
SINGAPORE – Supporting the DNS Industry in Underserved Regions
Wednesday, March 26th 2014 – 15:30 to 17:30
ICANN – Singapore, Singapore

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: It is March 26, 2014. The session is Supporting the DNS Industry in Underserved Regions. The room is Canning Ballroom, and the local time is 3:26 PM, with a start time of 3:30 PM.

MIKE ZUPKE: Good afternoon. It seems like every workshop that I'm in I'm always apologizing for the late start, but I think that it's usually because people are coming from someplace else, so everybody's a little bit late. I apologize for the late start. We'll be getting ready in just a minute.

Are we ready with recording and everything? Okay, great. Thank you very much. We're just waiting for one more of our presenters, so hopefully we'll be able to begin at any moment.

If you're online and waiting for this session to begin, we're getting ready. We're just waiting for one of presenters. We should be able to start soon, though.

Okay. We're going to begin. My name is Mike Zupke. I'm the Director of Registrar Programs at ICANN. I want to welcome you to this session, Supporting the DNS Industry in Underserved Regions.

This is a topic that I'm personally very excited to be discussing, and very enthusiastic about, although I have to admit that I'm mostly here taking

Note: The following is the output resulting from transcribing an audio file into a word/text document. Although the transcription is largely accurate, in some cases may be incomplete or inaccurate due to inaudible passages and grammatical corrections. It is posted as an aid to the original audio file, but should not be treated as an authoritative record.

credit. Most of the other people who are on this panel have done the work that has led to this.

So, what we have today is a session to talk a little bit about some of the challenges that have been identified previously for registrars and other potential participants in the DNS marketplace in what we're calling "underserved regions." So, we use this terminology because it's not necessarily that this is challenges that are particular to an economy or to a geography, but that we recognize that there can be challenges for any particular region where we see that the marketplace could be better served.

So our program today, we have an agenda, if you wouldn't mind putting the agenda slide up, please. Thank you. So our goal today is actually to do not too much talking at the front, and to have more of a discussion with the people who are here in the room. So we'll be putting you to work, if you don't mind.

But, before we begin, we thought it'd be really helpful to give some updates on what's been going on in this realm to date, and what the progress of these activities has been. So, I'm going to introduce each of our presenters, just as they're ready to speak.

So we'll start with the Africa in ICANN strategy update, which my colleague, Pierre Dandjinou, will be speaking to. So if you wouldn't mind, Pierre, would you just please take it from there?



PIERRE DANDJINOU:

Thank you, Mike. Thank you all for coming and for sharing. As Mike said, what we are looking forward to hear is that we have our working group that can eventually further discuss some of the issues. The ultimate goal for us being to really see what could be the appropriate solutions that we'll present to ICANN for a decision to be eventually be taken.

Rapidly, I would like to take you through the Africa strategy, because this is where, for the first time, we were really able to put a few of [said] people together, especially the ccTLD managers, but also the registrars from Africa. And one of the meeting we had in Africa, and some of the issues were very crystallized then.

But, before I go into that, I will just also say that the Africa strategies stem from a few observations. You remember the new gTLD program, when this came out, and then we have 1,930 requests for a new domain. Since only 17 of them came from Africa; and of this 17, 16 came from South Africa, and just one from elsewhere. Well, that really clearly showed that there was something to be done, because Africa is about 54 different countries. So if people didn't show that interest, so it means that something need to be done.

So the new CEO then, Fadi Chehadé, suggested that maybe Africa themselves be able to tell exactly what they would like to do. The issue was also about having ICANN much more present in Africa, of course, but also more and more Africans participating to ICANN and contributing.

So the Africa strategy we refer to, in fact, in the word of, it was a bottom-up approach. We managed to collect the most important issues,



but also the solution people now are facing. But, to put it short, it's about building capacity in Africa at a different level – not just only on technical level, but also on business-wise. Today we do have seven registrars and ICANN accredited registrars, but none of them is really making any money, because of the local environment they are living in, because they are having difficulties in actually working with the ccTLDs, because they have to face competition or things like that.

Anyways, so the issue were raised there. What we did was to have a working group of them, and they came up with a few issues but also solution. Mike will certainly go deep into that later on. But the Africa strategy was there to actually boost the sector, and by a few initiatives.

One of the initiatives was about securing the DNSSEC. Another initiative trying to discuss the issue of digital entrepreneurship, including the younger generations, and then having finally [inaudible] incubators. So they are close to a host of projects.

Today, after one year, we are able to have staff, at least in Africa, three people that are doing heavily in the engagement work in different countries. We have different stakeholders. But the conclusion today for us is that we are yet to engage with the business sector in Africa.

So we are planning some sort of strategy partnership with the global DNS industry that will come and help us build capacity there. We'll be talking on that in our actual DNS session.

So what I just hear is that I think the African continent is really looking forward to a solution we might really have to maybe lower the barrier for those registrar and registries in Africa. So, we really look forward to



working groups and whatever solution we are going to actually suggest. With that, I would like to stop here and then pass over to Mike.

MIKE ZUPKE:

Great. Thank you, Pierre. And I forgot to mention that Pierre is our VP of Stakeholder Engagement for Africa, but that we have VPs of Stakeholder Engagement in all of the ICANN regions. And so the work he is describing, there are similar sorts of initiatives in other regions. I would be remiss if I didn't at least point that out. So, thank you. That was a very helpful update.

Our next speaker is Manal Ismail. She is from the – I was going to say, she's from the GAC, but she's not from the GAC. You're a member of the GAC. So, she represents Egypt on the GAC, and she's here to speak on behalf of the National Telecom Regulatory Authority, and to talk about a particular project that I find to be completely fascinating.

So I will let you speak, and I'll just preface this also by saying that Manal won't be able to stay very long, because the GAC is working at the same time. She's got that and one other commitment. So, we're really grateful that you could join us, even though you're triple booked today. So, thank you.

MANAL ISMAIL:

Thank you, Mike, and thank you Pierre, and thanks to everyone. Following on the introduction by Pierre, and as mentioned by Mike, we had the same strategy and had the same community initiative for the Middle East that was also coordinated by Baher Esmat, who is the VP for



the Middle East and whom couldn't make it today at the meeting, and has shared the slides for me to present on his behalf.

As Pierre mentioned, both strategies for the Middle East and Africa has identified the need to grow the DNS industry ecosystem in both regions, as well as the need to develop local expertise in different aspects – technical, business, as well as policies.

