
CR - ccNSO Members Meeting Day 2
Wednesday, March 14, 2012 – 08:00 to 15:30
ICANN - San Jose, Costa Rica

Lesley Cowley:

So if I could ask you to set up and settle, and we'll begin.

Okay, we're ready to start, and I'm on a mission, because I've just seen we need to finish early to get the bus for the Gala night, as well. So there is nothing like deadlines to work to.

Let me welcome the Inter-Registrar transfer policy GNSO Working Group, which I think is the first time we've had a GNSO Working Group visit us as such, so we are honored to welcome you, and over to you.

James Bladel:

Thank you Lesley, my name is James Bladel and I am representing the GNSO Registrar and Co-Chair of the Policy Develop Process for the Inter-Registrar Transfer Policy. And I understand from staff that is correct, this is the first time in the entire history of ICANN that a gTLD policy working group has come to the ccNSO and essentially asked them for their assistance and their experience. So hopefully we represent ourselves well and that we don't close the door to future invitations and we certainly appreciate your time on this.

Giovanni Seppia:

Thanks a lot. Basically, this session, I don't know if James would like to say a bit more of the scope of this working group at GNSO level, and the objective of this 30-minute session is to provide some input to this working group about how change of registrant is dealt with in the ccTLD space. And I understand and I

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.

was, to be honest, quite surprised, I was not fully aware that there is not a sort of uniform policy in the gTLD space for this; while in the ccTLD space let's say that each registry operator at ccTLD level has a specific way to deal with change of registrant procedures. And that depends a lot on the kind of registry, registrar, registrant model that has been chosen by the ccTLD operator.

Before leaving the floor again to James, yesterday when I'm preparing for moderating this panel, I just let's say searched a bit of the CENTRA website and CENTRA during 2011 there has been two surveys about the change of registrant and how the CENTRA members are dealing with the change of registrant. And those two surveys touched different elements of the change of registrant policy, including how much is the registry involved, how much is the registrar involved if the operation can be performed entirely by the registrar and there should be intervention by the registry. And I think those two could be the outcome of those two surveys, the findings of those two surveys could be something interesting to share with this working group. Of course that has to be – you have to ask this to the Secretariat and therefore; but I'm sure that it's a good basis to start from.

So if James likes to explain a bit more the objective of this working group, and eventually the timeframe for you to develop a certain proposal, if any.

James Bladel:

Thanks Giovanni. So this is the third in a series of five working groups that will refine and update the transfer policy in gTLDs. It's a very important component of the competitive market that registrants who are unhappy with the services from a registrar be able to take their domain name registrations to a competitor and to be able to do this relatively seamlessly and without interference from their current registrar.

Through the whole course of looking at all of the issues that are causing confusion, perhaps or friction in these transactions, we identified that for gTLDs in ICANN space, there is no such thing as a change of control policy. And by this mean there is no function to change the registrant of a domain name. You

can change the registrar, you can type new information into the WHOIS, but and make another party responsible for a domain name, but it's very informal, it's very ad hoc. All the registrars, and there are approximately 1,000 accredited entities handle it differently. And so this is as you might be aware, this has posed a number of questions about well, why is this the case, can this be improved, can there be a standard process that allows two parties to change control, or change registrant of a domain name. And can it be done securely, so that those with knowledge of the process can't use it to disadvantage registrants who may be less familiar with the process.

There is a very healthy and vibrant and innovative domain name after market with auctions and sales, buying and selling of domain names that also could benefit from a secure and uniform policy. So in our discussions about this, we note that many registrars, including the company that I work for, as well as [McCally] and some of the other registrars that are represented here in the room, we in addition to gTLDs, also offer registrations in a number of ccTLDs. And that ccTLDs have some experience in this area. In fact, we looked very hard to find a ccTLD that did not have a change of registrant policy, and I haven't found one yet. So we looked at a few examples, and I'll just scroll down here briefly.

For example, and these are European examples, but they didn't necessarily have to be European examples, they were just I think the ones that were more readily available to us. We looked at the transfer functions from Nominet, UK, from EurID, from IE and from ES, and looked at some of the elements of that. So the question that we're bringing to the ccNSO is with the variety and diversity of experience in this room, can you tell us – what can you tell us about this process? Do you feel that this is something that all registries should have? I think we're starting to coalesce around that opinion. Can you tell us what dangers we may have overlooked? What vulnerabilities? What elements have to be required? I guess we're kind of throwing open the floor to the folks in this room who have experience with this function to help give us some advice and guidance and lend us some of your expertise in this area.

Giovanni Sepia:

Thank you James, I would just like to add probably it would be also worth to explore the decent share of some of our experience with this working group about changes that might have happened or can happen in the ccTLD space in the sense that I know that some of us in the past, they had quite strict policies when it comes to a change of registrant and some of us are move into more softer policies. So that is also something that we could share with this working group, because I know there is a tendency and you have in front of you somebody that in the early years was coming from .IT, and in .IT, if you wanted to change a registrant ten years ago, and the registrant, the older of the domain unfortunately was dead. In that case, the registry had to receive basically a copy of the Last Will of the registrant, and that to prove the domain name sometimes was not in the Last Will and it could have been moved to another registrant. But if it was in the Last Will of course we had to follow the Last Will instructions, and it was quite an experience to see that some of these people relating with us, they didn't delete some information. On the contrary we could see how some people were cutting out from the Last Will some people of the family much more. So in terms of this, I just like to also invite you to share this kind of experiences in the sense that there's been an evolution from a strict model to a more open model in terms of changing of registrant. And I leave the floor open. Anybody like to, yes.

Debbie Monahan:

Debbie Monahan, .nz. We actually don't specify exactly how registrars have to process a change of registrant. But for all we seek minimum requirements as to what they need to do, and then they can build from that. They have to have it documented, and essentially in the case of the Will, for example, Giovanni, essentially the Executors got the right to actually sign on behalf and make the changes on behalf of the registrant. And since we registrars have acquired but essentially directors can make the decision for a company and various other such (inaudible). We also have exercised our right in a case where we have [force] was used to actually sign a document, to actually reverse the transaction back to how it was. So I think it's important that you keep the power to actually take

back a transaction before it's actually been used in each situation. And just briefly, I'm going to speak to change in registrars. We have what we call a [UDI] and the UDI has to be provided on the [face] to the registrant. And the registrar can't decline to provide that, even if they're owed money, they have to release that UDI, and then the registrant is free to transfer to a different registrar. And the other protection we have is if the registrar refuses to provide the UDI, we will step in and provide the UDI to the registrant, email address and then take action against the registrar for not meeting their obligation.

James Bladel:

Thank you Debbie, I appreciate that, and in fact your discussion about the minimum requirements that you require for each registrar was very similar to a suggestion that we received in our open comment. So I think that we'll definitely take that under advisement. Any other speakers want to share their –

Male:

We have Lesley and Roelof.

Lesley Cowley:

Seeing as you already studied Nominet I'm not going to go into great detail on some of our procedures, but just to your question around should everyone have this, I think yes, because that kind of seemed pretty obvious. But I think in terms of your other question on you know is there a move to making this softer or what other requirements that you put in place, I think that's a real good one to pack a bit. So in our experience who controls the registrant field if I call it that, and can be quite an interesting discussion. And we very much want to make sure that the registrant doesn't get their name taken away from them, or doesn't get it stolen and so on. And so there is a high level of security and trust in the whole process. But people do sell their names, [die], etc. and all of the things that one might expect. And when those type events happen, they want a process that is cheap, that is secure, that can be trusted, and doesn't take a long time, and like many things in this field, there is kind of a tradeoff between security and

speed and cost and so on. And I'd encourage your working group to kind of think about some of those aspects from the customer's shoes.

James Bladel:

Thank you, excellent and I would point out that we had another scenario that we hadn't considered going into this, but your thoughts reminded me as a side effect of not having a change of control policy that has a law enforcement aspect, which is that I could create a criminal or infringing domain name registration and assign it to Giovanni without his knowledge, without his acceptance, without his agreement and make someone else legally responsible, at least in the WHOIS for a domain name. So this is another issue that is a side effect or a consequence of not have this policy, that maybe putting something in place here would help to address.

Giovanni Seppia:

Roelof for .nl.

Roelof Meijer:

Yes, Roelof Meijer, .nl. The way we handle is very similar to (Inaudible) I think. It's up to the registrar to run the process. We have certain criteria, but not too many, and there is one very important one, but it's valid for a lot of transactions and that is that the registrar can only transfer control on the explicit instruction of the registrants. And he needs to have documented proof of the request in case of transfer of ownership. But I find it interesting that it's an issue for you because it's not very much an issue at our level, transfer from registrar to registrar is much more a transaction, that gives us a lot of attention from all kinds of areas, and this one normally runs very smoothly.

Male:

Roelof just explained part of the problem with gTLDs, and pretty much all ccTLDs, with a couple of exceptions are thick registries. So you the registry, you have the data about any registrants, any changes, everything. With thin

registries, in other words, .com, and .net, the registry can only see the registrar and name servers, they have no access to the registrant data which is part of the potential problem, let's just say.

Giovanni Seppia:

Thank you and everybody knows [Nickel], but just in case [Nickel] you don't know Black Knight.

Fernando Espana:

Good morning, this is Fernando Espana from .us. If I could just add a couple of comments and observations. I guess implementing some sort of mechanism to validate the transfer of registrant at a ccTLD level is probably a little bit easier, because you deal – usually you deal with one jurisdiction, but when you try to implement something like that at the gTLD level, where you're dealing with multiple jurisdictions, it does become a little bit more complicated.

If I could look back a few years back when the old Network Solutions days even before ICANN was in place, I remember when you had to transfer ownership of domain name, there was a form, a paperwork that you had to fill out, get it notarized, and getting a notarized document in the US is fairly simple, you go to a bank and there's a notary publics that don't even charge any fee, or if there is a fee associated, it be \$10, \$20 at the most.

But the problems that we encounter was that in different jurisdiction, getting a notarization document involved \$500, you had to go to an Embassy, and it could take three, four months to actually get a document notarized. So those were some of the complications that we encountered at Network Solutions when we tried to implement a big global perspective at the global level. So I just wanted to add those comments.

James Bladel:

Thank you and good points.

Annebeth Lange: Thank you. It's Annebeth Lange for .nl, the Norwegian registry. We have had a very strict regime in Norway, and we still have in some ways. But it's more and more liberalized with us as well. But as for transferring from one registrant to another, up until – through the 1st of February, actually we had to do that on paper, but now everything is being electronic and through the registrar, so that is a lot more easy for the registrants.

But when you have to sign a self-declaration when you register a domain name, so the registrars are responsible for doing that, also (inaudible). But if we ask for it, if there's some problem then you can have it. And it's also a domain lock, you activate it strong, you can ask for having a domain lock. So the registrar is incapable of transferring that to another without the concept. And that seems to function very well.

Male: One very quick question, but this lock, is that set at the registry level or at the registrar level, just to clarify?

Annebeth Lange: No, it's the registrar level. It's the registrar level, yes.

