TRANSCRIPT

JOINT ALAC/ccNSO Meeting Singapore
24 March 2014

Attendees:

ALAC:
Eduardo Diaz ALAC
Pavan Budhrani APRALO
Tijani Ben Jemaa ALAC
Sylvia Herlein Leite LACRALO
Rafid Fatani ALAC
Garth Bruen NARALO Chair
Holly Raiche ALAC
Maureen Hilyard ALAC liaison to the ccNSO
Olivier Crépin-Leblond ALAC Chair
Ariel Liang – STAFF
Heidi Ullrich - STAFF
Evan Leibovitch - ALAC
Leon Sanchez - ALAC
Beran Gillen - ALAC
Alan Greenberg - ALAC
Hong Xue - APRALO
Ron Sherwood – ccNSO Liaison to the ALAC
Glenn McKnight – NARALO Secretary
Jean Jacques Subrenat - ALAC
Dev Anand Teelucksingh - ALAC
Carlton Samuels - LACRALO
Rinalia Abdul Rahim - APRALO

ccNSO:
Victor Abboud, .ec
Becky Burr, .us
Keith Davidson, .nz
Byron Holland, .ca
Don Hollander, APTLD
Hiro Hotta, .jp
Jordi Iparraguirre, NomCom
Annebeth Lange, .no
Roelof Meijer, .nl
Abibu Ntangahiye, .tz
Souleymane Oumtanaga .ci
Katrina Sataki, .lv
Dotty Sparks de Blanc, .vi
Ron Sherwood, ccNSO Liaison to the ALAC
Margarita Valdes, .cl

Peter Van Roste, CENTR
Hong Xue, Nomcom

ICANN Staff:
Bart Boswinkel

Speaker:	Good morning, good afternoon, and good evening to everyone for the participants here on site and remotely. This is the ALAC and ccNSO session on Monday March 24, 14.00 local time Singapore. Over to you, Maureen. Thank you.
Maureen Hilyard:	Thank you, everyone, and welcome to the ALAC, ccNSO joint meeting. I'm just waiting for my presentation to come up so we can actually start. Because I'm going to begin by giving a brief overview on what our role is at ALAC, a very simplified, very brief version.
	Great. Can I go straight to the sixth slide, please? Okay. First off, the key question here is where do ALAC members come from? ALAC members, there are ten ALAC members who are elected by our ALSs which are our At Large Structures. What we have here is a map representing the five regions. We have about 160 odd ALSs at the moment spread over those five regions. I'd just like to note that I actually come from the ALS which is on the far right, bottom corner of the map in the Cook Islands right in the middle of nowhere. And the brown region represents AP RILO, a very large and very diverse region.
	Next, how is the ALAC organized? We have 15 members on the ALAC and as I said, ten members are elected by their RILO. So, we have five regions and each region chooses two members to the ALAC and one member is actually appointed by the non-com. So, we have 15 members on the team and of course the five regions, as you saw on the map previously covering Africa, Asia-Pacific, Europe, Latin America, and North America.
	When we're looking at -- sorry, next? When we're looking at the leadership within the group, we have what we call the At Large Advisory Committee Leadership Team, the AACLT which is a few members of the ALAC plus the liaison and liaison are -- for example, I'm the liaison for the ccNSO. Ellen is liaison for the GNSO. We have Julie who is the STAC liaison and we have Mary who is the liaison for dotMobi. So, together we make up the AACLT and of course we have our RILO chairs and the RILO secretariat and with the ALAC and the RILO chairs elect the RILO representative on the Board which is our current -- is something that's happening at the moment and will probably be decided on Wednesday. That's coming up.
	Next? RILO elect, there's actually a little booklet that's available and tells you all about what we actually do but the whole purpose of the ALAC is of course providing advice on activities and how they relate to individual internet users. That's in a nutshell basically what we do. Next?
	Of course we do this by way of a whole lot of working groups which I'm going to go through and you'll see that. This is just a sample of some of the working groups we're currently involved in. There's a whole range of working groups that ALAC members take some leadership role in ideally. But ALSs are very integral to the input that comes to policy development through these working groups. Next?