So, if we have this next slide, please. I decided to very quickly use my own home country as an example, just to further illustrate the problem.

We're a population of 84 million, a young population because we have 25% between the age of 18 and 29. We have 38, almost 39, Internet users, 13 million Facebook users, 3.9 million mobile broadband subscribers; and even mobile subscribers, we have 99.7 million mobile subscribers.

And the reason I'm putting this figure, although it might not relate directly to Internet, but we keep blaming illiteracy and low GDP and things like this for the low penetration we're suffering, which is not true, because the numbers are not so bad in other areas. Whereas for the DNS, we have registrations under dot-eg are only 9,000 names, and under the IDN ccTLD we have 3,000. We have no ICANN accredited registrars from our country, and minimum number, like six or seven, from the whole region. And we had no gTLD applications from our country, although were involved in two gTLD applications through the League of Arab States. But, again, we did not have any applicants from the country itself. So, having said that, if we go to the next slide, please.



We had Fadi Chehadé visiting Egypt this last December, and this is when the idea was agreed to have a DNS Entrepreneurship Center in Egypt that would basically build the necessary expertise to help Egypt and the region provide the necessary consultations and have a nucleus that would carry on the task of triggering the industry not only in Egypt, but also in Africa and the Middle East.

So, the scope is to foster the DNS sector, and of course, develop related industries such as e-content, e-government, and other software development and applications and things like that.

The Center is supposed to provide three main services. Those are professional training and capacity building, consultancy services, and technical operations.

It's planned to get into operation in three phases. Of course, there's the launch phase, where the partnership would be announced, and the signing of the MoU, which we target to have it signed in ICANN 50 in London.

Then, we are going to go through phase one, which is basically creating the program and targeting to train and provide calibers in the different DNS-related tracks. Those graduates will be the nucleus working on building the Center and getting it into operation. We expect this phase to take one year, and then we can have the Center ready.

The second phase is the training and consultancy phase. This is where those trainees are going to start to train other candidates from the region and from the country, and have material ready in the different languages spoken by the region – basically, Arabic English, and French.



And then have the training programs set, the certification curriculum in place, and introduce work tracks on providing national and regional consultancy, also. So there, you will be given consultancy all over the region.

Then, coming to the final phase, we hope that by then – phase two is expected to take two years – and then by the time, we hope that we would have the caliber within the region that would be providing the service within the region, and also putting some strategies regarding operations, maybe for dot-eg and IDN ccTLD also having some strategy on how to boost and develop the national ccTLD and giving also the same experience and the same consultancy within the region.

I hope I didn't exceed the five minutes. I know it's intended to be interactive. Thank you.

MIKE ZUPKE:

Thank you very much. One of the things that, in us talking about that project at ICANN, is in what ways can ICANN help to facilitate the development of that project? And one of the things that we've discussed frequently is, how can we help recruit people from the industry with lots of solid experience to come and either volunteer some time, or maybe even help us by putting on some sort of a training program or those sorts of things?

I think, for people in the room – and of course, who aren't in the room, but speaking in particular to people in the room who come from registries and registrars – you may find that ICANN is approaching you in the future and saying, "Is this something that you'd like to contribute



to?” I think it’ll be a very worthwhile endeavor. I just wanted to put that out there. I think that we look at this, and I think that’s maybe one of the things that, although ICANN doesn’t consider that we have the technical subject matter expertise and how to run a registrar, for example, we certainly have lots of relationships with registrars, who I think could be very helpful in that.

So, Michele, did you want to ask a question about that?

MICHELE NEYLON:

I just want to make a small comment. Michele Neylon, I’m Chair of the Registrar Stakeholder Group.

One of the comments we raised at our session with yourselves yesterday in the SG was in relation to the language of communication used by ICANN staff, with respect to registrars, and I think it’s something that, for those people in this room who are obviously interested in – what was the term you used earlier? Underserved regions. etc. It’s something ICANN may need to have a look at.

Many of the registrars in Europe at the moment, whose native language isn’t English, aren’t participating actively, and without going any further, you don’t even have to go outside Europe. And part of the reason for that is because ICANN’s communications are through English. And it’s not normal English. It’s not the English that I speak. [inaudible], but that’s another conversation entirely. It’s a very technical, acronym-ridden, doublespeak, jargon, legalese, and I think that can be a challenge. I think something that, as a community and as an organization, it needs to address.



MIKE ZUPKE: Thank you, Michele. That's a very good point. Go ahead.

JIMSON OLUFUYE: Jimson Olufuye, Africa ICT Alliance. While I preview the presentation, and I noticed some things that are [core] value. I'm a registrar for dot-ng in Nigeria, though it's less than 10% of my business. But from experience, I think that moving the industry forward, we need to look at the policy framework and now implement it. It has to be fair.

One of the things I've seen is the implementation is not that fair, in the sense that it's not consistent to what has been laid out. Also, you need to organize some peer review – something like this, but with more successful ccTLD. I learned this morning that [Mali] has really pushed up his domain to 80,000, which is quite impressive.

Also, within the economy, truly there's a lot of money in the system. You just need to get to the proper channels. For example, Eitesal in Egypt, the Egyptian ICT Software Communication Industry Association, there has to be some linkages. I also mentioned this morning to Chamber of Commerce, where you have investors. So, that's treated as a business case, not as, say, not for profit. As a business case, for profit.

So if you get the right people, get the brief, get to know what to do, then we invest the money. This thing needs lots of awareness, lots of advertisement, and status will not bring that money. So people that have the resources need to see. You need to meet them at the appropriate venue. And you'll bring out the money. The techies are



always there. They can engage them in order to get the ecosystem running faster. That's my thinking.

MIKE ZUPKE:

Thank you. That's a good comment. I look forward to having you joining the discussion later when we do some brainstorming on these things. I can tell that you've got some great ideas.

Before we continue with the comments, I was hoping that we could also allow Sam Lanfranco to give his update on what the NPOC is doing.

SAM LANFRANCO:

It may make sense to finish that off.

MIKE ZUPKE:

Sam has told me he'd prefer if we finished the comments first. So, please, if you'd like to come back up to the microphone, we'll do that first. Sorry for the change of plans here. Thanks for your flexibility, Sam.

MARIA FARRELL:

Hi, my name is Maria Farrell. I'm in the Non-Commercial Stakeholder's Group, and I have two things.