James Bladel: Thank you and you know one other challenge that we encountered when we were discussing this was also very appropriately similar to what you face in the ccTLDs is that many ccTLDs have eligibility requirements for a registrant, that you can't just be anyone, you have to be a citizen or have some of connection to a location, or be a member of a society or an association. And one of the challenges that we've encountered is that in the gTLD space this is not really an issue, but it is a potential issue both in the sponsored TLDs as well as the new anticipated community TLDs that will be applied for.

So a question for the group would be do you have any thoughts or concerns when a registrant is transferring to another registrant a domain name that there are checks in place to ensure that that new registrant is also equally eligible for a domain name?

Giovanni Seppia:

Please.

Dave Archbold:

Dave Archbold ky domain, Caiman Islands. We have just that issue. You must be a resident of the Caiman Islands and you must have a resident admin contact as well. Basically we just don't allow the transfer of domains whatsoever. The only people that can change the registrant is the registry and has the added benefit that we don't want a secondary market to be generated, so it prevents the secondary market. We're an extreme.

Mike Steward:

Hi, it's Mike Steward from .cn. As you may know we've got the eligibility requirements as well. I think that a lot of you will find is that it quickly gets into the same kind of discussion with WHOIS validation, you're almost are going to be required to do inline validation if you're going to try to do those checks for a new registrants. And I think that creates the same kind of issues. We don't currently have those inline validation checks, but we do have the requirements that any new registrant meet those requirements, and we do the kind of usual post registration validation processes to see that the new registrants do comply. But I think that would be a really complicated issue with any large TLD to try do an inline.

Lesley Cowley:

Can I just make a plea on behalf of the ten remote participants to speak as clearly and loudly without deafening us all in the room. I think there's a quite a problem with sound for the remote participants, please.

James Bladel: If I could ask one quick follow up, is common for Cira to then after the fact, if you detect that a domain name has gone to an ineligible registrant, is the process then to cancel that registration or reverse the transaction? What's the general approach?

Mike Steward: We don't particularly monitor transfers per se; our validation is done kind of registry wide. But if we do find a registrant who doesn't comply with the eligibility requirements, there's a process to validate their information, which if they don't respond or don't provide the data, it first leads to suspension and then ultimately if they can't comply or show compliance, we cancel them.

James Bladel: So you would treat them no differently than if someone who is ineligible to begin with registered a domain name.

Mike Steward: Exactly.

James Bladel: Okay, thank you.

Annebeth Lange: It's almost the same as in Cira, actually because a transfer is considered as a new application in a way, the deletion and a new application. So therefore they have to comply with the same rule as the first one. We have a (inaudible) and we know quite a lot about the registrants and we wash it up to the registry where we have the numbers, the trade number that they need to have if you have a domain name and then they watched quite continually against the register. So then once in a while we find a lot of these applicants that did not comply and (inaudible)

breaking the rule, so they will then be contacted by us and given a chance to rectify or if not they're deleted.

Giovanni Seppia:

Yes, it is an extremely interesting but also complex topic and we are almost approaching the end of this session, as we have a quite tight schedule. Just one last question from me, and it's about as many of us again in the past decade we have changed procedures and policies about the change of registrant. Is there anything that you like to recommend on the basis of the experience you have or the feedback you received from the registrar and registries?

Are there any, let's say core element you'd like to bring to the attention of this working group, and I'm sure that this should be a full author in the future to make sure that we convey as much input as possible to those people that we love to work on a paper. And at the same time, I also want to underscore something that Lesley had said, and it's about the security aspect in this process. Because many of us they are thinking quite a lot from the registrant perspective, and again that is really related to security, and it's one of the most important aspect to avoid identity theft or any kind of unfortunate circumstance that can happen during a registrant transfer process. So is there anybody who would like to comment on this and provide input on this? Peter?

Peter Vergote:

Peter Vergote from the DNS.be. I would like to share some of our experience because just last year, we changed our transfer policy. And we came from a system that is an exact match with [EurID] system. It's that a transfer of registrant requires a specific transaction, closely related to a simple transfer of the domain name, it's a trade.

Now, the advantage of such a procedure is that it is highly reliable in terms of security, because you have the procedure initiated by the registrar, and you have the verification by staff of the registry, and you are sure that both parties, former and the new registrant, are aware of the situation and like the situation that

Michale described cannot occur – or James, sorry that you have, and how would I call it, a transfer with risk domain to somebody who isn't aware that it becomes owner of that domain. So that's the advantage.

The disadvantage is that it can be frustrating for registrars, because you have to sacrifice on the effectiveness and on the speed of the operation. Now we departed from that type of transaction and we introduced a transaction that is much more close to the current transfer procedure for gTLDs. It's triggered and initiated by the registrar. We send out an authorization code, and as soon as that authorization code is given to the new registrar, the transfer is immediately carried out.

Disadvantage, there is no verification from the registry any longer, so there is a higher risk on insecurity. Advantage clearly is that the transfer whether it's a plain transfer or a change of registrant is immediately carried out. Now this just proves that there is no ideal solution. But to come back to my point, what is our specific experience; we just finished a registrar survey and 90% of the registrars is very positive about the changes that we have implemented.

So if you ask our experience, check with our registrars what should be the most important factor, [hyper] secure but not efficient procedure, or procedure where you trust your registrars and you gain in speed, clearly the preference goes to the latter. Thank you.

James Bladel:

Thank you and I see that we have now approached the end of our allocated time. So I wanted to once again express our gratitude for the ccNSO and allowing us some time on your agenda, and sharing some of your experiences and your cautions with us. This is, as you mentioned, a very complex issue that once we start scratching away at the surface, it becomes very intricate and has a lot of consequences that we want to be careful.

So if there is any other feedback maybe that comes to you later after the meeting, that you'd like to contact us, I think that if you could relay that through

Giovanni, through Mareka is the policy staff member on the GNSO side that's working with us on this working group, we would certainly appreciate anything that you have to offer. And again, thank you for your time.

Giovanni Seppia: Thank you. Thank you James and I will follow up with Mareka just in case there is a way to channel more input, and we will be really happy to do so.

James Bladel: Thank you.

Lesley Cowley: Thank you guys and you're welcome to come and visit again. I think this is a very interesting topic for many of us.

Okay, we are going to break, and I know coffee is long way away from here. We're going to break for coffee now, and back again at 11 please, promptly. Thank you.

[break]

Lesley Cowley: Okay, welcome back everybody. Okay, we're going to make a start and the observant amongst you will notice that we, due to delays at the GAC and the time to travel from the GAC to here, we managed to skip our session on rules and responsibilities in the ccNSO work plan. So we're just going to very quickly go back to that before our main session for this morning and hopefully you'll be able to see a very colored and interesting document up on the screen.

That's what's known as the ccNSO work plan mind map, which is our plan to have something on one page that brings together all of the various streams of work that we have ongoing at the moment. Now I'm not expecting you to read

the very small print, but just to be impressed with the number of boxes and their pretty colors I think at this stage. [Laughter]

So your Council spent more than two hours on some day this week in a very drafty tent, working our way through this work plan and coming to the conclusion that the ccNSO is probably at capacity at the moment, and how we deal with that maybe by prioritizing work, getting more people involved, etc. Obviously, that's a discussion that we'll continue.

But I can reassure that you now have a very good overview as to our work vis-à-vis this pretty plan. But behind the plan in all seriousness sits a very detailed project plan that Bart in particular has put a lot of work into where we now have a good feel for each project and working group that we are dealing with, the time frames that are involved, when things are coming back to the ccNSO or to the Council meetings, etc.

So hopefully, I can give you the reassurance that your Council is very organized currently with some excellent support from the Secretariat. Bart, I don't know if you want to add anything to that?

Okay, so the second item of work that we spent all of those drafty hours in the tent looked at was the list of the roles and responsibilities of the ccNSO. So you may recall that when Chris stepped down from being Chair the Council spent some time actually trying to not only find a new Chris, which of course was impossible, but to deal with the roles and responsibilities and actually share the [matters] of the Council much more, because frankly, we had realized that as the work of the ccNSO had grown, that there really wasn't anybody who could put in the amount of time that the previous Chair was.

So again, this document will be available on the ccNSO website, but what the Council have done is gone through all of the work strands and delegated them either to the Chair, the Vice-Chair or to the Council members. So again you'll find we have a very comprehensive list of what we're doing, but also more importantly, who is doing it. Bart.

Bart Boswinkel: Just one thing, I'll put this up on the screen so you have an idea how it looks like this division of roles and responsibilities and again, this will be on the ccNSO website.

Lesley Cowley: Okay, happy to take any brief comments or questions or expressions of amazement that we've got it all on one page.

[background conversation]

Lesley Cowley: Okay, thank you and I'd encourage people to review those documents on the ccNSO website and please do let us have your feedback, and let us know if there is anything we've missed. So with that let me move onto the next session and introduce Victor who is going to be chairing for me.

Victor Abboud: Thank you, Lesley. I'm Victor Abboud from .bc. We will have the traditional ccTLDs new session, and then we will have the re-organization news. So let me introduce Luis Espinoza from .cr, our host in this meeting. He will talk about DNSSEC launch with Banco Nacional de Costa Rica. So Luis?

Luis Espinoza: Good morning. This presentation is supposed in joining with the Banco Nacional people, but they are really here in the meeting, not in this meeting, but they at the DNS workshop. Then I will present this news that's it's work we did with Banco Nacional. I would explain to you a little bit about how we did this, what is the planning about this research and development we did, the implementation, and some results.

Thinking about the evil things come up to DNS, this new man in the middle attack like a cash poison, a [real] virus like configure. These kind of things provide identity theft phishing, and could keep results like bank fraud or worse, if something could be worse than the bank fraud.

Then when things come to an order, then this is one of the reason we choose to work with Banco Nacional because it's one of the main targets for phishing and for fraud currencies from internet using different techniques. And one of the main reason to implement DNSSEC is motivation from configure by example where there could be too much damage of the people using this technique of phishing.

Then we decide in Costa Rica to implement DNSSEC and we know the DNSSEC must be complete, it's a chain that must be completed, and then we have only sign our domain .cr on the subdomains, .fi, and .cr by example. We decide to go further. We decide to go with a customer, and with a customer that could have meaningful for the people, to create awareness. Then thinking about all the environment and these technologies, there's many goals that must be achieved with different techniques.

There's a very important thing about DNSSEC that must be secure, stable, should be a bible, have a good performance, and be reliable every time. And these things happen usually. Then to provide this kind of stability things, there is many tools here and by example, DNSSEC is one solution to provide some better stability, better security about the DNS. But there are other strategies like using anycast for spread servers on the work, or by example check the recommendation of software development techniques promoted by [OSP] by example.

And we know in this session, I want to talk about specifically DNSSEC deploy in our .cr. The first thing we need to do is how to make operations, because the DNSSEC signing is – could be a complex process to do it without automation, an automated process, could be some hard to do the things manually, then the first thing we need to do is how to make the operation, this automated operation

using EDP, takes at least two years for us and many different issues we need to resolve in this automation. And then with our researching about possible DNSSEC solutions, we found many, many products on the market that could be expensive for example for a small ccTLD, and we are looking for a good solution, open solution that could be inexpensive.