This is a very brief overview of the process. Okay? So, you know, what normally happens is those policy statements come from ccNSO and other SOs within the system, comes to ALAC, ALAC puts together a working group -- they decide on whether we need a working group to organize a statement. The working group works on it, gets back to -- a statement comes to the working group from the ALAC. We decide on whether it needs to be through the center for further consultation. Consultation happens and it comes back and we approve of it or not and then it goes back to whoever gave it to us in the first place. This is our statement, this is a public consultation statement. Okay? That's it in a nutshell.

Just as an example, what I've actually given you here are the working groups that are actually just delivering for one event. That's ATLAS2 that's happening in London in June. So, in order to make that happen, the ALSs -- ALAC and the ALSs are very much involved in putting in all those different areas. So, it's a very collaborative effort. It's not just what's going to happen isn't just going to be -- it's not a one person or one man band thing. It's very inclusive and all the RILOs and all the ALSs are involved.

Okay. Sorry. I forgot to mention that the ATLAS2 of course is the At Large summit which is where we're actually getting all the ALSs globally have been invited to attend a special event, sort of like a special capacity building event in London which is why it's more inclusive -- it can be inclusive because every single ALS that's actually been invited is I think most of them are actually involved in a working group in UA. We're trying to get them all involved before they come.

But in the working groups too we try to make sure that there is representation across the RILOs so that working groups aren't just focused on a particular region. They are representative of all the regions. We're actually getting everyone's contributions. But I actually put this one, this particular group in because in the AP RILO region, for example, because the region is so diverse in this particular working group AP RILO is represented by ALSs from India, China, Armenia, New Zealand, Hong Kong, and Iran. That's just one working group. You're getting that representation from one RILO. So, the other RILOs will also be as diversely represented as well. Next?

Just to finish off, to advertise an event that's been hosted or showcased and is being hosted by AP RILO and our theme is celebrating diversity. We would invite you all to come to our showcase on Wednesday. Drinks and nibbles. We think that's going to be an enticement to come. Thank you. Now it's Katrina's turn. Questions after. Katrina next. Unless you've got a question while Katrina is setting up.

Katrina Sataki:	I have a question.
Maureen Hilyard:	While she's setting up, she has a question.
Katrina Sataki:	May I ask, while my presentation is being uploaded, you mentioned you have a liaison with dotMobi? That's interesting. Could you explain why dotMobi has one?
Maureen Hilyard:	Good question. I'll find out.
Heidi Ullrich:	This is Heidi Ullrich. Within the dotMobi bylaws there's an element that there needs to be an At Large liaison or an ALAC liaison.
Katrina Sataki:	Thank you very much. I'm Katrina Sataki from ccNSO. After our meeting in Buenos Aires we realized that there's really a need to elaborate more on what ccTLDs are and what ccNSO is. One of the favorite sayings that ccTLDs is one, five, dozen -- it's perfectly applicable to ccTLDs and to ccNSO.

Thank you. Yes. So, we're all working to make sure the internet is working. Yes. There. We believe that ccTLDs play a crucial role in ensuring that the internet is still working. But as you know we have -- typically we can say that the top level domain could be divided into a country code top level domain and generic top level domain.

If we look at this picture, I hope you can see the numbers at the moment -- those are a later date from IANA. At the moment there are 490 top level domains delegated and 285 of them are country code top level domains. Most of them are Latin, however, 36 are non-Latin script at the moment and still considered ccTLDs. We hope we're going to have even more non-Latin ccTLDs but those are the current numbers.

Of course this is going to change as we use numbers from one of the regional organizations of ccTLDs. These are quite old numbers but still they show off general principle of market share and the growth and again, it's going to change due to the new GTLDs coming on the stage but this shows the global breakdown of top level domains. dotMobi is a very, very small, tiny, tiny share of all of generic top level domains and there are really many top level domains and the top 20 largest country codes, top level domains account for 70% of domain names registered under ccTLD.

