRT 2 and I hardly got any input from this community. And that is really – we need to every ccTLD be active in this if we want it to be representative.

OSCAR ROBLES-GARAY: I think that one of the most relevant things will be the coordination among these different working groups and task forces and whatever they are called, because there will be a lot of information, related information, and it will be very important to define not only a framework of [to take] decisions but also to share that information and

to share all that documentation and papers and drafts that may be published among them before they are published to the broader public.

But also I think that this will be highly dependable on the selection process and the selection criteria because we may end up defining a different criteria for purposes of time, but maybe those selected people will have the broader views of the community.

So in that case, they have to come back faster and more often to know, to communicate and to share all that information presented in the working groups. Otherwise, it will present a bigger challenge.

BYRON HOLLAND: I think I heard several different elements there. One is the need, and especially interesting based on ATRT 2 work that you did, Lise, is community input into the members of this coordinating committee so that they can have a better sense of the views to articulate. So, something feeding into those four members, not just setting them adrift on their own up there.

The other thing that I heard – Oscar, I think, made two comments in there – one is the need to have regular communication back out of the coordinating committee on a very timely basis so that we in the broad ccTLD community – not just ccNSO, not just the ROs, but the entire ccTLD community – are continuously updated.

The follow-on point to that I think that I heard was the timeliness element. I think that's a key theme that's going to run through this is, there is a date out there, September '15. It is a date and there's

discussion on whether we need to meet that date, but nonetheless, it is an important date, whether it's exactly met or not. And in order to make this process happen, there's going to have to be a very time sensitive back-and-forth.

And to that end, it probably means that we as a community are going to have to go with sort of the equivalent of rough and running code and good enough as opposed to perfect.

Is that – did I summarize that effectively? Can I get any input or feedback? Is that approximately where most people's heads would be at on this subject? One, two, three. Okay. Nigel, to begin with.

[NIGEL ROBERTS]: In one word, yes. But there's one thing I'm concerned about, and I heard it from Theresa Swinehart, which is I get the impression if we don't do something, they're just going to do it without us and we're going to be late to the party again, just like the U.K. is in most E.U. things. We've got to do something.

JÖRG SCHWEIGER: In the first place, I would like to voice my irritation about the topic being discussed right now because it hasn't been properly announced – at least, this is what I feel.

Concerning to the matter at hand, I'm a bit irritated about the diversity of the different blue boxes you called quite easy in their separation. I certainly feel that there's a whole of a lot of overlap of a group that is

concerned with Internet governance as it would refer to accountability or as compared to the IANA transition process.

And if there is a substantial overlap, yes, I would feel the same, but the panelists have been voicing that one major thing about – one major topic we should deal with is try to get coordination between the different groups, but then I doubt that we really sliced the elephant in a good way. I just wouldn't slice it that way.

MARTIN BOYLE: Thanks. Martin Boyle from Nominet. Yes, I certainly would agree with what Jörg just said, but I'd like to pick up on the point that I think it was Lise made about the process will take a little bit of time to start kicking off, but when it kicks off, the time for thinking is already past.

Right at the very early stage, I think whoever are our nominees for the various groups, we do, as a community, need to start thinking about what are the issues that are of particular concern to us, and most importantly, of what roughly looks good and what certainly looks bad?

Because by the time that discussion goes on, we I think as a community need to have some very clear ideas of where the discussion should not go, and if we wait until those issues come up on the day, it's already going to be too late for us to get a coherent view into the mix. Thanks.

BYRON HOLLAND: Was there somebody over here? No?

I think Jörg and Martin have picked up on, essentially, the theme here, which is about timeliness. The reason, as I said at the start, that there wasn't an explicit and detailed agenda is because the situation is fluid and fast moving. I think you're expressing irritation – which is going to be a common theme, probably – that the situation is going to be fluid and fast moving and we will have to be responsive to it overall.

And we need to be prepared and right now we're in the storming/forming stage, but we are a long way away from the norming stage.

JÖRG SCHWEIGER: All right, then. So now a more constructive comment: I think it might be crucial to get at least a sketch out of what this community thinks that a solution should look like, so that we do not get in the mode where those four representatives are in a situation where they have to transport information back and forth and back and forth and back and forth, because even they do not where the community wants them to go.

So it might be better to roughly sketch out where we want to go and make them represent the model we think is appropriate in a way that it would be really like four voices articulating the same thing, instead of listening, taking back, taking forth – so basically a recommendation to come up with something that roughly fits our model of how this whole is going to be designed.

EN

MARTIN BOYLE: Thanks. It looks like it's turning into a bit of a German/English dialogue. But I think I would disagree with the idea of we should be at this stage focusing on what model we want. I think we need to be very much more flexible than that and actually start to think about, as I put it, what looks good and what looks bad.

In other words, what are the principles that – and I'd refer to the [CENTR] paper that got circulated around the community – where you look at what the principles for providing the service are and then to look at the risk factors.

Then, when something happens quickly, the people who are on the committee can try and map whatever proposal somebody is proudly presenting and see whether it actually fits or not. And that, I think, is probably the most important role for the person who's sitting on that coordinating group.