One, I think that might possibly be of interest, is that I am doing a project for Oxford University, funded by the Foreign and Commonwealth Office in the U.K., and we are putting together some best practices, and possibly even metrics, for ccTLDs on cyber security. It's all based on first person research and interviews, so the more



people I can talk to, the happier I will be. I hope to present it in June at the ccNSO Tech Day.

And the second is an idea that I know has been percolating around for a while. Anyway, it's that, you know the whole registrar model is created very much on a North American, Western European business financial model where you've got a lot of capital, you've got a lot of resources, you've got a fair amount of operational sophistication, for want of a better word. Clearly, that's not engaging with other economies in the world.

So should we start maybe looking at the fact that maybe it's not the problem of those economies or those markets, but the problem is with the model of the registrar that we have right now? That it's just maybe a bit too gold-plated, and a bit too, as Michele says, heavy on the legalese?

So I just wonder, is there a group of people, or are there people interested generally in looking at that registrar model and saying, "Well, how would it look like if we came up with a registrar light or a different type of model that would just work in more places in the world?"

MIKE ZUPKE:

Thanks, Maria.

RODRIGO DE LA PARRA:

Good afternoon. My name is Rodrigo de la Parra, and I'm ICANN Vice President for Latin America and the Caribbean. I just wanted to share that also in the Latin America and Caribbean Strategy Group, there is an



initiative that has to do, or is pretty much aligned with the ones in Egypt and Africa, the Middle East and Africa, and we should pretty much would like to be part of these discussions. With the group we're facing the same challenges as other regions. Thank you.

MIKE ZUPKE: Thank you.

TONY HARRIS: Good afternoon. My name is Tony Harris, one of the Executive Committee of the Internet Service Providers Constituency. Also, I'm working in the ALAC Strategy Group with Rodrigo here.

Yesterday we had a discussion on something which was mentioned by the lady from Egypt, particularly to deal with becoming an ICANN accredited registrar. I noticed that Egypt doesn't have a single one, and I think there's a very good reason for that.

Basically, what we see in Latin America is a system of application to become an ICANN accredited registrar, which is totally slanted towards the wealthy, let's say, developed communities involved in the United States and Europe, particularly who have a complete market dominance of the registrar business for very good reasons and for, I'm sure, excellent work, which they do, but which renders it very difficult for a small or medium enterprise or organization in Latin America, for example, to participate at least in a very modest way in this activity.



It doesn't help ICANN's image in the world, in my opinion, that you have such very meager numbers of registrars in developing regions participating in this activity. It doesn't seem to send the right message.

So, I have a proposal. Probably not the right time to go into detail. But there are a series of fees and requirements that you must fulfill to become an ICANN accredited registrar, which for a small or medium entity or company in Latin America, to say the least, they're abusive, and very much a deterrent to anybody who really wants to become a registrar. That's our situation.

I'm the Executive Director of the Argentina Internet Association. For a year, we've been trying to complete the application process to become a registrar in Argentina, with no intent to profit. We want to do this for our members without making any money. And not only do we find an economic barrier in all the requirements and payments you have to make, but the strangest thing is the application form to become a registrar in ICANN really demands of the applicant a description of the hardware and software the applicant is going to provide or put in place to provide the service. It should be the other way around. ICANN should have a technical specification of equipment, software, and whatever is required to technically operate a registrar, and ICANN should be demanding of the applicant the fulfillment or the compliance with these requirements.

We have repeatedly asked ICANN to give us the technical specification in order to be able to determine how we put together all the requirements, the platform, and service or whatever, and there is none.



I apologize if I'm taking too long with this, and also I have to run and be a speaker next door. But I do have a proposal, and I'd be happy to send it by e-mail – it's probably too complicated to bring it to the mike right now – item by item on what could be done to make this problem go away and, let's say, ease the entry of interested applicants in developing regions to become an ICANN accredited registrar. Thank you.

MIKE ZUPKE:

Thanks, Tony. And feel free to send that to me, because I know you've got my e-mail address. Did you need to leave? Okay. Yes, please, please, by all means.

MANAL ISMAIL:

We can take the rest of the questions, and maybe we can respond collectively.

MARIE-LAURE LEMINEUR:

Good afternoon. My name is Marie-Laure Lemineur, I'm the Chair of NPOC within the GNSO.

I just wanted to highlight the fact that when you want to promote business, you need to understand the context where you're going to be in, and look at the big picture. We're talking here about DNS in regions where a very high proportion of the population is very young. The figures that you showed prove that they are very interested in having phones, in accessing – how do they use Internet? They use apps, they use social networks. We need to understand how they use the Internet, how they want to access the Internet, and find ways to grasp their



interests so that the idea of the DNS is appealing to them and all the related issues, you know what I mean? I don't know if you've been thinking about that, what are the strategies you've been thinking of? Thank you.

MIKE ZUPKE:

Thank you. I don't know if that's a question we can answer now, or if that might be something we can talk a little bit more in the second half in the discussion.

Okay. All right, thanks. Please, go ahead.

PRANESH PRAKASH:

Hello, my name is Pranesh Prakash, and I'm at the Center for Internet and Society in India and with the Yale Information Society Project.

I came to this session hoping to get some information about why exactly these underserved areas and regions are underserved. Has there been any analysis done towards that? Firstly, that.

And second question was I recently started actually – I'm a very recent entrant into the domain name space as a user in terms of registering one, and when I was looking around, I found that many developing countries' ccTLD addresses were actually really highly priced. And I couldn't imagine who from these developing countries would buy these domain names if they cost so much. So, second question is, has there been any analysis done as to this? Do governments think that patriotism will make people shell out more money than they actually have?



And lastly, about the impact – and this might be a little bit outside the scope of this panel – but the impact of this underrepresentation on Internet governance at large. Because a large part of this multi-stakeholder model that you’re pushing for is the business community, and if the business community is predominately from North America and Western Europe, then of course, in the multi-stakeholder model, their voices are going to be heard much more than the voices of those from developing countries. It’s not a system of equal representation the way it is in UN, one nation, one vote, etc., right? How is this distortion towards the Western democracies, how is that going to be addressed if we don’t actually address this imbalance in both the business constituency as well as in civil society?

MIKE ZUPKE:

Thank you. I think those are good points. Did you have some thoughts on those? Sorry, I’m not trying to hoard the microphone.

MANAL ISMAIL:

Yeah, many points, and excellent points. Actually, it’s a whole ecosystem. It’s not one thing that we can focus on and then things can work. We need awareness, and this is for the registrants. We’re not promoting the ccTLDs properly, we’re not making the right campaigns, we’re not outreaching to the end users, and we don’t know how they really use things. Because even when you ask someone, “Why don’t you register a domain name?” and he says, “I already have a Facebook, I use Google to search,” so the concept is not there. So, this is one thing. And specifically with IDNs, and this is even a more complex thing.