So, how actually ccTLDs are being delegated, first of all there's nothing to invent there. There's an international standard and it contains the list of country codes -- two letter country codes. Those country codes are assign to the particular country or territory according to this standard. There's nothing that anyone could evaluate or there's really no need for a long process. It's quite clear, written in the standards.

Best practices, we have upper management and operations in the particular country or territory and the main goal of the ccTLD is to serve their local internet community. Actually the users who you represent. Each ccTLD has its own policy. Of course some of them are more like some are completely different but unlike in the case of generic top level domains, ICANN does not say ccTLDs, how to set up their policies. We do that on our own. Some ccTLDs have joined according to the European uniform distribution policy. It's really optional. If a ccTLD wants, it can us that policy. And of course we expect ccTLDs are run with technical competency. We consider ourselves experts of the internet.

So, regarding the policies, mostly ccTLDs are run by not-for-profit organizations. And registration models and all that, again, they may differ. One size does not fit all. We cannot operate the registry-registrar model. We can offer only direct registration, but many chose to operate a mixed model.

There are four regional ccTLD organizations and many ccTLDs choose to join these organizations. However, not all ccTLDs are part of the regional organizations. It's really voluntarily. If they want, they may join.

Same as well the ccNSO. This is again another voluntary organization and at the moment there are 148 members. 148 ccTLDs decided to join the ccNSO. Again, not all ccTLDs which are members of regional organizations decide to decide to join the ccNSO and perhaps vice versa. Not all ccTLDs which are members of ccNSO do join regional organizations in their regions.

So, for some reason it does not work well but what the ccNSO members do, first of all they elect a council. They also elect Board members to ICANN. Members are the one that vote on policies and resolutions. Members participate in working

groups and suggest topics, and set the meeting agenda. This organization is for members and members rule the ccNSO world.

Speaking of the council, members elect -- yes, okay. Sorry. Change. This is the -- we don't have this nice animation. But the idea is that from each ICANN region there are three counselors, 15 counselors elected by our ccTLD plus we have three counselors from non-com, four others from regional organizations, from each regional organization, and we also have liaisons to other organizations.

So, unlike maybe other councils that you're used to, the ccNSO council has two main roles. First, administrative, actually organizes the work of ccNSO. And another is representative. At the moment for example we're meeting with ALAC and counselors representing ccNSO. But all the major decisions are made by -- not by the council but by the members.

Regarding ICANN, ccTLDs, as you could see actually this morning, ccTLDs are one of those who really rely on IANA functions. We also may join our ccNSO, many ccTLDs financially contribute to ICANN and also to ICANN meetings. In many cases when ICANN meetings are held, in particular countries, a ccTLD really gets involved in organizing the meeting and including the financial contributions and of course some of ccTLDs have exchange letters with ICANN. Some have agreements.

Those are the main things I wanted to stress. One size does not fit all and that's in terms of different ccTLDs and in terms of different organizations. CcNSO is not like other organizations within ICANN. Please bear that in mind when you rely on the council to make decisions. Our members do.

Thank you. Are there any questions?

Eduardo Diaz:	This is Eduardo Diaz. I have a question. You mentioned that you develop policy for the ccNSO. Are these policies, do they apply also once they're established, do they apply to the non-members of the ccTLD?
Katrina Sataki:	The ccNSO?
Eduardo Diaz:	The ccNSO.
Katrina Sataki:	Yes. CcTLDs are members of ccNSO. And policies apply only to the members of ccNSO. Other ccTLDs, they may choose if they want to follow policies or not. And again, if a ccTLD -- actually, it's not mandatory to be -- to stay a member of ccNSO forever. CcTLD may decide just to leave if ccTLD does not agree with the policy and does not agree to follow the policy. I haven't heard of any case where a ccTLD decided to leave ccNSO but theoretically it's possible. So, no. It's only binding to the members of the ccNSO.
Eduardo Diaz:	Another question, in order to become a part of the ccNSO do you have to pay? Or is it free?
Katrina Sataki:	No. You don't have to pay.
Eduardo Diaz:	Thank you.
Katrina Sataki:	Thank you. Any other questions?
Speaker:	In the sense of your question, Eduardo, we are voluntarily applying the policies because it's voluntarily to be in the ccNSO. At the same time we have some current statistics that are very -- link it with the participation of the ccTLDs. So, sometimes we agree about the policies but sometimes the policy not necessarily