And we were thinking about this could be helpful for all other ccTLDs too, then it doesn't because we put a lot of work in this, maybe more than work – more work than we should put in any other solution. Then IDN we have now already signed the .fi.cr, that is the sector for the financial institutions and all the banks should be there, fi.cr. It's a separate some, split some then we have .cr by itself like a [limited zone] then we find .fi, .cr, and we change that, put in a DNS record into .cr.

And then we have a meet with Banco Nacional to help them to sign their own zone and provide the security change with .fi, .cr. This last work takes four months and I will be honest, we rushed to have ready that for this meeting. We want to show you before. Probably if no meeting, could be take a little more, but we need to rush. Then good because the thing is there.

Then about implementation; we focus on financing institutions. Why we focus on finance institutions? Because if you touch the money of the people they will be aware, the people is concerned about that. The people are very concerned about doing transactions their portal of the banks, some people lost money because they lost the credentials in his account or her account, and it's a good sector to provide awareness about the UNISEC security.

We want to, we need to create trust in the [mechanics]. Then because we need to create trust, then we go for hardware solution, not only software solution – why? For the most people it's not that relevant, but the technical people they found this could be a difference between generating keys using only software or generating keys using hardware solution. There's a differing on that.

And hardware solution is the way that the certificate authority do it. The other important thing about this is, have a complete chain, because you cannot see any

results until you complete the change. You can have your top domain level signed. We can have the root server signed, but until all the parts in the name, we are accessing is already signed, it doesn't matter. There is no way to provide security in that level. And that is because we look for a partner in this, and in this case it was Banco Nacional.

The other important thing we were discussing about in DNSSEC workshop is about validation and verification. This thing is very related with the ISPs, and we tried to put in on the project, but for the third time it was not possible. Then this would be our next step after the meeting, bring the ISPs in Costa Rica to try to put in place the validation and verification to complete the chain.

So I'm going to tell us about the implementation. We choose Banco Nacional. Banco Nacional is national bank. It's a state bank. It's the biggest bank in the country. And have been very early in development of the web based transactions. Right now they are doing a lot of transactions on the internet, than they can do it in the normal office. Then this is very important, because they for the people in Costa Rica Banco Nacional is like an icon of trust banking and web banking. Then with this bank we can trust many, many people and create awareness about this. Like I say we implement DNSSEC in the chain .cr, .fi, .cr, and a few days ago we really have the anchor in the root servers, then this is the key that will complete the chain.

We are using a hardware based solution, and this is very interesting for the technical people, I'm sorry if you're not technical people here but this is very interesting because we found we can use some hardware that is embedded in many, many, many system for free, no cost is there. The name of this platform is TPM, and it's cryptographically wise that has many, many components that could help in the signing of the DNSSEC and with no cost, because it's only activate the system and you start using.

Then with a very cheap computer, just a computer with \$200 or something like that, we can have a very trusty hardware implementation. It's not like HSM completely, but works like. And we are providing this solution to the

community. And we are very proud to help the people with other ccTLDs to work with this technology. And the other part I'm seeing is about the DNSSEC policy statement, we already have a draft of this DNSSEC policy statement, and we worked so hard with a Spanish person as a translation from an English from .se that provided from .se, and working with ICANN staff, Richard Lamb, and we work so close with them to provide this knowledge.

Okay, the goals. DNSSEC awareness, one thing we didn't realize that will be happening so quickly is that Banco National embraced quickly the DNSSEC technology, then I assume we have our first meeting as explain in the technologies, explaining the security about this. Certainly in this matter this takes its own control, and quickly they sign their zone and suddenly they are coming 8:30 in the night and tell me "We have the ideas, where do you want the ideas. We have the anchor for fi .cr. We already assigned our DNSL, our zone, we want to do this now."

Then it was a surprise for me because they embrace the technology very quickly, and this is a good thing. And then the implementation, we really have right now is we have a signer use in this DPN technology, that is innovation. We are signing and resigning integrated, automated in the workflow. All our zones are signing constantly, and we have this DPS [dispatch].

This is how it looks, our system without DNSSEC. We have web portal that capture all the transactions on the website, and this web portal communicate using EPP to our middleware system that runs on Fred software from Czech Republic. And Fred generate the zones in the text files. Then we run on a script that verify the script zone, then after that we reload our servers, our hidden servers and all these zones are split around the – spread around the world.

Then this is how it looks, our secondized service around the world; this is our present implementation. We have coloration from the Chile, from NIC Mexico to have secondary servers there and many others. And this is how it looks now with DNSSEC. We have strived to put in the same workflow. Then after generating the zones they are passed through DNS signer, DNSSEC signer that

is used this DPM technology. And after this all the zones are signed and then verify again for syntax, for completeness. They are reloaded to the systems and spread around the world.

We have here no issues, no one issue we have here; yes, we have one issue, I'll let you know. But most of the distribution of the new DNSSEC zones around all the secondary servers was very good, was excellent.

Yes we found an issue here. There is a problem with the size of the packets of the DNSSEC, and we need to increase some of the servers. Some of the servers – the firewalls increase the size of the packet.

Yes, there is an issue here about the DPM technology, we need to find out to back up these keys because these keys are assembled in the hardware of the motherboards of these systems; and then for security, it's not possible to back up easily, because if you can back up easily, the trust of that system could be lost. Then this key is very, very well protected, anti-tamper, if you touch it, it erase it. If you provide three time – more than three times the wrong password it will be disabled, and only if you have physical access to a system you can activate it and enable this device. It works very good for the hardware cryptographic device.

And it's very hard to find some way to back up this key, but we found a way to back up the DNS zone signing key, and key signing key and to move to another different DPM key, DPM hardware. And at the end it's not so hard to do it. But well we need to protect it very well.

And we are working on the process to approve and polish the DPS, this is a legal document and we need to be pass through lawyers and lawyers don't work at the speed of the internet, then we need to wait, but I'm sorry for the lawyers.

Being online .fi, .cr. If you try to get into this area right now using the ICANN provided, like these facilities that provide the service, and you have installed some of the plug-ins to validate the DNSSEC by example the DNSSEC

validator from Czech Republic, you can see that URL is on green, that URL is really verified.

Then how we work with Banco Nacional, it's some easy way. We have face to face meeting to create awareness about the benefits of DNSSEC. Then we have a technical work session to explain concepts in detail, to explain concepts in deep. Then certainly they sign in their process and send to us, this time by email, because we don't it ready yet, we don't have ready our web system to input the DS records because this is the first phase, it's the launch of the process. But after this meeting we will have it soon. Then all we need to do is incorporate the DS security record, this anchor to the fi .cr, zone, our zone. And there is a script that runs hourly that signs everything. That phase after the self-signing process, that phase takes two hours and that's it, everything was signing at that moment.

If you use some tool like this [DNSbeast.net] to check the online .fi, .cr, you will see everything is green for me, it looks good. But there is a deep detail about all the technical issues about DNSSEC that are already signed there, and like I mentioned before there is a plugging from Czech Republic that runs in Firefox and Chrome, where you can check that the site is secure. Right now in this moment, on production, the web banking system for Banco Nacional is signed for the people. The only thing we need to do in the next steps is to convince the ISPs that must enable the DNSSEC verification, DNSSEC validation. But this is a work in process.

Yes. Here is some of the – one of the main concerns about how to start to implement DNSSEC is something about the – some are scared. Some are scared, I don't know why they are scared, but some are scared about if something fails you will have lost your zone, if something fails, if the key fails everything goes down and there is a lot of issues about the – issues now, there's a lot of things created around this, and about technology, because it's very close to certificate authority, and these systems are very hard to implement and very expensive to implement. Then there is a lot of fear about that.

But at the end we found this could be do it very easy, very quickly and right now we are ready in deep Costa Rica, we are ready to help any other ccTLD that wants from us to help in implementation of this. And we are pretty sure we can do it quickly, because we really have – we really have a very simple solution about this.

The zone of the... So to be sure we try to follow as much as possible good practice about the key management, then this room is not made for this, this room was made for other purpose, but this was also hard to implement to a security camera, where we can record of the key management, key ceremony process, and whether it's a PC, so that's .PC, that PC hold the DPM chip inside, enabled to generate this in a secure way and this PC is off line, we move using USB flash drives; we move the keys to some signing key, and the key signing key from this device to the server that is really on production.

And this was not so hard to implement. We don't have a bunker or we don't a very expensive facility for that. It only follows good recommendations and take care of many things. And this is a very nice [fax] that Richard Lamb give us in the LAC TLD technical workshop in Chile last year, and he use it to tamper evidence [box], and where we're holding the USB flash drive with the copies of the key signing key, yes.

Then we have some of them keep safe from security box in the bank, and some of them keep safe in the security box in our office, then any of these keys we can set up again, the signer in different equipment. And this is very important phase because in case of emergency, we need to have a way to reproduce these keys.

But at the same time we need to keep it safe, because they are holding on this tamper-evident box. Now, that's more or less, we are ready to sign it, we have the .cr signed, .fi signed. We already have in production; we already have been online .fi, .cr. The main bank in Costa Rica and this URL is their web banking interface. And we are really kick off this implementation with the embrace of Banco Nacional and we know many, many other users will follow this implementation. I finish a little early, but sorry. But thanks and we are so proud

about that, and we receive many, many help from IT staff in ICANN and many help from this workshop in Chile was very helpful. And this embrace for Banco Nacional was amazing, it really was amazing and successful. I feel so proud. Thank you.

[Applause]

Victor Abboud: Any questions for Luis? ... she's here. She will talk about .cn, availability for individual registrants.

Hong Xue: Thank you for giving .cn an opportunity to present its new development, the information and the data I'm going to present were provided by CNNIC and I'm presenting on behalf of CNNIC.

In China, Ministry of Industry and Information Technology is the highest authority on domain names, and the issues is regulations on administration of internet domain names in 2004. This is a legal document provide the basic legal framework on domain name registration and the management.

Any registry or registrar setting up in the territory of China must be officially approved by MIIT, well of course it depend on interpretation what is meaning of setting up. I guess this means legally incorporated in China. And the registries domain name registration policy shall be revealed and approved by MIIT.

Then talk a look at the development of CNNIC registration policy, what we can see as the full period, even though the first one is rolling out and we haven't reached that period, we're still at period three.

The first period, 96 to 2002 this kind of beginning period, at that period registrants were limited to Chinese entities. So first of all you want to register it in .cn, you must be an entity, an organization, not an individual. And secondly, you must have a Chinese permanent address. So the foreign companies,

enterprises were not able to register in .cn before 2002. This is very serious limitation, even though those FDI, the Foreign Direct Investment enterprises located in China would be able to register, because they're permanent Chinese address. That's the first period.

In order to improve the services of domain names from 2002, .cn open up its domain. So from 2002, .cn is an open domain name to all the registrants around the world. It's not limited to Chinese citizen. However, the registration policy on the individual registration didn't change. So in paper that registration was still in place. However in practice in order to expand the business CNNIC actually allowed individuals either Chinese citizens or foreigners to register in .cn. That is kind of ad hoc basis reform for individual registration there is still uncertainty.