The business side of it – people has to know the business opportunity that lies ahead so that they start investing until they reach the critical mass so that the business breaks even, and ultimately becomes profitable. Because so far – and this is, I think, in my opinion, one of the things, the domain names are highly priced, so people don't register, so the business model is not profitable.

We've been talking to some of those registrars in the region, when we were drafting the strategy, and they said that their registrar business – they are like five or six – the registrar business is not sustainable and they cross-subsidy from other services, and if they were not providing other services, they wouldn't have provided the registrar thing.

And, moreover, to the maybe highly priced ICANN process, we also have to go through even more expenses to get consultants to help us go through the process, and we've been through this in applying for two of the new gTLDs through the League of Arab States. They don't have the caliber and the caliber is not that common within the region, so we have to bring expertise and pay for them just to go through the process, which is over and above more expenses.

And on the multi-stakeholder thing – and I'm not sure if I skipped any of these points, but on the multi-stakeholder thing, this is crucial. We keep talking about multi-stakeholderism and all stakeholders, and then we don't have our stakeholders here. And I think if the multi-stakeholder model is not deployed nationally, then we're not benefitting from the multi-stakeholder nature of the organization.



I come from the government, and I've been attending ICANN meetings for years now, and we failed to bring our private sector to attend. So, to us, ICANN is more now of a governmental thing, because only the government attends. We don't have other stakeholders attending from my country or even I don't think we have appropriate representation from the region.

And I won't keep the floor more than that. Thank you.

MIKE ZUPKE:

Thank you very much for that. So I really hate having to say, "Please hold on to your comments," but I do want to allow our panel to finish with their presentations. So, if you don't mind. Okay. Thank you.

Sam Lanfranco is here from the Not-for-Profit Operational Concerns Constituency Update. I think I said that right. I have to say it slowly. They've been doing some work, and he's going to give us an update on some of the things that they've been doing.

SAM LANFRANCO:

Thank you, and thank you for attending this. I have one little side comment I want to make. I first got involved with Singapore about 35 years ago. I was working for the UN, and Singapore was a poor city, state, nation, country, assembling circuit boards for export. And a number of us working for the UN in Geneva for [UNPAD] were saying, "Singapore will develop starting with circuit boards." And the prevailing opinion was that we were wrong, that Singapore would not develop



starting with electronics at that point in time. They would just make circuit boards and export them.

Here we are, a third of a century later, the evidence is in. It wasn't just circuit boards. It was governance and government policy and so forth. For those of you who are here and young, what looks like an unpopular idea at one point becomes conventional wisdom at another. So, some of the ideas that you will develop and carry away here, they may be unpopular now, but they will be popular later on, and somebody else will take credit for them.

Okay, let me talk about what I'm supposed to report on. The Not-for-Profit Operating Concerns Constituency, NPOC here, held a set of panel session on Saturday in which we discuss – alternately, you could call it "ICT for Development" or "DNS for Development" – what does the Internet ecosystem mean for development in the less developed countries, areas of the world? Not just the development of the ecosystem, but development in general. I'm a development economist, so I came with that perspective.

So what we're going to present, I'm going to present a report of what we did. We dealt with three topics. And it's food for thought, and it's a complimentary food for thought to what has just been discussed.

A successful registrar, registry, ISP industry requires both effective production, a good regulatory regime, and effective demand. In the absence of effective demand, your ability to supply is useless, because they're not there. And in the wrong regulatory structure, you get so tied up, you can't do what you want to do.



So, this is food for thought. And our discussions were about how to get there from where we are, where are we taking stock and how to get there. Our round table on Saturday focused on three things. Opportunities and challenges of the new global top level domains for development, the current state of the field that began on day one – which was ICT for Development, Information and Communication Technologies for Development. Very early on, people recognized this works across time and space. We should be able to involve the economic and social margins of the world into this.

And the third was – and I think we made a major step forward here – the third panel was on the growing mutuality between the concerns of the non-profit civil sighted community, not its self-interested concerns, but its concerns looking out over society, and the intellectual property community. That’s too often presented as the loggerheads, with civil society arguing with intellectual property issues. There’s in fact a whole lot of commonality there, so we’re trying to explore that.

The first panel, we focused on private sector opportunities, and it was a standard list of the registrars, registries, what you do with a domain name, the kind of spinoff jobs that will go to, programmers, and so forth. But, the main reflection was not making that list again, but reflecting on how hard it is it roll out that list to many places, and some discussion of possibly incubator-style efforts or that the non-profit sector and geo-sector should work more closely with some of the incubator-style efforts. And the recognition that, in the long run, if it’s not sustainable, if it can’t carry itself for most of these efforts will fail, that if you’re an ISP, if you’ve got your infrastructure in place and the effective demand isn’t there, you’re in trouble.



The second panel, which was closer to my heart, was ICT for Development, and what I tried to do there was take stock – and it's a taking stock that I think that the ISPs and the registrars and registries have to think about – and that's that 20 years ago, ICT for Development was talking about the last mile problem, computer literacy, accessibility and cost, and what has happened in the last 25 years is mobile communications: the cell phone, and the app. The cell phone and the app and the amount of time it takes somebody to learn to use an app. They can no more sit down at a keyboard and write a letter to their mother or their grandfather than fly, but they can use an app on a cell phone.

So it's that that's happening on the ground, and the whole industry above that is going to have to come to terms with two things. One, that mobile access reducing most of the technical last mile problem – not all of it, not everywhere. The second, the removal of a need for that whole bit of literacy training around the end user. It's still there for the app developer and so forth, although that's getting easier and easier. And the fact that those stakeholder groups, they're not here. They're not at ICANN, they're almost unheard of in most places now.

The end users on the ground, because of mobile communications, will be able to gradually coalesce and have more and more of a voice. So the multi-stakeholder model is going to increasingly be invaded by Internet sovereignty, by which I mean not at the nation state level, but that the individual using the Internet is expecting to have feedback on how the Internet operates. Not just because they have some social concern like NPOC's members, but because they have a concern for themselves,



their family, their business, their community, the whole agenda, and they'll layer through that like fish. They won't all want to come here.

So what we came away from that with – and I'll summarize it in a minute – was that there are, in that area, ICT for Development, there's a huge layer of service provider agencies, NGOs, government initiatives and so forth, that have been trying to deliver ICT for Development for the grassroots.