I promise I won't take the microphone again, even if Jörg does.

BYRON HOLLAND: Are there any other comments or feedback, or a reaction to, at first, the like opinions and then the differing opinions? I'll let you finish the e-mail that you're working on right now and then I'll come to you. Lise?

LISE FUHR: I certainly agree with Martin. I don't think a model would be good at this stage. If you have four people that are bound to a specific model, it's going to be a war between the members of the coordination committee.

I think it's very important that we make some principles, a framework, and we have processes to reach the community fast for these members because they need to be able to send out and get responses very fast, and they need to have responses.

But the good thing is that there are four people and therefore, as far as I'm informed, they're going to be within the ccNSO and outside the ccNSO, so we'll have a variety here and we'll be able to reach far out to the many different communities.

BYRON HOLLAND: Thanks. And one other thing, just to take note too, in the bottom middle blue bucket, actually speaks to having a ccNSO-specific working group on this, which doesn't exist yet, is only there as a placeholder, but perhaps it's the vehicle for feeding into the four candidates. Mathieu?

MATHIEU WEILL: Thank you, Byron. Mathieu Weill from .fr. I was told to step into the Anglo-German discussion, which is usually what we do.

Elaborating on what you said on the additional working group of the ccNSO to follow all those processes with two comments. One is, I was in the GAC session earlier and what they're considering is a GAC contact group that is common to the different tracks, to avoid being sidelined by the different – and put into contradiction – with ourselves.

One step further, let's simplify this on the ccNSO level as much as possible. If needed, and I think that's needed, let us seize the opportunity to remove some working groups that are lower priority to

lower the volunteer fatigue that I think a number of us are feeling right now.

BYRON HOLLAND: Thanks. That's probably a good suggestion right there. Any other comments? I know Jörg's dying to make another one, so anybody else? Anybody else on my way back there?

And Roelof, I'm going to give you another moment or two to get ready for the summary, because we're going to wind this one down and go into the next one shortly.

JÖRG SCHWEIGER: I just want to mention that I do like the idea of coming up with values and principles. I think it was a good thing at the NETmundial, but taking the problem at hand we currently have – and I'm predominantly seeing the IANA transition over here – I personally do not see that this is rocket science.

If it is not rocket science, we do not need – my point of view – we do not need abstract principles. The danger that comes for me with abstract principles is even those principles, you've got to define them very clearly. I'm not sure whether we do speak about the same things under a certain principle.

One example: let us, for example, just cite what the NETmundial statement on privacy said – and that was you shouldn't be subject to arbitrary or unlawful surveillance.

So what does that principle or value really mean? It means completely different things to completely different states and people. If we come up with a solution like that, only stating values and principles, that just might not fit the problem at hand, which I think is a lot easier for ccs.

ROELOF MEIJER: Byron, I'm conscious that I'm the chair, so I don't want to interfere in the discussion, but I have to summarize. And I now understand what Jörg doesn't want, but I didn't get what he wants.

BYRON HOLLAND: Are you asking me to go back to him? Okay.

ROELOF MEIJER: Under the condition that he only states what he wants.

BYRON HOLLAND: This is the 30 second speed round, Jörg.

JÖRG SCHWEIGER: Shit.

ROELOF MEIJER: He wants shit, he gets shit.

UNIDENTIFED MALE: That was [inaudible] 28.

JÖRG SCHWEIGER: Basically what I do want is a seamless process for technical functions that are associated or related to an IANA function. I want a process that is completely automatic, that is stable, that is resilient, and so forth.

Just a distinction between the technical function, and that we can do very easily. We could associate that with service level agreements and it will just be it.

So there's just one very tiny problem we've got to solve and that is redelegation and delegation. You know my position about redelegation. There's no problem to solve either because that is a local consideration and decision, so the only thing we've got to come up with a solution for is the delegation process.

Good enough?

BYRON HOLLAND: Thank you, Jörg. Just that one little simple thing around delegation, right, okay. Roelof, I'm [going] to ask you to be ready. Oscar, and then I'm going to make a comment. Oscar, go ahead.

OSCAR ROBLES-GARAY: Just bear in mind that how long it took us to define the ccTLD principles 12 years ago. We should not try to come up with a very specific

principles but broader sentences and more general ideas, otherwise it will take us forever to come up with a set of ideas.

BYRON HOLLAND: But I think it's safe to say, too, that the folks who are going to be on that coordinating committee are not there and are not empowered to make decisions on behalf of the ccNSO.

Would there be broad agreement for that? You all have your cards. Just to say it again, while you take a look and find a card: let me restate the question, which is, do we agree – this would be green – that the candidates on the coordinating committee are not empowered to make decisions on their own on behalf of the community?

Do we agree with that? Green? Okay, so of those putting cards up, the very significant majority are green. We've got an orange and a red. Roelof?

ROELOF MEIJER: Thank you, Byron. First of all, I'll take the opportunity to repeat something I've been saying quite a lot, but Jörg tempted me. Still too often we refer to the "IANA transition," and that's why we start talking about delegation and redelegation. This is about the oversight of the IANA transition, not about the IANA function itself.