What I can see this is tremendous expansion of registration volume, because this kind of opened up by the end of 2009, almost 40% of the registrants were individual registrant, and the registrant volume of .cn reached its top level, that's 13 million. I guess we're number one ccTLD, however, at the end of 2009 because of the event I talk about yesterday, the cleaning up campaign at CNNIC have to check out all the registration information of every domain name is tremendously increased, it's economic burden and of course because of this absolute accuracy of registration information is actually frighten away about 80% of the registrant. And now we can see the current registration volume as actually 3 million. So it dropped 10 million, and now there is not – is largely in the list of top 10 of ccTLD now.

And because of this extreme measure on the accuracy of registration information only 15% of the individual registrant left. Actually, the MIIT specifically order CNNIC to stop providing registration service to any individuals. If an individual would like to keep his registration he must get a guarantee from an entity, this is extremely difficult.

Let's take a look at this current implementing registration policy, it's 2009 version. A domain name applicant must be a legally-registered organization

with a capacity to independently assume civil liability. So this is officially written into the documents, things that individual pose is not legally-registered organization has been excluded from the scope of domain registration. In addition to that, CNNIC is implementing very strict registration and a verification system. 99% of domain name registration information were verified. Actually, it could reach even 100%, so every domain name was specifically verified.

And there are other mechanism available to inspect and process domain name abuse as our colleague from .cr just mentioned, there's some abuse in domain name system, such as the phishing and for .cn it has a mechanism to delete the identified phishing domain names, even though at some discussion with the legal department of CNNIC about this kind of a legal risk of deleting phishing domain names, CNNIC is a ccTLD is a non-governmental organization is not a law enforcement agency, delete a domain name and in its belief that it is phishing has its own legal risk. What if the domain name stays the property of the registrant, and you delete it, you deprive other people's property. But this issue is not even addressed in any court proceeding and any case law. So it's still the practice now.

Then let's have a look at the last period, the period we're moving to, the openness and the resurrection period, because it's a tremendous drop of the registration volume, it concerns the government. And so there are some new direction, a spring atmosphere is coming to Beijing, so it's think about open up the registration on individual registration and now, the revision plan has been completed. It is now pending for the approval by the Ministry of Industry and Information Technology.

Hopefully, it could be approved by the end of March 2012, so it will be in 14, 15 days and the revision plan is quite simple. As an individual, say I'm a Chinese name is Hong Xue. I can register my own name Hong Xue, but Hong Xue is very common name in Chinese 1.3 billion population, and there will be a land rush for that. So you may add some numbers or prefix, suffix, such as Hong Xue 007 or something like that. As far as a matching to your name, you get a

discount prize for that domain name, HongSha.007.cn. In addition to that, you can register any domain name such as IloveICANN.cn, they're all possible. So that's my little briefing, thank you.

Victor Abboud: Thank you Hong Xue. Any questions for –

Female: Thank you for the presentation. Just a small question. With the initial period of openness and then the withdrawal, do you think there will be some kind of hesitation with this new proposal from the registrants?

Hong Xue: Well actually there is no hesitation from registry; oh you mean from registrants, yes, of course, the uncertainty is still there. The MIIT may not approve this openness plan in the first place. And secondly, the registrant may worry that the policy could be change, and the change they would really in danger of protecting their property in the domain name.

Victor Abboud: Any more questions, Kristina?

Kristina Nordstrom: Hello. Yes, I have a question from the remote participation room. And [Emanuel Hazes] would like to know if you can explain a little more how .cn would deal with individuals wanting to register the same domain.

Hong Xue: Sorry, would you please repeat the last part of the question?

Kristina Nordstrom: If you explain a bit more how .cn would deal with individuals who wants to register the same domain.

Hong Xue: Oh, well use the example of my name, say there is 2,000 Hong Xue in China, they all want to register their own name, well the plan that is being drafted is that there could be a sunrise period for the kind of registration on first come, first serve basis. And then there could be a kind of a random selection period to determine the person who eventually get the name as being competed by so many people.

Victor Abboud: Any more questions? Okay, let's say a big thanks to Hong Xue.

[Applause]

Male: ... in the ZA ccTLD. Victor?

Victor Ciza: Good day, my name Victor Ciza, I'm the general manager of the ZA Domain Name Authority, this is the TLD manage for South Africa's top level domain, which is ZA. I will talk to you briefly about running a gTLD on ccTLD infrastructure with a reference to ZA and involvement in .Africa and other gTLDs.

This is what I will cover briefly: .ZA on the one hand and then talk about ZA .Africa and the other new gTLD possibilities, and close with an update of where we are now. Right, this is our mandate in terms of ways to do our entity formed by an Act of Parliament called the ECT Act, or the Electronic Communication and Transactions Act of 2002, it says that the regulator is responsible for

managing and administering sort of because internet space and licensing and regulating second domain registries and registrars.

Of course we have a second level domain structure, so you register names under second levels like ac .ZA for an academic institution, [c.ZA] or ZA and so forth. So we licensed and regulated the registry, the individual registries involved there and the registrars. We also developed domain name policy, conduct education and awareness, local in sort of recurrent domain name space; conduct resurgence of investigation as and when. We are also able in terms of this to make relevant regulations in relation to the ZA name space and we also oversee as a regulator domain name just proof resolution.

What we currently working on now and I'll cover a bit of this as it relates to .Africa and the other new gTLD possibilities is that we've focused a lot more on registrant infrastructural improvements. This is more of a supervision site of the work that is going on below in the second level registration – with particular emphasis going toward ZA which account for around 96.5% of the ZA domain names to date; and that infrastructure improvement includes deployment of EPP technology. I will cover a bit more on that below.

We're also working on branding ZA a bit more actively, but in the light of the new gTLDs that are coming into play, improving our communications with our relationships with our stakeholders and customers. In particular, there was the AVP technology allows us to accredit a lot more registrars locally instead of internationally. We're also working on building a domain name and of excellence and investment in local DNS skills development and strengthening our participation in the Africa's domain name community. In particular, in relation to AF TLD, African top level domains where we're involved in any case. And we'll continue Africa on internet policies and standards, those who make policy standards for us such as ICANN. But we hope to expand and have visibility now on such fora as your IETF and others.

The current landscape is we're currently very focused on infrastructure and upgrades. As I said we introduced a locally developed EPP system, thanks to

the .ZA registry. We've also appointed what we call a central registry and the entity that says a central registry is effect in the forum [SA] which runs through our ZA; and we'll be absorbing that at second level domains like your net, ZA, and web and others.

And we did of course [come] the accreditation of EPP registrars and that obviously is a rapidly growing list. It allows the (inaudible) [or parent] of the central registry and also said not to have better business planning, because the old system was a post payment system. The APV system brings with it the prepayment system, so you know that before you register a name, you must have funds in there.

We have as far as I'm aware a little more than 66 local and international registrars already accredited. I've spoken personally to some of them here who are exhibiting and I think so far they are happy. And as I said other second levels will be moved into the central registry and to the APV technology.

So what of ZA and .Africa, now that new gTLDs? Probably from a .Africa point of view, it helps just to take a brief look back on AF TLDs .Africa project, because AF TLDs announced that it was going to [bid] for .Africa. A formal announcement went out in early 2011 following the meeting of the AF TLD board to strategize about .Africa. And we decided to embark on an open RFP process, RFP, that's for request for proposal to select our registry partner. And we then went through an evaluation process. We receive a proposal from a couple of operators, gTLD operators, and even ccTLDs operators from outside Africa. And following our aged and luster in (Inaudible) we made a decision on a preferred register, but not for our bid as AF TLD.

And then July 2011, we begin negotiations with our preferred registry partner. It wasn't and is a process, I was the one taking the lead for AF TLD when it came to that negotiation. So it wasn't easy, and it didn't move as fast as one would have like to move. But in particular, there were delays on the African unions, the AUC requirements, because the AUC was going to decide which individual it would support to apply to ICANN. And that in itself, the delays on

the AUC side meant that everybody was sort of really uncertain how best to position themselves for .Africa. But then came to a point where the AUC became clear, oh, no, I didn't want that.

The involvement of the AUC followed a decision of the 2010 AUC ACT Ministers in (Inaudible) where they decided that the AUC should take the lead on .Africa and select a party that will apply to ICANN for .Africa. What was important was that in 2010 as well, later the AUC there you see came up with original confirmation that they had not endorsed any party. That gave I think AF TLD another (inaudible) a great deal of comfort because there had been rumors by one of the peers or competitors claiming that they had the endorsement of the AU, so while that communication hurt us and encouraged us to call them (inaudible). They were committed; this AUC committed in the open tender process, but as I said they delayed, there was a serious delay, we had expected these tender requirements to be released as early as 2011, but it only came in November 2011.

What came out of there was the key requirements, they wanted a consortium of African ccTLDs, they wanted a clear involvement of African ccTLDs and they wanted an entity that had demonstrated technical registry operator experience and a proven, sound economic and financial health, surely have enough funds to run this. And they also wanted whoever they would appoint to then operate a [first-to-last] .Africa registry.

So in essence there was an emphasis on African investment, ownership and operation of .Africa. And when the tender requirements came out obviously they forced us to rethink I'm sure on other bidders' sides as well, but on the AF TLD side where ZA is involved, we had to look at the agenda and realize that we needed to change the strategy, because looking at the key requirements AF TLD is not a registrar operator and has not such experience and AUC wanted to appoint a registrar operator from an experience, so that alone threw us out. AF TLD's finances, as it is known were limited to internal funding and limited to membership fees, so we're not in a financial state to run .Africa. And that we cannot operate a registrar and so we are not a registrar operate. So in essence,

we needed a quick change in strategy to avoid missing out and we had the support of the African internet community. So whatever we did had to be also in the interest of the broader African internet community.

We had two questions that we needed to answer. Did we have time to set up a consortium of African ccTLDs and can such consortium provide enough funds? Did we have a ccTLD with a good enough technology to meet the ICANN standards. In essence the AUC RFP was out three and a half weeks if I remember well. So time just didn't allow us to [continue] on prolonged processes. We consulted broadly but as AF TLD we consulted broadly with the African community and it became clear that we can't set up a ccTLD consortium at that time and that trying to come up with the framework for funding base would not work, because the time didn't allow us.

So eventually we came to a point where [Z Net] offered to make up level of ZA ccTLD to be on the effort of the African ccTLDs, the AF TLD and to provide the required financial and technological and project management experience. This obviously came after consulting extensively within the African community region. What did it offer? What does the offer entail? Funding provided by the ZA central registry, the (inaudible) .ZA operator which is a nonprofit entity. We decided to make up a level 1.3 million US dollars as well probably the 1 million and then an addition \$300,000 US dollars for it to fund this project.

And also there is a possibility for African ccTLDs to invest as well or to put in funding. We also provided the EBP Registry Technology undertaken to operate on a cost recovery basis, and also to set up structure and leadership there to make sure that the project is owned by Africa and it's not just one country. And this includes setting up a steering committee of the African internet community and this organization and establishing a separate [demographical] foundation with its own board, AUC involvement, but no [ZA net] presentation; and it should have a strong African ccTLD involvement.

In addition we have undertaken to separate .Africa from ZA so that would be a clear .Africa operation generally that does not involve [ZA net] staffing and

effectively have ZA take the back seat was the whole project becomes an African project. And we'll have an MoU with AF TLD, that will cover all these undertakings, and all these undertakings by the way were in the proposal that we sent to the AUC. We then received letters of support from AF TLD, which gave us a letter that just conditional appoint an MoU being entered once we get the AUC endorsement. If we get the AUC endorsement and we receive letters of support also from different ccTLDs and different African regions, and as I said all our undertakings were included in the proposal.