There are service industries that are going to have to become a collaborating partner with the grassroots, because the grassroots is going to have much more voice here. We're not that far away from some rural farmer saying, "The app I have on my cell phone is not only the app that I really wanted, not the one that somebody thought up in Washington or Paris or London, but it's the app that we sat around and talked about, and my nephew in the capital put it together for us, because he or she is in school." Niece or nephew is in school. So, there's a whole democratization of access that's taking place there.

In that mobile cell area, there are issues too around data privacy and so forth. But we're not talking about that here.

And there's space for some collaborations there. ICANN itself has reached out, but it's always reached out to try and bring people in, instead of saying, "We need to be a collaborator in initiatives where we're reaching out to help people out there do something."

The third thing was the panel on intellectual property. Two things I can say there is that the discussion was around a mutuality of interest and concerns – not fighting over GMOs or private property versus



communal property, or shareware, and so forth – and the understanding that there’s a real basis for a constructive dialogue there, a constructive dialogue that will help inform the whole intellectual property discussion, both from the grassroots level and up.

That was what the three sessions were about: GLTs for development, ICT for Development, intellectual property for development. Those are the three short ends.

The takeaways were that in all three areas, change is being driven by two things. Initially, it was driven by promise, the promise of ICT for Development. Now it’s being driven by expectations. The access is increasingly there, and the people who have got the access have got expectations about how they’re going to use it and what they need, and those will be satisfied for the most part by the private sector with some nudging on policy by our group, by the civil society areas.

The other one is, of course, the major increase in capacities. The ability to get access now is becoming much, much, much more reasonable. That was the one take away, is that the expectations are becoming more democratically spread, and the capacities to respond are becoming better. This is below the registrar-registry ISP level, this is what’s going on down there on the ground. And how those two come together is part of the challenge for you.

The other is that it’s going to be much more stakeholder-focused, because the stakeholders are going to be in the market, more of them, and they’re going to be worried about policy. If you’re a fisherman off the coast of Ghana, there’s all kinds of icy teething you can use, but how



do you keep the foreign boats out of your fish? That's a policy issue, that's not an ICT issue. And you don't want to necessarily do it the way that they did it off the east coast of Africa.

The third is necessary actions. And necessary actions – and this is going to be the test for ICANN going forward – is what do we actually mean by stakeholder engagement? What is a stakeholder model of engagement and involvement?

A lot of organizations, including ICANN, have been able to wear that coat with a very skinny body on the inside of the coat. But, the test going forward, for a whole variety of reasons – not the least of which is the people on the ground are getting much more access and will be effective, if not in the market policy place, in the market place – is what do we mean by multi-stakeholder engagement there, what do we mean by accountability, how does that happen?

If you look at some of the proposals for ICANN from those strategy panels that should be put to rest, some of them were for open data. We know what's been happening at open data. It doesn't get to the stakeholders on the ground. It only gets to the stakeholders up here. We've got lots of evidence on that, so we have to think about those.

The last is that we have an obligation. If you want progress to happen, you need these dialogues between stakeholders, but there has to be a level of awareness and some reasonable forums for engagement. And one of the commitments that we talked about, and NPOC is looking at, is strategic alliances with other entities that focus on stakeholder awareness and engagement. My model is usually stakeholder



engagement, awareness and empowerment, and then they decide where to get engaged. They may not necessarily come here. In Egypt, they may say, “Our focus needs to be first within Egypt, and then go on from there,” rather than just trying to go here to try and do something that causes the Egyptian government to respond. So there are those kinds of dynamics that are going to be sorted out.

One of our initiatives which we expect is that NPOC itself will enter into some kind of MoUs with other organizations to work in this area of raising awareness and the potential for engagement and involvement on the part of, in our initial interests, civil society communities, but in also the stakeholders that they’re supposed to be working with.

One of the MoUs is with I-Engage, which has been mentioned a few times over the last several sessions of ICANN. As a free standing institution over here, where we reach an MoU and say, “Okay, here’s some initiatives and deliverables around raising awareness and engagement,” and understanding what we mean by a multi-stakeholder model, getting some of those terms teased out so they have some meat in them, and then try and have an effect on how this roles out in the Internet ecosystem. I’ll stop there.

MIKE ZUPKE:

Thank you, Sam. So, I think that provides a lot of food for thought for our discussion that we’re going to have now. I’m wondering, Caitlin, if you could advance to the next blue slide in this deck, please. Yeah, that one, thank you.



I think we've had a lot of really helpful issues that were brought, either here at the table or at the microphone that people have seen as potential obstacles or issues to be addressed in trying to help raise up the industry in these underserved regions.

One of the things that we wanted to do was to bring some of the issues that we've heard to date to the floor. And so, what our goal is going to be is to take the issues that have been raised – and a lot of this was through some of the work that Pierre has helped to facilitate with the Africa strategy, and some of these come from other areas. So our goal was to take those issues that have been raised and allow you to bring the other issues that you're identifying here to the table and to break into smaller groups here and discuss ways to try and address these and try to come up with some way of approaching those, and then also to try to identify who do we think should be at the table when we try to resolve these things.

As an example, Tony mentioned that there's an issue with the application process at ICANN for registrars, and so this would be the kind of thing that you could say, "This is an issue. We think this is something that ICANN staff could help resolve, by putting together a technical specification document."

And so what our goal will be in this is to take the inputs that have been received, either through previous processes or today, and to come up with an action plan and say, between now and London, we'll come out with a report on what we came up with in this workshop, and say, "Here are our targets, here are our goals," and we can try to measure our



progress against those things, both leading up to London and on a longer term.

So I've got here on the screen the list of issues that have been raised to date in very short form, and so I thought I might just expand on those a bit and then we'll break into our groups and actually begin the problem solving part of this. Not to worry, I'll provide written descriptions on paper of these in case you want to refer back to them when we break into our group activity.

But, just to give you an overview of these, the issues that have been raised that we've heard before this session today – and by all means, we realize this is not the exhaustive list, this is really things that have been published in previous documents. We're trying to avoid asking people to say the same things that have been said before. That's why these have been collected.

The first one on our list is that there's an issue of the complexity of the marketplace with regard to the registry-registrar model, in that registrars in a world of new TLDs have to contract with every single registry, and each registry can have its own registry-registrar agreement. And for a smaller registrar, or a registrar without substantial legal resources, this is a very difficult challenge to deal with, trying to make sure that you're being informed on how you engage with these registries.