I cannot underscore how important this point is because it gets the whole discussion out of scope if we do not get this clear. It's all over the place, this mistake.

Having said that, to try to summarize what I think we have a rough consensus about, the four representatives from our community should communicate back out on a regular basis. They are supposed to seek – but that also means that they are supposed to get – input from the community, from us.

An important factor is that this is going to be a time-sensitive process. We don't have lots of years. We need to conclude next year, I'm sure, personally, but somebody might have another opinion. But time is not on our side as a factor that we have plenty of.

We seem to agree that we need a set of principles. I would say that the rough consensus is that they should not be too specific but they also should not be too abstract – quite a job to find something in between. I think a common sense is also that we shouldn't spend too much time on getting them.

You measured the temperature in the room already. The representatives from the community do not have the possibility to engage the community on their behalf, so they cannot take decisions for us. They cannot agree or disagree with something on behalf of the community.

This still implies, of course, that they can disagree or agree with something, but they will do it on their own behalf, [and it] should be avoided. I think that's the overall sentiment.

I think we do the trick with the colors again? Have I missed something out?

BYRON HOLLAND: I think that that's a fair appraisal of it. Did you want to ask a question?

ROELOF MEIJER: Yes. If you agree that this is roughly what came out of this discussion, something that most of us agree upon, can you raise your green card? That's quite a bit. If you don't agree with this summary, can you raise a red one? That's Jörg.

BYRON HOLLAND: Our contrarian.

ROELOF MEIJER: And if you're unsure, you can raise an orange one. I don't know what I'm going to do then. Okay, so there's quite a majority of green cards. Thank you.

BYRON HOLLAND: Thank you. I do have a stack of cards here. Is there anybody who would like cards that doesn't have cards? And Mathieu, no, you're not allowed to have a red one. Thank you.

Next up on our speed-dating panel here are Eduardo and Keith. We're going to be – this is talking about the selection process for the four ccTLD members on the coordination committee. I think just in the title there's an important distinction: it's for ccTLD members, not ccNSO members.

What we're looking for there – I think that ICANN has actually tasked the ccNSO with reaching out to the entire ccTLD community and involving the views of the entire ccTLD community.

Obviously there's 150 of us in this particular part of the community, so we're well represented, but it behooves us to make sure that the folks who are not ccNSO members are also very much appraised or advised, informed of what's happening, and encouraged to participate and share their views.

Eduardo and Keith, interested in your views on what the best possible composition of those four members could be and also what the selection process potentially could be. I have put a draft one out there suggesting that – some filters and the composition, but perhaps you could offer your own thoughts.

KEITH DAVIDSON: Just for clarity's sake first, please, you're saying the four members of the selection committee or what the right attributes for those people are, and then some criteria around that?

BYRON HOLLAND: Sorry, no. The selection process. If I said the other, I misspoke.

KEITH DAVIDSON: Well, let's deal firstly with some high level aspects for the selection committee. This committee needs to be available now and conclude its work, in theory, by 2nd of July. I think, firstly, it needs to compose of

people who have time and capability right now – not next week or next month, but right now. That probably reduces the sorts of people that we can get our hands on.

I think they should be the sort of people who are not subject to the pressure of lobbying and so on, and seem to be independent thinkers and capable of reaching rational and sensible conclusions.

They should be able to, as a group – and you'll have a different composition of people – but as a group, they need to measure and audit the applications they receive for the positions and verify that these people will have the skills and the time to serve over the next 15 months or more on this committee.

On Sunday in the workshop, we also discussed some [limit] to the selection committee. There was a very strong feeling in the room that if anyone is on the selection committee, they are prohibiting themselves from going forward onto the coordinating committee. There's probably a principle, too, for what we were discussing earlier.

There was a suggestion from that workshop that the selection committee should recommend to the council, but I think given the time constraints and the fact that most of us will still be traveling home on or about the 2nd of July, we perhaps have to empower this group to make a binding decision, as to those four.

Then, I think after you've got that, you want to start looking at ensuring that you have geo-diverse, size-diverse members on that group, so representing small or larger registries and so on.

One comment I would like to make regarding inside or outside the ccNSO, I think we need to work on getting the best skill set on the committee. But given that the ccNSO members account for about 99.8% of ccTLD registrations overall, there's a pretty compelling case in my mind that the clear majority of people who we're seeking to populate with should be ccNSO members.

That's further reinforced in my mind by the idea that the ccNSO members are bound by bylaws and should be acting in the ccNSO's best interests.

And ccTLD managers outside of ICANN could prove to be somewhat disruptive or not be able to be brought to account in this community so readily. They might be appointed and not do the job that we expect, so we would be wasting a place on that committee.

My recommendation is that, for the selection committee, there should be no more than one non-ccNSO member, and they should be also looking at a criteria or a principle of not appointing any more than one outside member to the coordinating committee.

BYRON HOLLAND: Just as a point of clarity, because I did use the wrong word to start with, what we're talking about here is the selection process and the selection committee members and how that happens and what that looks like.