And after an interest [letter] obviously, we then received the news that this project that is [ZA-led] but is led and owned and supported by the African community had received AUC's endorsement. So that exactly takes us to where are now, and the focus is on building .Africa's brand strategy.

Allow me to just to indulge a bit because I meant to switch quickly to some few slides. So in essence this is where are now with .Africa. If you look around the exhibition area, you will realize that there is a booth with this logo in these colors, that's a collaboration by the African internet community, through ZA and the African Union. This is the logo trading on the African one space which was good enough to avoid all the confusions because there were many [dissensions] or regulators with .Africa. So it was at least [Fred] but the steering committee came up with a different name for this. We held a workshop [JOB AID] or with the African internet community and a ten-member steering committee was established to draft .Africa.

There are four representatives of African ccTLDs and this steering committee is responsible for overseeing the .Africa application process to ICANN, and then for overseeing a whole lot of areas that are included in the MoU with AF TLD and also in the proposal to the AUC, each has its own dedicated stuff and the AUCs were present in this steering committee and then ICANN obligation is in progress pretty much done with just that we should hold on until we come back from this meeting, before we click the submit button. And yes, I've covered the AF TLD MoU which is – I mean a couple of things that just need thrashing out before it is signed.

We're working on visibility and participation at strategic events with ICANN AF TLD, AFRNIC, a silver sponsorship on ICANN meetings for the rest of this year taken by the (inaudible); and we're also implementing a marketing and communications campaign obviously, but that is driven again by the steering com. So that's where we are with .Africa and if I may just probably switch on quickly back to my presentation here, and I'm wrapping up Mr. Chair. I can see you're anxious.

Just in closing, it was after all this [light]. So and what about other new gTLDs that ZA is involved in? Well, there have been a lot of developments, but eventually through the drive by [ZA Net], the regulator and the Department of Communications inside Africa, we have decided also to mandate the ZA central registry to file an applications for the three major cities in South Africa, Durban, [Jobik] and Cape Town. This is a project, a gain that responded by the ZA central registry. So we hope that something good could come out of it.

In closing, there will obviously be inevitable next steps that comes from this month and one of them is that there will have to be some structural and operational separation of .Africa from .ZA, that's for .Africa as I said earlier on, so that there is no confusion and there is operations. There is a requirement by [ZA Net] an undertaking by the ZA ACR to separate or have a separate division that will run .Africa, and it's staffed by external people. We'll also have work that will arise on managing relations between ZA and this local ccTLDs, an undeveloping and national domain policy and participation in the GNSO will become inevitable. With that Mr. Chair thank you very much.

Victor Abboud:

Thank you Victor. Any questions for Victor? No. Okay, let's say thanks to Victor.

[Applause]

Victor Abboud: ... to be more greener in the cyber space.

Giovanni Seppia: I have to apologize because in the agenda you were probably expecting to have a presentation about registrar satisfaction measurement. But this is about news in the ccTLD environment, I just wanted to share with you what we have been working on in the past 12 months to reach a certain level of let's say sustainability in the [.u space].

And I'd like to start by saying that .u we had already several measures in place. Let's say that where you could call them environmental friendly. And then we said why don't we structure all these efforts via a channel, a process and this process was at our hand in a certain sense, and we decided about, as I said 12 months ago to move forward this way.

This process or let's say scheme is called EEMAS. EEMAS is an acronym and it's the European Eco Management and Audit Scheme. It's basically a management tool for companies or organizations to evaluate, report and improve their environmental performances. The EEMAS goes a bit farther than the famous ISO 14,001 standards, because it implies a higher participation for instance from the employees. It implies a higher level of reporting system, and it also implies that everything that we do to achieve the objectives that we set is checked on an early basis by verifiers that are appointed by the local committee of the EEMAS.

EEMAS is a scheme that was open in 1995 and it's a scheme that was launched to certify companies that were producing mainly goods, so concrete stuff, tangible stuff, that they were following certain environmental criteria throughout the production process. This regulation, the European regulation which is at the basis of the EEMAS changed in 2001 to allow organizations that do not produce any good but basically that are in charge of services to become EEMAS certified.

And therefore since 2001 EEMAS is not restricted any longer to companies that are primarily in the industrial sector. EEMAS is a voluntary scheme, so you're not obliged to let's say go for this if you're interested in the territory of the European Union. It's a scheme that is open to companies and organizations that are based in the territory of the European Union as well as the European economic [carriers] so it's Norway, Lichtenstein, and Iceland. And also to branches of organizations that are based in those two areas that are working in third countries.

There are three core elements of the EEMAS, and the three core elements are performance, everything is linked to the way you perform against the environmental standards that you've set; credibility, because it's really a matter between you, the scheme, but also your stakeholders, and transparency, because from the moment you start this scheme, you must have a specific communication actions and therefore you must inform all your stakeholders of your environmental activities, including for instance suppliers, any kind of supplier. So if I have let's say a supply of 100 pants every year, I must inform that supplier that I'm following this process and to make sure that eventually the supplier is also environmentally certified.

EEMAS is based on a policy that is set by the company or organization, and actions again to achieve the objectives that each company is free to set. And again, it's based on the fact that you try over a three-year period which is the standard initial period to continuous improve against your environmental objectives.

And just to give you an idea where everything starts, basically everything starts with an environmental review which means that you have to check what environment legislation of the country that you are based applies against what you are doing, what you are producing, the services that you are offering.

The second step is to produce an environmental policy where you set very high level goals for the company and the next phase is to produce objectives and

actions to achieve those objectives. And just to have – so it's basically seven steps.

Are they easy? No, they are not, because it's quite a lot of bureaucracy, it's quite a lot of paper to read and to produce. And it's also quite stressful at certain points to be verified by people that are appointed by the local EEMAS committee that is there to verify that what you are committed to is shared at company level, but also that is doable for the time frame you expect it to be subjective.

And those people, they come to your company or organization for a couple of days, eventually three days and basically they can check anything that is related to environmental standards and anything that is related to the documents that you have produced, that are basically the environmental policy and the environmental declaration or statement that are two of the key documents that you have to produce when you join this kind of scheme.

At the end of this process, you get a registration number. And from that moment, you are officially EEMAS certified. This certification, again, last three years, and every year you are checked.

Basically we have decided to go for that because we have been looking at what we have been doing in the past, and our commitment to the environment, and we also have seen that the companies that have gone for this certification, they have let's say increased their profile towards their stakeholders. And this is something that any company that commits to environments should be proud of, because again, it's an added value in the marketplace.

In terms of our environmental policy, we have set some sort of high level, six high level goals. And those high level goals in this one-page document that we have produced are related for instance to the adoption of energy and water saving measures, implementation of a plan for green corporate cars, elimination of waste, efficient use of products and materials, reduction of the carbon footprint as the internet industry is an industry that likes to travel a lot, and that is also an element you have to take into account when checking what you're

doing against the environmental legislation that applies to your activities, and internal and external communication about our environmental goals.

At the end of this exercise which is draft this environmental policy, we moved the following step, and the follow step was to set several objectives and actions to achieve those objections. And always thinking that it's a voluntary scheme. So it's up to you to set concrete and measurable actions, and at the same time it's up to you to review those actions regularly over the three years' time, and make sure that if those actions, they are not contributing to achieve the objective, there are corrective measures that are taken up and you share those corrective measures with the EEMAS committee verifiers and of course with all your stakeholders.

So just to get into the objectives that we have set. The first one is to increase the use of sustainable material consumption by 30%. And basically what we have done was to screen and evaluate all our suppliers, and we're talking about over 100 suppliers of different kinds of goods that we use in our daily life and registry business. And we make sure that whenever we select a supplier, or we place an order purchase for new goods, the suppliers we are working with they have again some environmental certification or they contribute to such an extent to environment. And I give you one example, for instance, we publish a certain number of copies of our public .u identity magazine. And we do it via a Swedish printer, because in Sweden there is a very specific procedure to make sure that whenever you print something there is a sort of pyramid of the forest authority in Sweden that gives to this (inaudible) because you have to pay an extra to make sure that what the paper you use is eventually compensated by the Forest Minister to make sure that their actions to compensate the quantity of paper that you produce.

So the second goal is to reduce the paper used by 10% and one concrete action is that for instance we have just introduced the e-invoicing for our registrars, so basically our registrars are from May onwards they will receive the invoices via email and therefore we just got all the envelopes and the invoices that we were used to printing.

Increased good practices such to reduce the electricity used. Reduce the amount of waste produced by 6% and in this case we have some actions like to have some special boxes in the office, close to those that are already been there for a while to make sure that recycling waste is increased and the waste that is produced is reduced.

Reduce the environmental impact of transport, compensate 30% of the Co2 and greenhouse gases emissions. And in this case we have let's shared at management and company level a document to make sure that for instance whenever we travel there is whenever it's possible of course, the objective to choose airlines or companies that they do compensate greenhouse emissions, and for this you pay something extra but again this is a small gesture that contributes to a greener environment.

Organize at least 50% of your events with environmental criteria. And for this we have taken on board a document that was produced by the United Nations Environment Program which is called the Law Environmental Impact Event Guide. And it's a quite interesting document because it shows that by implementing very small actions you can make sure that an even that your guys, it could be a registrar lunch, it could be the participation in ICANN meeting, it could be the participation with your booth at the (inaudible) days or any internet-related event, that is again environmental friendly. And one important aspect of being environmental friendly when you organize an event is to make sure that you leave a positive legacy to the local environment when you move out from that environment, increase the environment communication towards all our stakeholders and to do this we'll have some actions including in the website which we are preparing to have a specific [corner] about our environmental commitment.

And the last one which is a key element in the EEMAS registration process is to make sure that staff members and employees are equally informed and they are committed to this environmental objectives.

Again, I'd like to stress upon you that it was not easy, because it's quite a lot of bureaucratic work, but it's also – you have to just move to a state of mind which is let's say environmental structured. So some actions that for you probably they do not – they're not relevant but those they are relevant to the environment, so you have to move to that direction. And at the end we see that as really an ongoing process, because this is a process that we started, it's a three-year initial process, and then it's going to be checked and super checked and rechecked during those three years to make sure that we are fully compliant with our objectives, we achieve our objectives and eventually we go even farther against the objectives that we initially set.

I think that it's something we have done with extreme interest and pleasure, we are at the beginning of this process, because we are now about to get this famous registration number, but it's something that even a company like a registry which is working in the cyber space doesn't product any kind of good, a company that again you can never think that you know just managing domain names can have an environmental impact, but yes we can contribute to the environment.

And if you'd like to know a bit more about the EEMAS, this is the address of the European Union site, Europe.u site where you can have more information about the EEMAS. And we are happy to share about our experience and eventually some tips and tricks to go through all the different steps that again, it's quite a long process because we started one year ago. So thanks a lot, and I'm happy to answer any question.

Victor Abboud:

Thank you, Giovanni, for your presentation, but that does not mention domain names, or internet or DNSSEC in any place, but any way, any question for Giovanni. Okay, let's say thanks Giovanni for this original presentation.