The next thing that we've heard, I think for years, is that the insurance requirements in becoming a registrar are onerous in some parts of the world. So, if you're not aware, the ICANN Statement of Accreditation



Policy requires registrar applicants to have a policy, which we refer to as a “commercial general liability insurance policy,” although it might go by another name, with a limit of at least \$500,000 US.

There have been people who have said to us, “That sort of insurance either doesn’t exist in my country, or is incredibly hard to procure, or it exists, but the insurance companies don’t understand this business and they don’t want to write a policy because they don’t understand it.”

The next issue on our list here is the matter of registry funding, and I’ve talked to a number of registries about this issue in advance of this. And so historically, most of the gTLD registries – or perhaps all of them up until recently – have required registrars to pre-fund their registry accounts in order to do business in that TLD. So that might mean that the registrar has to make a deposit with the registry, or they might be able to acquire a letter of credit, which is not necessarily an easy thing to acquire, either. In a world of potentially 1,000 or 2,000 TLDs, that cost could add up very quickly to a small registrar. So, that issue has been raised.

Next on the list is what I’m referring to loosely as the indirect and direct costs of accreditation. This is referring to the fact that in order to become an ICANN accredited registrar – and there may be similar issues in the ccTLDs – there are fees involved, there a number of difficult compliance issues that registrars have to be prepared to deal with, and registrars or prospective registrars have said to us, “Well, how do I compete with resellers? I see benefits to being a registrar, but I need to register certain number of domain names in order for this to be cost effective.”



The question has been raised, how can the community, if at all, help registrars to reach that critical mass of registrations that's required in order to make sense to be a registrar?

Next on the list is developing operator expertise. This is both in the technical and security realms, but I think also in the sense of marketing expertise, and how to best approach customers. I think we've heard that consistently today in some of the comments that we've heard, so I think that will be a good one for discussion.

And I'm sorry, this is a pretty long list, but I want you to know we've been listening to discussions and we're really hoping we can move this forward, starting with today's sessions, as I said, and going on to London.

Next on the list is participation in policy-making. The idea here is that if you're a registrar or registry, what goes on in ICANN affects you regardless of whether you're a large registrar or a small registrar. However, if you're a small registrar, you might find that participating in the policy-making process is very difficult. So, we want to look at ways that that might be made easier for interested parties.

And finally, an issue of consumer awareness, and that's that in some of these marketplaces. There's not a lot of consumers of this product right now. There might be education needs, or there might be a lack of trust in the system, and so those are things that might need to be addressed.

So, that's the list that we're starting with. And then we're going to give you an opportunity to add to your list when we start our activity, which is going to start imminently. You can scroll to the next slide. Thank you.



So what we're going to do – and my colleague, Caitlin, is going to come out to the audience and distribute the printed documents that have the descriptions that I promised, as well as a chart that will allow you to say, "Here are the issues, here's how we would rank them in terms of the order that we think they should be addressed."

And the two really big questions are how do we recommend solving this, and who needs to be at the table to solve this, and how do we engage them? Is this a matter we think should go to the GNSO? Is this a matter for the ccNSO? Is this a matter we should start lobbying people in the private sector to provide assistance with? The idea is let's stop saying this is a problem and let's figure out how do we really want to try and address these things, and who should we be engaging?

When we come away from this, we'll have our small group discussions, we'll come back together, and we'll try and collect all of these ideas. When we come away from it, this will become an assignment for staff to try and say, "All right, here's our roadmap." We'll put it out for the community to look at and to comment on, and then we'll say, "Can we agree this is how we want to go forward, and how do we best do that?"

So, before we begin, I thought I would just see if there are any questions about what we're about to do, or any other final comments here from the panel.

Otherwise, Caitlin's going to distribute these, and I think we've got enough people that maybe three or four groups might make sense. If you'd like to coalesce into your own groups, that would be perfectly



fine. Otherwise, Caitlin's been given the responsibility of trying to make sure that there's a good distribution of people among the groups.

When you've done that, what you'll want to do is designate somebody to be your official team recorder, and that will be the person who can make a note of the ideas that are made, and then present them to the larger group when we're done. Hopefully, somebody with good handwriting, so if you want to give this to me at the end, that will help me and my work as we go forward from that.

Without further ado, are there any questions about what we're about to do? Please go ahead.

MICHELE NEYLON:

I just noticed – this is more of a comment than anything else. Just one thing that I hope that people should be very careful with here, is how this is all framed. I'm all for clarifying it, making ICANN less North American-centric, but there's no way that you can possibly have a situation where the standards are applied differently in different geographic regions, because being an ICANN accredited registrar, it's binary. You either are or you aren't. And you cannot have a situation where there are different levels or different rules applied, because that will just break the entire thing.

Now, ICANN could do a lot, and maybe some people will come up with some nice ideas, to simplify things, to clarify things, to make things easier, more accessible. But the rules of the game, as it were, have to be the same globally. Mr. Harris is now going to totally disagree with me, but that's okay.



MIKE ZUPKE:

I think you make a good point. I think, though, as we go into this brainstorming activity, I would encourage people think big. We may come away with this and say, “There were some great ideas that we think might not be implementable,” because of a reason sort of like what you were mentioning. But I would say, when I think about brainstorming, dream as big as you can, and I think that’s part of the next part of the discussion, is we post this for public comment, and maybe that’s where we start to say as a bigger community, “This is the direction we think this kind of work should take.” That’s how I encourage you to think.

Go ahead, Tony.

TONY HARRIS:

Well actually, I haven’t said what I wanted, so I don’t know why we should be in disagreement, Michele. But, quite honestly, I can see his point. Why should anybody have advantages just because they live in Africa or Latin America? It’s a very good point.

But we’re not talking about that. We’re talking about the fact that, I think, when the application to become a registrar was designed originally, the market and the players who were envisioned are perhaps the right players for the application that was developed at that time. But if you’re talking about expanding the possibilities to become a registrar to other regions of the world, who are not empowered in the same manner, I think this does merit a revision.



And I would add to that that I hesitate to think that anybody in any of our, let's say, developing regions, to become a registrar with perhaps some – I wouldn't call it advantage – but some lenience on their requirements, I don't think we present a threat to anybody in the business right now. We'd be laughable, as far as scale is concerned, but we can get back to that later. Thank you.

MIKE ZUPKE:

Thank you.