And I referred to the fact that I put something out on the list, so I should actually say what it was, not just assume everybody read it.

I had suggested that the selection committee be comprised of the ccNSO chair – so that would be me – one other ccNSO member, an RO member – somebody surfaced by the regional organizations – and an esteemed independent person very familiar with the community and the overall landscape. A couple of names have been surfaced there, like Markus Kummer or Janis.

That was the suggestion that I put out onto the overall list. Eduardo, your thoughts?

[EDUARDO SANTOYO]: Thank you. I won't make an echo about everything said by Keith. Yes, I agree with all of this but probably I can to add some other things.

We also consider that it's good to have one person from the regional organization on the selection committee just to bring to the table the point of view from the regional organization's perspective, which is not completely different of the ccNSO point of view, but it's a particular point of view [in particular] think that to be considered and we appreciate that.

Regarding the number, why to have four? I don't know. Probably four will be difficult to get an agreement if you are in two [pairs] in difference. [Probably] having three is good, or [probably] five –a non-pair number would be better than four for a selection committee.

If we are also considering to have an external person from the cc community, it could be difficult because probably something important also is that this person who will be invited know very well the

community. He has to have the possibility, or she has to have the possibility to know everyone in the committee that could be postulated for the position as a candidate.

So I see really difficult to invite some external person to be participating in this committee that has to be working during this short period of time, as was mentioned just during this week, because it ends next Wednesday, that work.

[Probably] my point of view is that we should have considering all the criterias mentioned by Keith, also to modify the number – not to have four, having just three – and having two members from the ccNSO [inaudible] with the Chairman of course and some other one, and one from the regional organization, considering that we also part of the ccNSO. That's it.

BYRON HOLLAND: Thanks, Eduardo, thanks, Keith. I think that's very helpful to give people food for thought in terms of how we should we constitute this process and the committee itself.

Input? Eduardo's made a particular pitch for no outsiders, odd numbered committee – both reasonable suggestions. Dotty?

DOTTY SPARKS DE BLANC: This committee obviously has to be a committee of select people, but their job is so short that they'll be finished within a week or so.

So I think that you talk about the coordination. There's other functions that you've talked about – the coordination between the various buckets of activity and the passing of information back from the four members to the rest of the community – so perhaps they should be selected based on qualifications that meet other needs, just beyond that first selection.

BYRON HOLLAND: Nigel? Thank you, Dotty.

[NIGEL ROBERTS]: As Byron said earlier, we're definitely in the storming phase right now, so a lot of this is reacting to what people say, and such as Eduardo just now said, that he has some doubts about bringing in even the most trusted of trusted outsiders – and I agree with that.

I think what we have to do is to realize that we're talking about two different committees. We're not talking about political correctness here. We're not talking about saying that we must be democratically and diversificationally representing this part of the world and that part of the world, particularly in the NomCom part of this.

You want people who will do the best job possible at identifying the best people to be on this – what's going to be, by the sound of it – a marathon and most important piece of work.

It's right that we look to make sure at least one of them is from a ccTLD that's not a member of the ccNSO, because there is a significant number of TLDs out there that, for one or another, have chosen or find

themselves in some difficulties in being members. We were one for a long time. We understand this.

On the other hand, it's our process. We're the ccTLD part of ICANN, so we should be managing our own process. I really have a strong feeling that these four NomCom members should be from within ourselves.

BYRON HOLLAND: Any other thoughts or comments on the process or composition of the selection committee? Annebeth?

ANNEBETH LANGE: Thank you. I really think it's a good idea, like Eduardo said, that to have an odd number could be a good suggestion.

As for choosing one from outside this ccNSO, we have candidates there that's really good and has been really into what we are doing without being a member.

But the problem is if we elect these people to the selection committee, then we can't use them in the next round. So we have to think thoroughly where should we put our strength? Should we use it in the selection committee or in the coordination committee?

BYRON HOLLAND: I think that's true, but there are also numerous other work streams that whoever ends up here, yes – and I believe whoever ends up here is

clearly precluding themselves from being on the coordination committee, but there's lots of opportunities for other work.

Can I just take the temperature here on the outside member? Green if you agree that an outside member should be part of it, or red if you do not think an outside member should be part of it, or it should be ccs only. Red is ccs only. Green is outsiders as well.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: [off mic]

BYRON HOLLAND: Okay. Question of clarification, fair enough, before we go to a vote.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: [It was just that] you had mentioned Janis Karklins and Markus Kummer. So when you say an "outside member," of course it had to be an outside member that know the business and know the ccs and have been involved before perhaps, so they know us?

BYRON HOLLAND: Yes, is the short answer, that it would only be a highly-esteemed, well-recognized member of the broad community, who would have unimpeachable credentials. Those are the two that we are looking at.

When I say an outside member, I'm not just going to walk out on the street and bring somebody in, but it would be that kind of person. No,

and [Bernie] wouldn't qualify either. We will have to go with the general principle that that would be the kind of person.

Is there a question in the back? I guess I should put my glasses on. We have one more question and then get your cards ready.