[Applause]

Victor Abboud: Fahd Batayneh, I don't know if I pronounced it correctly.

Fahd Batayneh: Good afternoon everybody, my name is Fahd Batayneh, I'm from .jo, the ccTLD for Jordan. My presentation is going to be about the rebirth of .jo and (inaudible) which is Jordan's IDN ccTLD.

So a brief history, .jo was delegated on November 23 of 1994. Our IDN ccTLD (inaudible) in Arabic was delegated on August 20th of 2010. Both TLDs actually administered by Jordan's national information technology center which is IT arm of the Jordanian Minister of Information and Communication Technology. Part of NITC is run and administer .jo and (inaudible).

On April 4th of 2011 a new DNS office was established to run the day-to-day activities of both Jordanian TLDs. Prior to that date, both TLDs were actually, let's say the issues related to both TLDs was scattered amongst various departments within NITC. The office actually consists of three staff members, one ccTLD manager, and two DNS officers.

We are totally devoted to run the day to day activities of both TLDs administratively, technically, policy wise and governance. Activities, other than administrating both TLDs, we ensure best service provided to our registrants. We communicate with them either by emails or telephone, which is the regular way of communication. We approve domain names, let's say newly registered domain names, we ensure – we audit them and ensure that they comply with our registration policy, we don't have an open method of registration, we actually have a closed method in which the registrants should provide official documentation before we can approve a domain name. We send out financial invoices through email, and then we remind registrants that their domain names have expired.

We try to be as active as possible in various gatherings related to names and numbers, one of which is ICANN. And we try to apply the best practices and trends in the names and numbers industries to our small registry.

In total we have six DNS servers and two caching servers with international organizations. We have one primary and one secondary DNS servers. Of course we are a government run agency, so we actually host domain names for government entities only and we have two DNS hosting servers. We have a reverse DNS server and another caching DNS servers for us to look up queries. And then we have a DNS server hosted with RIPE NCC and another one with PSG.

One year later, we managed to document all our six DNS servers. There was no documentation whatsoever. We wrote a comprehensive registry framework in both Arabic and in English to ensure that like an easy transfer of knowledge, if we assume that we get like new staff members, they can just read the framework and get to know what exactly they're getting into. We managed to audit all the zone files and ensure that it had only necessary data. We also optimize the values found within the zone files to ensure that DNS querying is done the best possible way.

Of course we do have a registration system, but it is not connected to our DNS servers, I mean it's a really basic system, so when a registrant registers a new domain name, it just goes into the database and we have to actually insert the new domain name into the DNS servers manually. So we actually ensure that the domain names that were on the database complied with those that were found on the DNS servers.

We did data cleansing for more than 4,300 domain names, well that is actually the number of domain names we currently at .jo, we're a really small registry, but we're looking forward to growing. We found that many of the domain names, especially the ones that were registered like years ago had outdated data on them and we were unable to contact their registrants, so we dealt with each domain name separately. We accessing the website that was connected to it, and we extracted all the up-to-date information from it, and we just updated our database accordingly. For those domain names that we were unable to locate any website, we just did a Google search and we managed to find some information. If we found nothing, we just left the data as is and just what would

assume that when the registrant contacts us we can just update our data accordingly.

Prior to the launch of new gTLDs we actually outreached many intellectual property funds. Actually entities who have a will to preserve their trademarks under .jo usually do that through intellectual property firms. We have actually around 15% of our domain names are registered through intellectual property firms. So we actually outreached them and explained to them the concept of trademark clearing house and how important is it for trademark holders to actually register their domain names under .jo, since the new gTLDs will – I mean new gTLDs will be rolling out soon, and trademark holders will definitely want to register their trademarks. And actually we found from our findings we found that they have been quite active, and there has been a lot of trademark registrations going on these past few weeks.

Even though we have three staff members, we try our best to ensure 24/7 customer service. We work from home. We published our first annual report and it was actually distributed on the ccNSO mailing list. The renewal rate of domain names was actually 66% and I mean prior to the establishment of the new office, at the end of last year, it was 91.5% which was a good jump. Of course the registration revenue increased by 51.42%.

We conduct frequent amendments to our DNS registration policy, we do receive feedback from time to time from our registrants and we ensure that that feedback is taken seriously and we reflect it accordingly. I mean if we can reflect it. One of our second level domains was actually a .name, .jo domain name for individuals, and that was retired due to the fact that many individuals just found that the name was too big like so they preferred using the .(inaudlbe), .jo and .phd .jo. We just introduced these two top level domains just recently, and no registrations have been done so far because we have still not announced them. But that will happen soon.

The DNS office is a member of ICANN's Country Code Name Supporting Organization, the Internet Society, the Asia Pacific Top Level Domain

Association, the Arab IGF Initiative, the Arabic Domain Names and Internet Governance Team, the Arab Script IDN Working Group and the .Arab at both ASCII and Unicode Steering Committee.

These are our statistics, I mean summarizing it we can see that almost 41% of our domain names are registered under .jo at the first level. Another 37.4% are registered under .com, .jo, and the rest is scattered amongst the second level domain names. We can see that the renewal rate as of today which is March 14, 2012 was standard 19.25%.

Of course our IDN has not been doing well, we only have 90 registrations and all of them have been renewed. I guess one of the reasons behind that is the Arabic language is a language that does not use, what do they call it, I'm unable to find the proper word. Okay, so basically when a registrant registers a domain name in Arabic, the name tends to be quite long. We do not use the initials, like we can't say ccNSO in Arabic so we have to write it as country code name supporting organization.

Our future plans. One of the main problems that jo is that the prices of our domain names are quite high, and we do receive a lot of complaints about that, but since we are government driven agency, changes tend to take long than we expect. We actually did submit a new pricing scheme. We haven't heard back from the government yet. We have to promote and market both our top level domains, especially our IDN ccTLD. We have plans on outreach and service providers regarding .jo for individuals and .phd, .jo for Ph.D. holders in which we want them to give registrants like webspace and emails along with the domain name for a minimal fee, just as a means to encourage individuals in Jordan to register under these two extensions. Of course we have plans on deploying DNSSEC soon, it's one of our plans for the second quarter of this year. We plan on hosting an out server in Jordan. We plan on hosting a MNOG meeting which is the Mideast Network Operator's Group in Jordan. And of course most importantly we have plans on hosting an ICANN meeting in Jordan. As many of you might know Amen was supposed to host the meeting last June but it was deferred due to the Arab spring. Of course there was nothing serious

going on in Jordan, it's just that the ICANN community, well some members of the ICANN community just felt that it wasn't in the best of their interest to fly into a troubled region. Of course the next Asia Pacific meeting is going to take place next April, and we have actually submitted a bid to host the Amen meeting. We hope we are successful on that one.

And you all will come to Jordan, and that's it. Questions.

Victor Abboud: Questions for Fahd, oh, Lesley.

Lesley Cowley: I have a question. You had a very significant increase in renewal rates.

Fahd Batayneh: Yes.

Lesley Cowley: What do you think caused that?

Fahd Batayneh: Okay, prior to the establishment of the office, there was no let's say follow up from the finance department. And so no invoices were sent. Actually when we started the sending out invoices, we realized that some domain names were active for the past five years, but they were not renewed, and they were not paid for. So we actually requested the registrants to pay for them. So actually the follow up, I mean sending out financial invoices, and then follow up through telephone was reason behind the increase in renewal rates. Thank you.

Steven Sheng: Steven Sheng .as, question, are you going to mirror your second levels in the IDN jo?

Fahd Batayneh: Okay, actually there is this Arabic IDN script working group, and one of the outcomes of the working group is not to introduce second level domain names in Arabic. As I said the Arabic is not an abbreviation-driven language, you have to write the term completely, so when you add the second levels, the name tends to become larger. So no, we won't be introducing that.

Victor Abboud: Any more questions for Fahd? Okay, let's say thanks to Fahd and all our presenters.

[Applause]

Victor Abboud: Now, we will have the summary of the regional organizations. I will hand the Chair to Carolina.

Carolina Aguerre: Good morning, we're going to make a brief but hopefully interesting new session. I'll start with a very brief update of what LACTLD has been accomplishing in the past months, and then Jian Shang from APTLD will provide a short presentation as well. Victor will also have some updates regarding some workshops that have been organized and that will be organized in Africa, and then we'll have a very what we hope is an interesting survey that we have conducted, and Patrick Miles from the CENTR will be presenting it.

Basically one of the most important news that we have from LACTLDs that we are now, 48 hours ago, we have an English website on, so it's bilingual and we expect to, it's not a CMS yet, it will be for a proper CMS for LACTLD members in a couple weeks, so by the end of March. So we hope that by this measure we

can become more integrated with the global world in general and the Caribbean as well.

So the website will maintain its functionalities for the members only section and data for members and as I said before the CMS, it's now .CMS, now it's a static website, but we are proud to have it ready in just eight weeks work for ICANN.

The other news that we have is that we have a defined schedule of our workshops this year, and as you might see the venues and the topics, or at least the titles, and probably the most interesting fact about this is that we have our legal work shop with a new trend of topics regarding our administration and management in ccTLDs which is a growing concern of our ccTLDs in the region. So we will start exploring that in our Aruba workshop in November. Thank you very much for your attention.

[background conversation]

Jian Zhang:

Hi everybody, I'm Jiam Zhang from AP TLD. So what's happening in our region. First thing you can see we are going to have this new looking, we just have our new logo passed by the last AGM, so it was Asia Pacific in Arabic style with a Tai Chi background. It's too bad it couldn't show up on this screen. So that's the first thing. And the second one, we're also going to have our new website launched very soon, probably in the middle of this year, are going to have more information on line and also we're going to have a data bank to be shared among members and their member session in the center to allow us to share the same framework on our website. Also we just had our last members meeting two weeks ago in New Delhi, once again IDN was still a hot topic in our region. There is some update on the policy development like a universal acceptance of IDNs; like this week we'll be talking about in the ccNSO session. Also the IDN email in a set has been updated during the meeting. And also there was a new topic introduced during the members meeting, like a piece

addressed yesterday that's [Douglas'] proposal. We try to bring members awareness, what's going on in ITU and how it could be possibly affect the ccTLD managers. We did have a discussion how ccTLDs should work with their government and the local community on domain name management regulation etc. So it's a very – I think it's very useful discussion.

Last and the most important our next meeting is going to be Moscow, Peter is already mad enough to me and all, because we're going to have a meeting in his territory. So that's going to be the week before ICANN Prague, so that's going to be the Thursday and Friday before ICANN meeting. So do stop by in Moscow on your way to ICANN Prague, so see you in Moscow next time. Thank you.

Female: Victor Ciza.

Victor Ciza: Thank you. I want to give presentation, it's just an update on AF TLD and its activities call for what we recently had an AROC, Advanced Registrar Operations Cause in (Inaudible) Burkina Faso in mid-January. It was attended I think by at least 12 ccTLDs from the Francophone Region of Africa.