	is -- has to be applied in the ccTLD in particular because some local things could have a conflict with this kind of policy. So, it's voluntary.
Katrina Sataki:	Thank you. That's a very good point. Really ccTLDs do follow local laws and other regulations.
Maureen Hilyard:	Just one point from a housekeeping perspective, can you state your name for the transcript when you pose a question? Thank you. Sorry. I should see that.
Evan Leibovitch:	This is Evan Leibovitch for the record. I wanted to ask, as you know, here we are in ALAC and we're supposed to be speaking for and at least try to represent the interests of individual end users. So, I informed my workings here by talking to my family and friends that know nothing about the inner workings of the domain name system and one of the things that keeps coming up is the matter of confusion. Most people when they're using the internet don't know whether something is a generic or CC or anything like that. There might be an impression from some people that everything is managed out of the same place. Does there exist any kind of information or any kind of portal that would allow an end user to go to this that says -- These are managed by ICANN, these are not managed by ICANN, these are managed internally. This is not a matter of asking for controls so much as a matter of information so that when somebody goes to a top level domain they understand which ones are under ICANN's oversight and which ones are not? Thank you.
Byron Holland:	I'll take a stab at that. Byron Holland from dot-CA and also currently chair of the ccNSO. Really, when it comes down to ccTLDs, there's two primary types -- CC Operators and G Operators. I can't speak to where you would find it specifically, but it's my understanding that on the ICANN website you can find the contracted parties and explanations of the differences. Becky?
Becky Burr:	The IANA website has a listing of all the ccTLDs and the GTLD operators. So, if you go to IANA.org you'll be able to find it.
Byron Holland:	That's true. You'll find it on IANA.org. But all you'll see is the TLD and whether it's country code or generic. That's absolutely true but I'm not sure if you're just an end user who's not informed on the differences if that's going to be helpful. And that's more what I heard in your question as opposed to just a list which it's true. It's at IANA. What's the difference?
Evan Leibovitch:	Thank you.
Maureen Hilyard:	ALAC is a little bit of -- because I have little signs that say stand up but if you're from ccNSO and you tried to put -- could you put your hand up so I can -- did you want to say -- ? Did you have a question?
Roelof Meijer:	My name is Roelof Meijer from dot-NL. In fact, Byron made my point. I think by the time that an end user knows about IANA and ICANN he will probably know the difference between the GTLD and the CC.
Maureen Hilyard:	Yes?
Garth Bruen:	Thank you. Garth Bruen, NARALO Chair. I think there's definitely a problem communicating to internet users about this. I'm glad Evan brought it up. It reminded me of the way that IANA keeps track of the contacts for different ccTLDs. When we ask them about this a few meetings ago, they sent a New Year holiday card to the contact address. If the holiday card is returned by the postal service, then they make further inquiries. I'm wondering if this methodology has received any update especially if we're heading into a new era of multi stakeholder oversight? Thank you.