PETER VERGOTE: Thank you so much, Byron. Peter Vergote, from DNS Belgium. Would it make any difference in sensing the temperature of the room concerning the outsider position if it were an odd number of people in the NomCom or not? If it were five, for instance, instead of four, I think it might change the position of the members towards having an outsider in.

BYRON HOLLAND: Good point. I like that idea. Let's change it. Let's do the number first – green for odd number, green for odd number, red for you're okay with this. Green for an odd number, red, it doesn't matter. So material majority green with a non-trivial level of dissent, let's say. Okay.

Assuming it's an odd number, are we okay with an outsider? And please, I put this suggestion up. I'm not wedded to this; it's just a suggestion. Becky?

BECKY BURR: I would like to make sure that whatever we do, we have the flexibility to do this quickly. So I guess my question is if there's an outside member that's available quickly, versus is it going to take a week to find them?

What's the – I'd go with doing it quickly rather than taking another week to find an outside member.

BYRON HOLLAND: My general sense is – level of complexity, lack of overwhelming support – is probably the outsider is not where we want to head.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: Thank you, Byron. My experience has been with a lot of committees over a long time, and the one thing you avoid at all costs is a three-person quorum. A three-person quorum amounts to two people, and a minimum of five is generally the only way to go if you're going to have an odd number.

BYRON HOLLAND: Okay. Last point and then I'm going to hand it over to the chair.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: Actually, I just want to make the point that I think one of the rationales for the outside member was the fact that ICANN has asked us to look to non-ccNSO members to participate.

So if it's only ccNSO members vetting the applications, and let's say for example, there are no non-ccNSO people forthcoming, it could call into question the integrity of the whole process.

I don't think the individual need be wedded in ccTLD business, but rather just be someone who protects the integrity of the selection process.

BYRON HOLLAND: Mr. Chairman? That's you, Roelof.

ROELOF MEIJER: I'm aware of that. I was still waiting for your card thing on ccs only or not.

BYRON HOLLAND: Yes, fair enough. I will do that. Your cards at the ready – green for ccNSO members only.

ROELOF MEIJER: No, ccs only.

BYRON HOLLAND: Ccs only, thank you. Green for ccs only, red for outsiders involved too. That's a mix. Keep them up. Keep them up, please.

ROELOF MEIJER: There is a green majority, but the red cannot be neglected.

BYRON HOLLAND: So there's a slim cc member only. Okay, thank you. You can put your cards down. Okay. Thank you.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: [off mic]

BYRON HOLLAND: "Provided there's a non-ccNSO member" was the comment, perhaps.

ROELOF MEIJER: Can I do one more thing? Those who just raised their red card, a subsequent question would be, if you are strongly against a cc-only committee, can you raise your card again?

BYRON HOLLAND: Strongly against.

ROELOF MEIJER: Strongly against. You can be in favor of – well, it would be nicer if, but if you're really against? Nobody.

BYRON HOLLAND: So nobody raised their red card in strong objection.

ANNEBETH LANGE: I have a question actually because it could be interesting to know, why do we want an outside member? And I think that [Alan's] suggestion, the comment was good because it has to do with being legitimate, so we have someone else with us. It's very easy that it's – we are talking for our own sake all the time.

ROELOF MEIJER: Annebeth, I'm sorry. I'm also the keeper of time. We've got 15 minutes and one more speed panel left.

BYRON HOLLAND: Can we give Keith just one final comment?

KEITH DAVIDSON: I think we're probably going to hang ourselves in knots if we get too forceful on what we must or must not have. I think the distinct feeling of the room was to say that there was a preference for an outside member, but let's not have to have one. Let's make it that the selection committee should comprise, if possible, of one, and it be a total of five.

BYRON HOLLAND: Just to be clear, it was the other way around. There was a slim majority preference for cc membership only. There was.

KEITH DAVIDSON: True but in order to – if we get too prescriptive, we can stall this process and not even launch because you can't find the outside member or whatever. So let's just –

BYRON HOLLAND: Okay. Thank you, Keith. Chairman?

ROELOF MEIJER: Maybe first the committee. There is a rough consensus on the fact that we go for five members – an odd number, not three – four of which will be ccNSO members, one of which will be ccTLD community member.

I think that's it. Maybe I should stop there. Is that it? Is that a good summary? This is not about do you agree with the outcome. Is this a summary? Yes. Okay.

Then about the selection criteria: the committee should verify skills, availability of time, and commitment. This is something that we didn't discuss further but Keith made the point. He said, "I feel that considering the time that we have, that the committee should not advise the council but should decide."

It's quite a distinction. So maybe we need some cards on that, too? Yes? Okay. Those who think that the committee itself should decide on the appointees, can you raise a green card? Those who are in favor of the council deciding, can you raise a red card? That's a clear rough consensus on the committee decides.

BYRON HOLLAND: The committee is empowered.

ROELOF MEIJER: Yes.

JORDI IPARRAGUIRRE: Just ten seconds, please. This is Jordi, ccNSO NomCom appointee. I've been serving also in the Election Committee for the At-Large.