The second development is we're working on registration of AF TLD in Kenya. So that's pretty much going okay, it's about to be finalized. Our Secretariat and our operations now are based in Nairobi housed by the Kenya ccTLD, and then we have an AGM that is for the last week of April in Livingston, Zambia at the Victoria Falls. So if that could been a part of the ad that excites you, you are welcome to come and attend all of these program in the following week. And then in closing we have a DNSSEC workshop, for the first that we'll have in our region. It will take place in Khartoum, Sudan, the Sudan before the south Sudan. And this is set to take place I think in November alongside AFRINIC too that will take place there. That will be all, thanks.

Female: Thank you Victor. Any questions up to now, I'm sorry I didn't put forward the mic. Okay, we are now having the presentation by Patrick Myles from CENTR, but we are having technical problems it doesn't come up on the screen. And there's many charts in this one. But we tried it both in mine and it's not working.

Female: When you choose screen, you choose that extended.

Female: Have we tried turning it off and turning it on again? [Laughter]

[background conversation]

Female: Oh, full power, okay, I didn't to technical support, I can just turn it off and start again. In the interlude, I wonder if we want an update on the Gala tickets at some stage? No.

Kristina Nordstrom: Okay, I'll tell you what I know about the Gala which is not that much but first of all, I know several people had problems to get the Gala tickets and they have been told that I have them, and I don't, just so you know. If you have problems please speak to Karen or Mary Antoinette, they know about this special problem and they should help you sort that out. I do not have your Gala tickets.

And the second thing I know is that buses are leaving, but only from this hotel at five o'clock, and from no other hotel, only this hotel. And you will both need to have your ICANN badge and the invitation and the special badge that you get for the Gala invitation. And I think that's all I know. But please speak to Karen or Mary Antoinette if someone claims that I have your tickets, because I don't.

Female: And for people who don't know those, I think there was some rumor that they were going to be located by the newcomers lounge.

Kristina Nordstrom: It's when you walk into the building where the newcomers lounge is, but you walk into that building where the lunch is going to be served, and it's on your right side. It's not actually the newcomer lounge, but it's that area. So it's just at the entrance on your right.

Female: Kristina, given we all have the laptops open, can you put it up on the website? Can you put it up on the Adobe room, given that we all seem to have laptops here.

Okay, so for those of you that aren't also participating remotely, there is if you go to the ccNSO website to the agenda for this meeting, you'll find a link to participate remotely, you can join as a guest in the Adobe room and you can actually see the presentations.

Patrick Myles: Okay, how do you make it go big? So we made it after some small technical problem, it seems to work now. So good morning, my name is Patrick Myles and I'm working at the CENTR Secretariat. So rather than give a CENTR update, we thought we would speak about a survey that we did recently that was a joint survey between all of our regional organization, AF TLD, LAC TLD, AP TLD and CENTR.

So a bit of background to the survey. It was conducted between – well, first what happened was we had some discussions between our regional associations throughout 2010 and 2011 where we were trying to get a greater cooperation between the regions and one of the ways that we do this is through statistics. So

in 2011, the CENTR did its annual statistical survey, which is a survey consisting of 40 questions relating to registry size, domain policy, registrants' characteristics, registrars and various other things.

So we took six questions out of our initial survey and we spread it around the regional associations. So we asked them to ask the same questions, so all of our members were asked the same questions. And so we had a total of 81 ccTLDs responding in some form to this survey, and like I say, it just ended in around February this year, so it was a while to put together, but we got 81 in the end.

So the objectives of the survey are listed up there as to promote the cooperation as I just mentioned between our four regions, particularly relating to statistics. We do have a big challenge at CENTR and so the other regions to find out the statistics that are relevant. Also another problem is privacy, we face issues of privacy on how much we can share with our members, how much that we can share publically. So these are the things that we have to take into consideration. Also the relevance of the numbers that we have, because each registry of course, the ccTLD knows the information about themselves, but they may not know too much about their peers, so we were trying to put everything together so it's interesting, but it is a challenge to find that relevant data.

So these are the people that took part in the surveys, a list of ccTLDs, but we thought it would be better to show you this slide which is the map of every country that took part in the survey. So you'll see in red is CENTR and then other regions in different colors.

The first element of data that we asked, as I said there was only six questions in the survey, it's a very broad level survey, as a first attempt at this type of joint survey. So the first question that we asked was about domain accounts actually, so very basic statistic, and rather than portraying that in a way that's just showing zone size, we put it against the population of the country. So it gives an indication of the penetration rate of a particular ccTLD. So there you can see it's per 1,000 residents and there's four different categories. So if there's more than 200 domains per 1,000 residents, it's in the dark purple. And I think

Denmark and Netherlands and Lichtenstein I think one of only three and Montenegro perhaps as well.

So moving along, this is just a very broad overview of some of the statistics that were gathered from this survey, so I'll just provide a couple of slides on that. The market penetration we divided up into different categories according to population. So this allows a member to benchmark a little easier on the broader sense apart from their regions. So this is an example of one of the categories, its market penetration according to the zone sizes with a country that has up to 2 million population. So you'll see the red dots there are the market penetration rate with the access on the right. And to the left is the zone size. So for example, Lichtenstein is the highest penetration in that category, followed by Montenegro.

The other categories that were produced from the report are 2 to 10 million population, 10 to 15 million population, and more than 50 million. So that's all available in our full report that we will give to our members and all the members of the people that took the survey.

So the next metric that we thought we'd show is one about registry employees. There was one question that asked the number of employees in a registry. So again, they're very broad statistics. It's just a way of presenting some form of data where these members can benchmark themselves a little. It's also a way to point out any abnormalities in data, where a registry might fit in and see how their peers are looking compared to them.

So the little dots are the number of registry employees, so the number of people who are taking – who are dealing only with registry operations, because sometimes these organizations are of course broader in their sense and they take care of other aspects of a business.

And there's a red line in the middle showing an average median of value and all the domain counts are there as well. So again the countries can benchmark a little easier. This metric was also done for several other categories up to 10,000

domains, 100,000 to 1,000,000 and so on. So again it's all in this full report that we give to everybody that took part in the survey.

The next thing that we asked was about domain pricing. So we asked what is the average price of the wholesale price excluding VAT for a registrar. Now this is very of course quite a bit due to currency across the regions. So we've converted it all to Euros, and I will mention that we had different sample rights for each of the areas. So for example, CENTR has an X number of ccTLDs responding, AP TLD had X number of ccTLDs responding, so the sample is an indication only, it's not to say it's a definite figure of this is the average price, wholesale price of a domain, but it's an indication anyway, and I'll go into further about what the future is of measuring these type of statistics.

That's actually all for the stats, so I'll just briefly mention on the future steps that we hope, this is the first time that we have tried a survey of this nature, combining the regions together. So it's a first attempt. It's quite encouraging. We got 81 ccTLDs involved, many of them are not used to sharing their data across other regions. So we hope it's an encouragement to all the ccTLDs that see this presentation and also who may see the reports as well, that they will take part in future presentations, in future surveys.

So what are going to do? We're going to evaluate the feedback on this initial survey of all the people that took part, we'll evaluate it and see where to go from there, and see what more we can do. So other ideas are always welcome about statistics that we can gather, and also things like economic factors are of course important, so we try to integrate the economic factors of a country integrated into the statistics that we gather.

Yes, so that's basically it. We founded a good grounding, it took us over a couple of months to sort of do the survey and gather the results together and form some sort of analysis. Now, it will go to all the members, they'll see the results and hopefully we can move forward and more cooperation between the ccTLDs. So thanks very much for listening. If you have any questions, we might have a bit of time.

Paul Szyndler:

... from Australia, good day. Just a quick question about I know you touched on it, but can you elaborate a little bit on the intentions, like this data that's been collected is obviously a baseline, it's the first time it's been done, it will be meaningful as the process goes on the second time you do it, you'll see where the prices go down, DNSSEC penetration is going up, etc., etc., but can you elaborate on the plans of where to from here. I know you're looking for input, but have you got any preliminary ideas about after this is distributed that the next step might be to build upon it?

Patrick Myles:

Sure, thanks for the question. As I said it is like you say, it's a preliminary, it's a first attempt at this sort of data collection. Where it comes from, I would say from my point of view in CENTR, we have a very healthy surveys culture. We have about two or three surveys running every month. Now we find this is a very valuable thing for all our members, they all actually are the ones that initiate the surveys themselves. So it's very, very wide ranging type of topics. The thought is behind this survey is along those lines to share data, but on a broader sense, so okay, we're all in four different regions, but there are some similarities, we're all ccTLDs, so we can gather statistics that will become meaningful, hopefully, allowing the ccTLDs to benchmark and where it might also become interesting is when new gTLDs come in, we might be able to see some sort of trends as well and developments in that area. But as I say the economic factors are very important as well, so a lot of countries are developing. We're trying to take this into account, and hopefully by the end of the year, we'll start thinking about another survey for example and will hopefully have even more data to play with. So these sorts of factors are –

Paul Szyndler:

Thanks.

Female: No more questions, oh Peter.

Peter [Hollis]: Peter [Hollis] from CENTR. It's not as much a question as it's also a follow up on Paul's question. A very basic reason as well to it is that and I don't know if I'm the only in this room, but I got somewhat frustrated by having to rely on the Verisign domain report at the ICANN meetings to tell us how ccTLDs are doing. And I'm actually convinced that we can do better job than the methodology that they're relying on. And so this is a first step, and obviously we need to move from this 81 to say 150. But I hope that the value that comes out of this will basically trigger other ccTLDs that it will be a sufficient incentive for other ccTLDs to join that effort and talk to their regional organizations.

Female: Thank you Peter. Thank you very much. Closing this.

Lesley Cowley: Okay, thank you very much for that, very interesting and I'm interested in that research as well, great, great initiative. Okay, we're going to move to lunch now. So firstly, some words from your lunch sponsor, which is easy because it's Nominet. This week .uk will pass the 10 million domain names mark.

[Applause]

Lesley Cowley: So we're actually thrilled to do that, and we thought we'd like to celebrate with you. We've not quite got there yet, so we will tell you when it's announced officially and if I keep looking at my phone and my laptop that will be why. But obviously very pleased to offer to sponsor lunch to celebrate. Lunch I'm afraid though is in the south lobby which is our daily exercise back through the conference center [laughter]. You need to go past the registration desk and the

trade stands, past Le Pas and then it's at the kind of lobby area there. Tickets will be issued at the door by the wonderful Kristina on a first come, first serve basis, and please can I encourage you to come back here at two o'clock, prompt for our famous panel discussion. And the room will not be locked, so please can you take your valuables with you. Thank you.

[break]

Lesley Cowley:

Okay, good afternoon everybody and welcome, can I encourage you to take a seat and we'll start our famous or infamous panel discussion which as you'll be aware is the closing item on the ccNSO two days of meetings.

And this time by popular demand, the topic is marketing ccTLDs with the advent of gTLDs, what strategies, what reactions, what are people doing in response to the changing environment. And I have Patricio who is going to be Chair and keep us to time and Byron who is going to be moderator. He did it so well last time, he's now got that job for a while. So over to you both, thank you.

Victor Abboud:

Okay, welcome. Welcome to this session. We're living in interesting times and this panel mark the ccTLDs with the advent of gTLDs, focusing on the strategies and reactions to the changing environment. We expect it to be very interesting for all of you and provide the information that you might find useful for the coming times.