Byron Holland:	I've been wondering where my holiday card from IANA went. I think it's a little more robust than that. There's a significant process by which CC operators are validated in terms of are they the correct manager of a given CC. So, there are policies in place that actually are quite specific to legitimizing whether that CC manager is in fact the correct one or not. It's definitely not just a holiday card.
Garth Bruen:	It must've changed recently then. I'd love to see the documentation on the process, thanks.
Holly Raiche:	I can appreciate what was said earlier which is each local area is responsible for the policies of its own country code but the fact is we have a thing called ccNSO in ICANN. Now, how do you see your role in terms of the governance of a sense of liaison but really like a sovereign separate entity and what role, how do you see ICANN's role given that you're dealing with essentially sovereign managers?
Roelof Meijer:	I think the briefest answer would be if you're talking about an individual CC, it's local policy. My answer would be there is none. Apart from making sure IANA functions properly. But no policy role.
Holly Raiche:	Could I ask this sort of discussions that have been in ccNSO, if there's no role in governance at all other than New Year cards.
Roelof Meijer:	That's why I said local policy. In the ccNSO if we talk about policy, it's global policy. Some piece of policy get their answers from technical aspects.
Holly Raiche:	I guess that's what I meant. Obviously you don't talk about local. But in terms of the discussions you have, what do you cover? What would you expect the response to be in terms of your discussions given that we've now identified them as global? Thank you.
Roelof Meijer:	I think our chair will pick up on this but I think the best recent example is the IDNs and IDNs version of CC.
Bart Boswinkel:	My name is Bart Boswinkel, ccNSO support staff. The policy scope of the ccNSO is very, very limited. It's effectively it deals if you were in the room next door up to it deals about what Ray called the transactional relations on ccTLDs. So, what is happening in the IANA database. And the recent example of that one is the IDM policy that is about this election of an IDM ccTLD and all the policies around it. That is the policy of the ccNSO.
	The second one, what the ccNSO also does and what some of your members are observers to is what is called framework of interpretation dealing with delegation and redelegation of ccTLDs in general. I gather that's transactional at the level of IANA. And what you see there -- this is the way the ccNSO policy is structured, it is a very heavy-handed process. Until now there were only two policies in the ccNSO. One was on its own bylaws and that was more dry run to learn how to do it. The second one is the IDM PDP. That one has taken six years and is -- in the meantime we know this. In the meantime we have what is called the IDM fast track and we've learned that's again one of the things the ccNSO in the policy development of the IDMs, we learned from what was done and from the implementation of the fast track process.
	That's why it took so long and you don't want to spend too much resources on both. So, it's really about IANA. Going back to your question, the relation between the policies of the ccNSO and individual ccTLDs, in principle what you see happening in the GNSO around these policies is exclusive of the policy. The ccNSO has no power, policy rights, where we got into policies of registration policy, transaction policies over individual ccTLDs.

Keith Davidson:	I was sitting in the back of the room but I was irresistibly drawn forward with this topic. Probably the one thing that you couldn't comment on that I can is that the independence of the policy making framework for the ccTLDs that has been virtually impossible for ICANN to deliver top down policies to us. We've reserved our rights and we have a very strong principle of subsidiary that if there is a policy decision made by the ccNSO, if a ccTLD has a problem that would conflict with local law in their country then they have an exemption from being bound to that policy as well. It's probably quite important to understand those principles, particularly as we go forward in the IANA new world. Thank you.
Olivier Crépin-Leblond:	The problem of speaking after Keith Davidson is he answers your question before you ask it. That's a bit of a problem. Thankfully I have a second question to fall back on which was a follow up from Evan, just a clarification with regards to the list of ccTLDs. It's well understood that there's a list of ccTLDs and GTLDs, et cetera, all on the IANA website. Is there a list of ccTLDs showing which ones are members of the ccNSO and which ones are not members of the ccNSO? I know there is a list of members of the ccNSO but I don't know whether there's any one that shows the ones that are not members?
Keith Davidson:	No. There isn't a definitive list in that regard. On the ccNSO.ICANN.org there's a list of members but that doesn't correlate with the database. Unless they're a member, we don't mention them. I guess if your spread sheeting capabilities are reasonable you could create both databases and tack them together but I think the last exercise I saw was that after 246 ASCII ccTLDs, 146 or 147 members, they account for about 99% of the domain names registered in the ccTLD environment. The hundred that are not members tend to be very small and or non-existent.
Maureen Hilyard:	Thank you, Keith. We're running just a little bit over time. We have one question from Eduardo?
Eduardo Diaz:	Just out of curiosity do you have in the ccNSO an outreach program to go to those that are not members? Do you actually actively look for those to try to be part of the ccNSO?
Byron Holland:	No. There isn't an active outreach. It's something we have discussed in terms of capacity building or further outreach and that is not a program that we have in place. Any CC is welcome to join us but we're not soliciting for new membership.
Abibu Ntangahiye:	In terms of outreach, the member organization at the ccNSO, like GTLD and the rest, they do outreach to programs in terms of capacity and they do collaborate with ICANN and ISOC.
Olivier Crépin-Leblond:	I unfortunately missed the beginning of the meeting so I hope I'm not repeating things that have been said earlier, that the At Large community is made up of 160 At Large Structures and we're scattered throughout the world. One thing we have done with the ASO a couple of years ago actually was to try and map out those countries which had ASO members in the country and those countries which had the local At Large Structures in the country. I wonder whether that might be an easy exercise that could be done to find out if there are any countries that ccNSO doesn't have members in and that the ALAC has members in and vice versa. We're looking towards trying to have one ALS in every country in the world. That's our aim, in order to be able to cover the whole planet and be able to get the input the internet uses from everywhere. We need that diversity. We need all the help we can have on our side. I don't know if you're actively looking for help to perhaps identify means of bringing more members into the ccNSO but that's just an open offer.