Something that we did – [I] explained that briefly on Sunday – is that we had a two-step – in fact, a three-step election process.

One committee designed the bylaws, the process itself. Another one, based on that, checked all the different proposals for candidates and then made a shortlist of candidates. Then, a third one elected the candidate to the board among those ones.

This is too long for that occasion, but maybe this distinction that you've just done now, having the committee, doing the shortlist on the process, and having the council to decide, may help.

BYRON HOLLAND: Yes. I guess that's part of what separates us from them.

ROELOF MEIJER: I think that would be fair.

BYRON HOLLAND: We've got to operate and get shit done.

ROELOF MEIJER: I think that would be a fair summary, Byron.

BYRON HOLLAND: Okay. Thank you very much. And next, from a timeliness perspective –

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: Just, do you want to do a quick poll on the selection committee members should not be or should be prohibited from selecting themselves?

BYRON HOLLAND: I made that a general statement at the outset. If you're on the selection committee, you're not a candidate for the coordination committee. I take the chair's privilege and just make that de facto. I think we can all agree on that.

The next speed panel is Giovanni and Katrina. Thank you very much. Speed-dating panel here. What we want to talk about is what are some of the key criteria?

The idea is it's not going to be an exhaustive matrix checklist, but that there will be some key filters through which we view what the appropriate candidates are. That is the kind of criteria, perhaps that Jordi was just talking about, that the council in general can provide to the selection committee. So, key criteria.

I think Keith has already articulated a few. One, you have to be available. This is a material task that the candidates are expected to participate in.

I'll be the bad guy here. This is not a committee to put your name on and not show up. I've heard that that happens from time to time.

This committee, just to be clear, is for people who are ready and willing to work – probably up to the level of ATRT 2, which is significant time. You should probably the explicit support of your organization if you're going to participate there. Those are probably the baseline criteria.

Katrina, what else should we be thinking about?

KATRINA SATAKI: I think that there are two dimensions to this issue. First is what we should have and another one, what we want. I think we all are long enough in this community, so we know that we should have geographical diversity.

We should have size diversity – big registries and smaller registries – even though it's quite clear that small registries cannot contribute so much to the process as big registries because of the time and resources that the small registries lack in many cases.

Of course, again, another important issue is the gender issue and here I say that there's a benefit of being a woman. I may say that I'm not a big believer in this gender issue. Yes, all of you are not allowed to say that. As far as I'm concerned, I would be perfectly fine if all four candidates would be women. Thank you.

But at the end of the day, what matters is what we want, and we want the best to be our representatives. Women – yes, as Lise said, those are women.

But those candidates, they must have – already mentioned several times – they must have time, a time they are ready and willing to contribute to the discussion, and perhaps not even time but even health, especially mental health.

That's why I think that we really need somebody with brains. And with common sense, which is so – it's really very serious because we need, and probably Giovanni later will say – and conscious.

Again, as several times it was mentioned that these people will represent the community and that really will be on their conscious, not to protect their own interest but really the interests of our community. Giovanni?

GIOVANNI SEPPIA: Thank you, Katrina. I'm happy to take the floor after the mental health. We were talking with Katrina earlier about what could be the selection criteria, and indeed, time and availability are the key factors in the selection criteria.

But also, I'd like to add a bit of IANA – well, a bit? – a lot of IANA/ICANN literacy. The understanding of what is the framework they are expected to operate, and they understand also the basically what are the duties and the tasks that are going to be performed at IANA level.

And also, one important element, which I learned my experience at the NomCom, if you represent the ccTLD community, you shouldn't be afraid because we are a strong community to speak up.

So if you know that there are candidates that are not welcome at ccTLD level, you might tell openly that from what you gather in the ccTLD community, this person is not the best to fulfill a specific role. People are free to speak up and make sure that the ccTLD community is well heard in this process. Yes, Katrina?

KATRINA SATAKI: I think we also should take into account that there are, again, ccNSO members, ccNSO non-members, and [inaudible] members of regional organizations who are active, and there are also ccTLDs which are not members of ccNSO, not members of regional organizations.

We had special commitment, trying to involve these registries as well. I think all those criteria should be somehow taken into account.

BYRON HOLLAND: Time, resources, support from your organization, experience and understanding, some time and distance in ICANN that you actually significantly understand the issues to begin with. It's probably not a learn-on-the-job role. I think that's what I understood from you, Giovanni.

Some geographic diversity, which will, in part, take into consideration, I think, the ccNSO versus RO versus completely unaligned membership criteria. Keith, what else?

KEITH DAVIDSON: Can I start to add some more too? I think a balance of perhaps government-run versus non-government ccTLD. I think other criteria could be whether you'd have a mix of not-for-profit and for-profit or structurally different ccTLDs.

I think you'd want a mix of skills that would at least cover off technical, in terms of the technical functioning of IANA, versus legal versus overall policy skills.

I think a balance of people who've had history in the IANA process going right back, perhaps some of the people who remember the good old days of ICANN looking for contracts and things.

This is what I'm saying: there's a mix. English fluency is probably quite a high criteria because all of this will conducted in English, but again, preference for people who have at least one other language probably stands up.