JIMSON OLUFUYE:

Just quickly, to also make this point as we go into our groups. Like the earlier presenter talked about government being only being here, actually, in developing and less developed nations, a lot depends on government, because if the government does not move, nothing moves. It's very different from North America, from developed environment, where the opportunities that has been given to business.

I remember WCIT in Dubai. The government from my country in Nigeria has large contingent, but for a [inaudible] business, I know what I had to do, to struggle to be a part of it. And I had to get funding from somewhere for travel, otherwise I would say, why should I? Because there is no business sense for me to spend money and just go.

But if government sees that it needs to develop the sector as they are coming to ICANN announce to the business sector, "This is going on, there is this incentive to come," you have to subsidize, you have to find a way to encourage participation. The game has to be very clear,



because it's business. You cannot have a different yardstick for these. You could encourage. That could be awareness, but a lot depends on government themselves to engender this process.

MIKE ZUPKE:

Thank you for that. So would you like assistance in being formed into groups? Maybe Caitlin, could you help to do that? Thank you.

I would just like to thank Manal for the presentation today. You gave us more time than you had, so I just want to say thank you. She's got to go. Thank you for that.

I'm hearing lots of great discussions. I don't mean to interrupt. Just a little time check. In about fifteen minutes, we'll come back as a big group and discuss what you've discussed in your small groups.

We've just about reached the end of our brainstorming period, so if you could just use the last minute or two here to finish up your thoughts and make sure everything is recorded, we'll resume in just a couple minutes.

Okay. So, I've heard lots of good discussions. I want to thank you for that. I think it's time now for us to try and come back together, and for our groups to report on the progress that they made on these questions.

So what I think I'll do is if I can grab that microphone, I'll bring them to each group, and the reporter can tell us what the group learned and what they came to.



There we go. Okay. So, my group over here, who would like to be the reporter for the group and tell us what conclusions you reached? The discussion continues. Are you the reporter for this group? Would you like to tell us about what your group's conclusion were? I'll give you the microphone.

JIMSON OLUFUYE:

Thank you, Mike. This discussion is highly welcomed. My group looked at it, and we zeroed in and focused on what matters the most, really? What matters the most?

We considered what has been our client, fiscally, as secondary issues, really, because we are talking about developing and less developed economies. You cannot compare it with North America, you cannot. So we said we cannot consider the economies in these developing and less developed nations with that of North America and Europe. And as such, we need to look at this from a different perspective.

So, first and foremost, we identified the challenge of lack of awareness, lack of awareness about the use of the domain and the business opportunities that are available. We recognize, yes, some resources are there. Investment, fundings are there, but entrepreneurs are not aware. So, who should do that? We recognize that ICANN [inaudible] is there. True, the African strategy is also there, and relating with local businesses and stakeholders.

Then, we also identified the fact that the registry and registrar policy issues, registry and registrar policy issues. This has to do [principally] even with the ccTLD, where we have these ccTLD, we see the rising of



much money being made, right there. That is just a primary issues on why the originally listed as secondary.

We're saying that, to tackle this, the ccTLDs need to do a lot of work, Internet reengineering. And then the registrars, too, have a lot to do. Just like the PDP Development Process in ICANN itself, there should be some form of registrar activities to ensure that policy framework is balanced and it helps and they're making money.

We also say that Vice President Africa, who also help in this, there could be encouragement for peer review of ccTLDs, peer review, there should be a mechanism put in place.

We look at ccNSO as well. They don't really have much to do with the ccTLD, because many of them are not there. But notwithstanding, you can encourage more dialogue, even at our level, as well.

Then we talk about the funding, registry funding. Yes, to acquire a new ICANN registry, for you to have a new registry in this region, funding of course is still a challenge. I'm aware that there is some funding set aside to help do this for those from the least developing nation to do some things, but notwithstanding, the cost of insurance, the cost of many things, infrastructure, this also challenges.

Then, we look at the model issue. Registrars need to review their models. It's a business issue. So if you want to make money, you must review your business model.

And we also want to quantify that it's a growing system, so we should not have too much expectation. Because if you look at the likes of



GoDaddy, they've been in business for quite a while. The North American or European economy are [inaudible] liberal environment for so long, and so we started a process and then we know it will mature. But, we need to at least look at the model, make it available as much as possible through the conversations.

I think basically this is what we have. There are other things that are mentioned, but these are key ones, so [inaudible] give all this opportunity. Thank you.

MIKE ZUPKE:

Thank you. That was a great list. Why don't we move over here? Who is the reporter? You're recorder and the reporter. I'll give you the microphone.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE:

I haven't finished reorganizing my notes, so these might be a bit disjointed, so please bear with me.

We noted, first off, that this problem is quite extreme. There are seven registrars in all of Africa, there are under 20 in all of Latin America. Sorry? Yes, exactly. Under 20 in all of Latin America, so it's quite a bad situation that we're starting off from.

The first item we discussed was the complexity of the registrar-registry agreements. One of the issues is these contracts are only in English. Unfortunately, not much can be done about that.



Another part of the problem is that each registry has a different agreement, and now with the new gTLDs coming into place, each registrar would have to sign thousands of contracts, unless there is a system to facilitate this. So this is not a problem that is best fit to underserved regions, but there is a potential solution, which is that there could be a clearing house mechanism that ICANN could possibly run, which would facilitate at least reaching out to different registries through a software system, by a registrar, for instance, saying that these are the 50 TLDs that I wish to serve, and at the back end, the software could say that these are the five registries that need to be contacted for that, and appropriate pro forma e-mails could be sent for that. So, that would be a simple fix.

Apart from that, there's the fact that there isn't much awareness amongst registries about these kinds of things. So, educational tools, introductory guides, perhaps in different languages about what it takes to be a registrar could be made and that helps simplify some of the legalese, some of the legal aspects of this, as well as for stuff that addresses the operational expertise that is required to be a registrar.

Next, we looked at the issue of costs, and Tony provided a very useful listing of the costs that are involved. First, there's the cost of an application fee, which is \$3,500 US. Well, most serious registrars should be able to manage that, perhaps.

Then, there's the liquid working capital cost of \$70,000 US. This is a very high fee, and this could perhaps be reduced, depending on whether you're from a low-income country, middle-income country, or a high-income country.



Then, the most outrageous fee is that of the certificate of insurance, which is insurance required to be taken for general commercial liability. This insurance is not, as you might think, insurance relating to the performance of your service as a registrar.