Keith Davidson:	That's a interesting proposition. Maybe that deserves more discussion between us. I wouldn't say that we've been on a rampant program of seeking to adopt other countries but we don't have a closed door policy either. But we've generally linked it to their regional ccTLD organizations to collaborate with us for their own outreach programs to encourage participation. But there are some groups also just to add a further complexity to the idea of the IANA database and the membership of the ccNSO, there are also people or ccTLDs who can be part of ICANN through an exchange of letters or accountability mechanism who don't want to be part of the ccNSO. So, there are other mysteries as well.
Olivier Crépin-Leblond:	Thanks very much, Keith. Just as a follow up, one of the things we've found a couple years down the line is that of course we have a regional structure. We divide the world into five regions and the ASO was also -- the RILOs were divided among the five regions, maybe slightly differently in some regions of the world. What has come spontaneously out of the equation is we now have RILOs that are signing agreements with their local internet registries for further collaboration and cross-pollination sometimes of activities if there is a need and user input, et cetera. The RILOs make use of this and vice-versa as well. We might be jumping very far ahead but I'm giving you this as an example with the sort of interaction there has been between the addressed supporting organization that is often seen as being the poor child of ICANN that no one really takes much notice of. That's what they used to say in the past. But we take much notice of them now and obviously with the INF function it's there. This is one of the things really that we've worked at. It might be something we wish to explore in the future but it's true that in general the regions have got a strong point to this and of course it's up to them to work on that.
Maureen Hilyard:	Thank you, Olivier. Dawn just reminded me that one of the collaboration partnerships is to be signed Wednesday between AP RILO and AP TLD. We actually have two. One is specifically with AP TLD. And so we in the ALAC we're starting to look this way.
	I think we really need to -- thank you very much for your questions and your interest in our presentation today. Thank you, Katrina. And I think what we've -- these discussions we've had today will actually be able to help us with our coordinating group too.
Olivier Crépin-Leblond:	Thank you very much, Maureen. One last thing before we go and continue with this mad week of ICANN meetings, I wanted to extend an invitation to Byron and to all of you to come to the At Large Summit in London. We have 160 At Large structures that are all coming to London. They're coming for a weekend of sessions and then a week of workshops and interaction with the community. I will be sending you an email, Byron, to come speak to our community and interact with them and go much further than just describing what ccNSO is all about but actually sort of engaging in further discussion. So, of course everyone is welcome. All of the At Large meetings are open. So, the At Large Summit will be no different. It will be open to everyone as well. That's all for the time being. Thank you.
Byron Holland:	Thank you very much. I appreciate the offer and look forward to the email.
Maureen Hilyard:	That's it for my session. Now for the beginning, the introductions from the leaders.
Byron Holland:	Thanks, everybody. I hope you enjoyed it. Thanks and good bye.
Maureen Hilyard:	This meeting has been adjourned, thank you.