It's a difficult mix and what I'm suggesting is that the selection committee probably has to matrix and weight all of those sorts of criteria, as well. Some of those things will be much more important than others, but there's a delicate balance to ensure that every set of skills that we possibly can have covered is covered as well.

I don't think this is quick and easy as saying, "There's got to be geographic diversity," and so on. This is about matching the right skills and getting the right people in the room.

BYRON HOLLAND: Thanks, Keith.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: Hi, this is [inaudible]. I would just like to add to the criteria of including the non-ccNSO ccs in the selection committee and maybe as a candidate for the coordination group itself.

One of the reasons for including the non-ccNSO community is to get them involved. I would like to make sure that an experienced and a very well-versed English-speaking female that we know, an individual that is familiar with ICANN is not just selected, but that a mechanism or a method of including more of the ccs in the selection should be considered.

BYRON HOLLAND: Thanks. And one thing just to note also is that Bart has been working with Xavier to get a complete list of all cc operators that this invitation to participate is going to go to, so that we will be communicating to the best of our ability with every cc. And I know the regional organizations are also doing their own work to reach out to everybody in their regions.

MATHIEU WEILL: I think we have an impressive list of criteria and my goal is to make things simpler. We need to prioritize.

I would like to respond to some of the ideas by saying I do not agree with these criteria. The reasoning behind this is by adding all those

criteria, we are actually drawing the perfect candidate as being always the same person. As usual, we are drawing candidates towards experts of Internet governance.

Two of these criterias I think are falsely good ideas. One is that English-speaking criteria. Yes, working groups are in English, but it shouldn't be so. This is not a good thing for the whole process, that it is only run in English. Therefore, why should we give an advantage to this criteria in our selection, since we are saying it has to be more inclusive? I would advocate against this criteria.

Second is strong experience on IANA. I know it's counterintuitive, but we need brains. We need people who are clever, who can actually think through these topics, but not people who are embedded into the system and who will not want any change.

That would actually lead to more difficult discussions and less productive outcome of the process. Let us beware not to produce always the same candidates by creating those criterias based on experience within our industry.

And of course, I have nothing against some experts, but it shouldn't be a prerequisite, because it's also blocking from participation a number of very valuable people who are maybe more recent. Thank you.

BYRON HOLLAND: Jordi and then Nigel and then Erick.

JORDI IPARRAGUIRRE: I subscribe Mathieu's words and I will add something else. We just said before that the committee is not going to take an opinion by itself but it's going to listen to the rest of the community. Again, that support I think what you just said, too. They do not need to be the best ones for that, because at the end of the day, they won't make the decisions.

BYRON HOLLAND: Thanks, Jordi. Mathieu, question for you. I don't disagree with your comment on language, but is this the forum to fight the language battle?

If the steering committee is primarily run in English, are we doing a non-English fluent speaker any favors by thrusting them into that, I guess is what I'm asking? Or maybe I didn't understand you clearly.

MATHIEU WEILL: Probably [is a] clarification. I am not advocating for diversity of language and including people who don't speak English. I am speaking against the criteria, the prerequisite that you have to be fluent in English. Okay? Do you see the difference? It's – I am not making sure we have a candidate who is non-English speaker, I am saying it must not be a selection criteria that we put on ourselves.

BYRON HOLLAND: Thank you for that clarification.

[NIGEL ROBERTS]:   Thank you. With that clarification, it's actually a very good point, but that's not what I wanted to talk about. I wanted to go back to Keith a minute ago. I agree with every single criteria that you put down, Keith. I think it's wonderful. The only problem is I think it's about 27 people.

And we are going to – is it four? Put four people on this and that's a fixed number, we can't just add another one like we did for the NomCom selection committee.

So I think that, yes, we can look at all of those things and they are certainly things that we can take into account, but on the spirit of rough and ready code, I think what we need to do is look at one criteria – criterion, to be precise – and that is that the people that we seat on this committee are going to be the four people who can fight the best for our corner.

And that's what they call an overriding objective in my book.

BYRON HOLLAND: Thank you. I'm going to hand it back to the chairman after Keith's final comment.

KEITH DAVIDSON: Just for the purpose ---

BYRON HOLLAND: I'm sorry. After Keith and Erick.

KEITH DAVIDSON: Just for the purpose of clarification, I think the overarching requirements were well sounded by the speed daters in the middle of the table and I was just merely adding some points that should be considered along the way, or could be considered along the way, as suggestions for the selection panel to use.

If they are using a weighted matrix, they may regard fluency of English as being a low concern compared to maybe some other criteria, but just as a helpful hand to say, "Here are some of the things that potentially are important to the process."

It's not to say all four members should have IANA history, but as long as one of the four ticks that box. In the matrix of selection, these might be useful things, or they might be totally peripheral.

ERICK IRIARTE AHON: Thanks. For Mathieu, I will speak in Spanish. Sorry, I will speak in English because the session don't have translation.

We can request about language diversity, gender diversity, size of the ccTLD diversity, non-governmental, academic diversity, and job diversity, but maybe one of the principle focuses are regional diversity.