So you might think, for instance, if your servers go down and lots of people are affected by that, and for that, you might require insurance. But no, this insurance covers lots of tortious liability, so liability, for instance, if your employee goes to a foreign country and slips on a banana peel, or accidentally stabs someone or something of that sort, then the liability that you might incur because of that. So these are not relating to the performance of your services as a registrar. So this gives rise to a few different questions.

And the amount, I haven't yet specified, is \$500,000 US. This is half a million US dollars. I can think of many people in India, for instance, who are technically competent to be a registrar, who even have the funding to actually hire a [co-location] service, to build out the machines, to buy the bandwidth, etc., to be a registrar, but do not have nowhere near the amount of money to be able to get this kind of insurance. So, for me, I came in here asking why aren't there more registrars in developing countries? I think I've found an answer. Thank you for that.

So, this could definitely be first rationalized. If there is a good explanation for why general commercial liability is required as opposed to liability relating to your performance as a registrar, then that should be explained. If not, it should be rationalized.



And secondly, this could be made variable insurance, depending on how many customers you have, because that's where the source of risk really comes from. The larger the number of customers, the larger the amount of risk. Variable insurance is something that could be thought about.

And there's a yearly accreditation fee, which is \$4,000 per year. This starts from year zero – not even from year one, not even after you're one year old – but from year zero. This should definitely be reduced, and it should be scaled. In the beginning, you pay a lesser amount, and as you mature as a business, this amount could be increased.

And then there's the variable fee, which is your quarterly contribution to ICANN's operational costs. This, as far as the expertise of this group goes, as far as we understand it, is split equally amongst all registrars, which doesn't really make much sense when the richest registrars in the world have to pay the same amount as registrars that have to cross-subsidize their business. This could also be made a contribution on a pro rata basis, depending on the income of the different registrars.

And then there's the transaction-based fee, which is \$0.25 per year, per domain name, which to this group, seemed reasonable.

Apart from that, we discussed a little bit about operational expertise, how most of the registrars, how lots of people selling domain names in developing countries actually end up being resellers. Most of the ISPs are not registrars but resellers, even though they have the technical know-how and they might have money, but just this process is too difficult to navigate.



So perhaps there is a requirement for greater awareness to be built amongst them, and for technical literature about being registrars that simplifies the process, along with literature that simplifies the legal and operational parts of this. Which, also, for instance, explains the technical specifications required to run, to be a registrar.

And we, unfortunately, didn't manage to get to the other parts, but I just want to make a quick note about participation and policy making, that if you have your registrars and registries, in fact, from most of the world, then undoubtedly, participation and policy making is going to be extraordinarily skewed. You can have requirements that are totally out of sync from the necessities and the realities of the developing world, which is what I think we are seeing right now in ICANN.

MIKE ZUPKE:

Great, thank you. For people who are coming in the room for the next session, just to let you know, we're running a little bit late. We'll probably be about five minutes over. We have the permission of the next meeting host, because the topics are so similar. So, don't feel stressed, we will get to the last group here.

And as I'm walking the microphone over, I just wanted to mention, one of the points that you made about the variable fee is actually addressed in that smaller registrars get a forgiveness of two-thirds of that fee. It's a small part of the entire fee picture, but I think that might be a model for some of the other fees, if you think about how that might be addressed.

Who's the reporter in this group? All right, Sam.



SAM LANFRANCO:

I was the reporter for the third group, which was basically from Nigeria, the DRC, and Kenya. We spent a lot of time – or they spent a lot of time – on three topics. One was insurance and the other was the RRAs. And what I’ll try and do is not repeat what has been said, but add a little bit to that, in terms of suggestions.

One of the suggestions was that, for the RRAs, that ICANN might be able to help by working on two things. Some standardization of some of the language and terms, because in many cases, just sorting out what the language means from one RRA to the other can be very confusing and difficult, so ICANN might have some expertise that it could develop or bring to bear there as a service to the registrars and registries. I won’t say any more about that.

And the other was the insurance requirements. And the insurance requirements, the language that ICANN uses, and the language that is appropriate in different settings is quite different. And one of the questions was to what extent is ICANN going to develop a capacity to deliver regionally appropriate advice and support across the different regions? Because the language for Europe doesn’t – even in various places in Europe, is not the same in terms of legal language.

So would there be staff support where you could call in and say, “We’re dealing with these language issues, and if we don’t sort this out, our insurance is either going to be impossible or extremely expensive.” The core question there was, is there a way that ICANN could develop some



capacity to support, at the local level, the dialogues and discussions so that insurance policies can be achieved at reasonable rates?

Other than that, there was a bit of discussion about the cost of accreditation. Those are the topics that were covered. That's it.

MIKE ZUPKE:

Thank you very much. I enjoyed meeting the people who are participating in this, and I really value the contributions that you've made. I'd like to say thank you to our panelists, but especially, I'd like to say thank you to all of you, because you're really fueling this process and helping us to move forward.

I think there's been, over the years, a lot of thoughts put into this, but I think that what's really important is that we're now committing to saying, "Let's take the next step." So, thank you to all of you. And then, one last closing point, Pierre, did you want to make a plug for the next event?

PIERRE DANDJINO:

Thank you very much for your contributions. Like Mike says, we are going to consider all of this, and we are in the process, actually. And the process is to find an appropriate solution to the issues that have been raised. So, the idea for us is – I don't know whether you explained to our colleague – by London, that we are able to crystallize some of your ideas and then we see exactly how we could forward with that. This was not in vain. It was to give us more ideas and more orientation to what we should be doing, actually.



So I thank you very much, and hopefully you'll be kept informed on our progress of this.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: My question is I understood that we would be enrolling in a mailing list if we wanted to continue in this contributing, or did I misunderstand? I didn't sign onto anything.

MIKE ZUPKE: Thanks. That's a good point. So, what we plan to do is publish the outcome of this at ICANN.org and allow this for public comment. So it will be broader than just the people in this group, but anyone in the community can contribute to it. So this is not the end of this phase of it. We realize this is just a small section of the world that might have some input into this. Thank you. So that's the plan.

Did you want to mention the next session?

PIERRE DANDJINO: Oh, yes. The next session is going to be a bit lively, as well. Of course, it's about the Africa strategy, but with a focus, which is a partnership that we would like to be developing around this implementation. We are going to have a panel, a presentation from registrar, registries, and we hope this is going to be also lively.

This session is going to be shared by Dr. Tarek, who is already in the room, and the moderation of this, that will be done by Rodrigo. So, Tarek, I think we can start now. Yes, please.



[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]