If we have five regions, why only have four positions? The same question was made by the GAC two hours ago. They request more positions, especially because ICANN division, natural division, is by five, not by four. It's clear in this case that will be complicated, have a very clear regional diversity in select these four candidates or four persons to represent us.

EN

BYRON HOLLAND: We've got to go to the chairman. We've got to go to the chairman. Mr. Chairman, can you summarize that?

ROELOF MEIJER: Yes. I wanted to on this regional thing, on this regional thing I wanted to start with one world, one Internet.

There was something about gender. I'm not allowed to repeat that, but I think Katrina said or meant that they shouldn't all be men, but it could also be they shouldn't all be women.

There was something about brains but that was way above my head. And there was something about language but it was in a funny speech, I didn't get it either.

But what we agree or seem to agree upon: skills, time, commitment and support from the organization, as criteria. As far as possible, geographical diversity, diversity in size, IANA/ICANN literacy – awareness about tasks and duties, etc., of the IANA.

Something that I wrote down, but I think it's the gist is they should be courageous and outspoken people that are self-confident on behalf of the community - so not self-confident by themselves – but about our position, our influence, our territory, so to speak.

The committee itself should weigh those criteria. There were quite a few people who remarked about if we ask all these things together, that might be very difficult.

They are not on their own, these four people. They have the whole community behind them. They can use that. And that was also kind of a warning not to overreach, not to make it ourselves too difficult.

If this is a proper rough consensus summary, can you please raise your green card, and if it's not, in your opinion, can you give me a red? Okay. Thank you.

BYRON HOLLAND: I think that's the first unanimous one so far. Nicely done. Do you have any – are you finished, Roelof?

ROELOF MEIJER: Sorry. Yes. I'm a man. I can only do [inaudible].

BYRON HOLLAND: Thanks. Just recognizing that we're already ten minutes past the suggested completion date, I did want to open the floor just to any general comments, but like our speed daters up here, I'm going to ask you to be fast.

[MARGARITA VALDÉS]:   Hello. [Patricia] told me something that maybe could be interesting for people that it's thinking about to be part of the coordination committee, for example, in terms of prepare themselves. Is there a kind of funding for this committee?

BYRON HOLLAND: Yes. Even though the details are somewhat sketchy in terms of how ICANN is going to support it, there's an expectation that there will be additional face-to-face meetings outside of ICANN meetings and that's – I believe, their first one is scheduled for July 17. That's what I understand. I believe it's going to be in London.

I'm getting a couple of nods from knowledgeable people. That's what I understand. First meeting will be face-to-face in London, July 17th, and there will be travel support for anybody who is participating. So yes, ICANN will be stepping up for that.

[VICTOR ABBOUD]:   About the selection process, it will be a closed nomination process or it will be an open transparent that everybody will know who are the persons that were nominated or postulated for the committee, and then we will know who are the last, the four selected?

But considering that is not only a closed group as the ccNSO group, that will be another ccs that are not members of the ccNSO, it would be good to have total transparency of all the names and positions and ccTLDs, where they come from.

BYRON HOLLAND: Thank you. I think that's a very interesting comment. That has been discussed in some of the early stages of discussions here, that how transparent would this be? There was no decision made, per se. It was just part of the discussion.

EN

My sense was there was an openness to very significant transparency, that if somebody to put their name forward for candidacy here, that they would be putting it forward to the list, essentially. But there was no particular decisions made on that.

I think that's actually a very good question to put to this group right now, which is, green if candidate submissions should be made completely transparent or public to the ccNSO community list.

I'm just talking about the names. If you are going to apply to be a candidate here, you're going to submit your name to be a candidate, that that would be transparent and that everybody would be able to see that on the ccTLD mailing list.

If that is what we should do, green card. If you have reservations, orange or red. Could you please show us that? Hey, I got another unanimous one. Okay, so 100% green on that.

I think we'll take that away for the council, that one of the criteria will definitely be that all names submitted, the names submitted will be available to everybody on the list.

[CARSTEN SCHIEFNER]: Thank you, Byron. The [corollary] of that would be that a candidate who is not willing to have his or her name disclosed can't be a candidate then. Is that a fair assumption? Okay.

BYRON HOLLAND:	Probably if you want to be representative of the community, the community should know who you are, I guess. Are there any other general thoughts, comments? One more. Dotty?

DOTTY SPARKS DE BLANC:	[off mic]

BYRON HOLLAND:	We're going to talk about that at the council meeting starting shortly, as per the agenda. We will be talking about that, about how to, now that – what I do want to say is thank you very much.

This session, while fluid in nature and design, was actually very helpful for all the council members and the community to get a sense of where we're at – or at least a general direction of travel – that we'll then be talking about in the council meeting and trying to put a little finer point on how we actually conduct this.

Of course, you're always welcome to sit in on the council meeting, which will be starting in about 15 or 20 minutes. With that, Mr. Chairman?

ROELOF MEIJER:	The chair thanks the moderator for speaking on his behalf. Thank you all. I think it was quite interesting and we have a good outcome.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]