Our panelists today are Fernando Espana from .us; Jordi Iparraguirre from .cat; Adrian Kinderis from Aus Registry; Eduardo Santoyo from .co; and Marta Tellez from Core. And the moderator will be Byron.

Byron Holland:

Thank you. Thank you very much? How's the volume? Okay. Well this is building a panel that we had in Dakar where we talked about the advent of gTLDs and how it's impacting us in the cc space, and what are the types of things that various ccns were doing and how were we thinking about it.

So this panel is really an evolution and step at ongoing dialogue and we have the benefit here today of having a mixed panel from inside the cc world, gTLD world, etc. So hopefully it's going to be an interactive dialogue, that's certainly the goal that the panelists, we're going to ask them to make a very brief introductory remarks, I mean like a couple of minutes, just where they're from and their take on what's happening in their landscape right now. And then just start posing some questions, and really what we'd like is like we had in Dakar, which I thought turned out to be a good session of very interactive question answer discussion oriented session. So that's the goal for today.

So I will pass it over to you two minutes.

Eduardo Santoyo:

Okay, good afternoon everyone, I'm very happy to be here to share with you our experiences with .cr. Dot cr is the ccTLD for Colombia. We host ICANN meeting in Cartagena in 2010, I hope some of you remember Colombia. Okay, and the ccTLD in Colombia has been ruled or regulated by the Ministry of Information and Telecommunications. They define the policies through administrate the ccTLD. They also and then we also have a contract with the Republic of Colombia in order to administrate the ccTLD has been defined by them. Dot co is an open – we have open registration for everyone, everywhere who want to have a domain name can apply for it. We have also the model of registry registrar system where we as a registry have not participated actively in their final process of their commercial chain, where it was the registrars who are in charge of that.

We are deployed these activities in February 2010 when was secured the transition between the past model upgraded in Colombia with this one. And since then... Okay, at that time we will see the registry of 28,000 domain names

and after this, almost 18 months of continued work we already have today almost 1,300,000 domain name in the .co. Okay, that's all.

Byron Holland: Thank you, I think that was more than one minute.

Eduardo Santoyo: I'm sorry.

Byron Holland: That's okay, it's a very interesting story.

Fernando Espana: Good afternoon everybody, I'm going to try to be a little bit shorter than Eduardo. My name is Fernando Espana, I'm representing .us, Neustar actually has the contract with the department, the US Department of Commerce for the Administration of .us. We've implemented a model similar to ICANN with the registry registrar model, so we do share a lot of the registrar channel and we as the registry would not sell the domain name directly to the end user.

We currently have about 1.5 million .us domain names and later on throughout the discussions I will share what have we been doing in order to get ready to the new TLDs. We have, I guess we're wearing two hats, different sometimes, because we are a ccTLD operator, but we're also providing registry services for new TLD applicants.

Jordi Iparraguirre: Hi everyone, well thanks very much for inviting .cat here. I'm Jordi Iparraguirre, monitor of the .cat domain. As you know the .cat domain is the first and right now the only domain gTLD addressed to foster and to protect and to enhance the presence on the internet of language, or the [Catalone] language.

Dot cat is managed by a non for profit foundation, absolutely, totally self-financed and not binded and associated to any political party.

As .cat, well we are much smaller than you. We just got 50,000 domains some months ago, but we keep growing slowly and steadily and so we consider that a kind of strong groove. What is important for us is not the amount of domains, but how those domains are seen on the streets, as soon by people and are being used in terms of content and in terms of all the metrics we have.

Besides that, I'm then getting a little bit into the topic of the panel, I'm talking about cat, I mean the domain is a little bit like animals. You may think about birds and birds fly, but then you have penguins. You may think about mammals and then you have only durangos with (inaudible) X, no? So .cat is a little bit something like that.

We are a gTLD, so abiding to all the bits and pieces that ICANN put on us that apply to .com and to other domains. But in fact, by the way in which we work and so, and the place where we have the market, we feel much identified with ccTLDs, because basically the needs we have on our presence on the market. So I tell you we're cats, but in fact it's a kind of special cat, it's a cat that can fly and maybe swim, but it cannot jump. So something is strange. Thanks.

Marta Tellez:

Hi, hello, good afternoon everybody. My name is Marta Tellez, I work for Core we're now a ccTLD. Core is fully committed to the gTLD program, that's actually my task within the organization and actually last week, I participated in a panel here and that was organized by LAC TLD by [Corina]; actually all of the ones who are at the table except Adrian participated in that as well. And it was very interesting to see how the Latin American and the Caribbean ccTLDs have foreseen the advantages, the tremendous advantages that the new gTLD program will bring to their businesses. So they have adapted their business models to the new gTLD program. Although there are still some ccTLDs that are against, I actually, I made a question in that panel that I would like to make here as well, which is how many of you ccTLDs were against, were reluctant to the new

gTLD program back in 2006, if you can please raise your hands. And how many were against it or not in favor in June 2008? And how many are still against or not in favor of the new gTLD program? Only one, that's very good actually.

So it's very interesting to know and that you guys share out your experiences and how your management strategies and your new business models are being adapted to the new program. Thank you.

Byron Holland:

Last but not least, Adrian.

Adrian Kinderis:

I am probably late, good afternoon, folks. My name is Adrian Kinderis, you'll be familiar with the accent have had to put up with Chris Disspain for as long as you have, so I apologize for that. It was good that [Al] is here well to hear that, that was good.

So my company, we wear a number of hats and we run the technical operations for .au through an entity called Ausregistry, and we have 2.5 million names under management there. With respect to new gTLDs in that role, I think we've got a unique perspective because ultimately, because of the contract we have, we're at the mercy of the regulator, [ALDA]. And whatever they decide to do to tackle new gTLDs we will get dragged along. And so that's one sort of unique thought that I had, whilst the others were talking, that there were some others out there that are in that same position and that you have technical provider, maybe you'll need to think about the implications are going to be upon that, depending upon what you do in response.

With another organization, our registry services we are offering back end registry to services, as many of the others here are, and I think that the biggest – this week one of the biggest thoughts I've been having is trying to think about what ICANN looks like in a post gTLD world. And the impact on you people, especially those of you that are going for a gTLD yourself, or maybe you'll be

running a city TLD, and how you'll cross pollinate between the GNSO and ccNSO. And I'm sure Lesley has been having these thoughts as well. And I know that in the GNSO Council yesterday, the way, the structure of ICANN is certainly going to have to evolve to accommodate. And I think that's something we should probably all consider when we think of impacts on our ccTLDs, not just the material direct impacts, but also some of this periphery ripple effect that's going to go on throughout our industry.

Byron Holland:

That's a real interesting point that we should follow up on, because that's not a dialogue or a conversation that I hear a lot about in the whole venue of the gTLD discussion.

So I know it's post lunch and it's the final session of a very long two days. So to get the blood flowing and people thinking, I'm just going to toss out probably a tough question for lots of us ccs to answer, but I want to get it from the different perspective, not just ccs. And fundamentally the advent of new gTLDs is going to be a really significant threat to your business, and if so, what exactly is threatening about it, and how are you dealing with it.

So from the different perspectives, maybe I could start with Eduardo, because you occupy an interesting space as a peer cc but are doing some interesting things with it. How do you see the advent of it impacting you negatively or a threat to you.

Eduardo Santoyo:

Okay, as we see it, most of the new gTLDs have been proposed from the offering, not from the demand; they are not making an answer for a clear demand that is at this moment unsatisfied. Most of them are initiatives from people who want to get domain names registered by the same people that is now registering the domain names all around the world.

That is we see that they are going to compete directly with all of us, and of course with the other generic domain names. Because the domain names will be

really straight for someone located probably in one of our countries, if not in all of them. But we don't see them answer, here is the threat yes, we see an opportunity too, because we have opportunity to get the people know that that com is not the only choice, that there probably many other choice that could be used for the people. And in that sense, for us we are seeing in this new scenario more opportunities than threats.

Byron Holland:

Maybe go the end of the table, and Adrian if I could pick on you for a bit. You occupy an interesting space as a registry services provider, obviously very aggressively pursuing the G space, but also a cc operator or service provider.

What do you see from your vantage point that we should be worried about or thinking about?

Adrian Kinderis:

Ultimately it comes down to your particular business model within your ccTLD. So to throw a blanket over it and say you should all be running for the hills because these gTLDs are going to come and steal your market, really isn't correct. So ultimately, you know like cat, they're very focused in what they need. They service the market well. And I've got a closed vertical that I want to apply with it. So really gTLDs aren't going to impact, even though I know they're a G, but in this sense we'll treat them as a cc, it's not going to bother them too much.

So I think the first step here is to assess what are your goals as a ccTLD, and what do you want to do? If it's going to grow your business and expand, well then yes, new gTLDs are going to come knocking because there are going to be alternatives. And whether those alternatives are ensuring that the client is able to participate in name space that is more relevant to their business, whether it's some of the big brands within your space, registering their own TLD, or indeed a geographic within your region that's a city and more representative of a

smaller community or a constituency, you know that's where I think you'll feel it.

We're in the fortunate position that, to give you some further insight, Melbourne and Sydney, and the two states that they are in, Victoria and New South Wales are all applying for a geographic TLD. And we'll actually be running those, we won in a competitive hour fee. And so that's I think fortunate for .au in a sense, because what we've done in working with the government is ensure that the names are complimentary.

Of course they'll be some overlap. Of course you'll have some competition at the edges, but what we've tried to do in the developing of policy, in the way we're looking at market and how we're rolling out our product is to ensure that we're building other value in that sits alongside the current naming structure. And so we've been careful to do that.

So if you're in a situation where you can get everybody to the table and have a conversation and make sure that you can work together, and hopefully it's the case of the rising tides, raising your boats, then that would be the way to play.

Byron Holland:

And how about out here on the floor, what do you think in terms of I guess the key threats that you're thinking about, if you think of it this way, defend the space that you occupy right now. Any particular concerns that are top of mind for people, and I guess the follow onto that what are you doing to differentiate yourself in your domestic market? Any thoughts?

Roelof Meijer:

Well, one of the things that preoccupies me a bit on this whole subject is if a lot of the big brands get their own gTLD and that might have a kind of a devaluating so to speak influence on the ccTLD. There's not very much I think you can do about it, apart from stimulating them to keep their ccTLD registration as well, or domain as well. But if they start using their own brand gTLD, then I think that will have an impact on a cc because it now works the

other way around, the fact that the big brands use the national TLD has an influence, because you see it in all the commercials and the billboards, etc. So it brings the cc top of mind.

Byron Holland:

Good point, any other thoughts? Questions? How about for those of us who administer a cc, or a given district, or a given territory that's probably going to have a city TLD, but aren't operating it? Does anybody have that situation? No? I'll say it with my best Canadian accent. Are you operating in a jurisdiction where there's very likely to be a city TLD that you are quite sure you will not be operating? And if so, concerns, thoughts, do anything about it? Just letting it happen? See where the chips fall? [Laughter] See he gets it coming and going. He's in the perfect spot.

So is there a question back there?

Male:

Hi Byron.

Byron Holland:

You are on.

Male:

I was actually going to answer your previous question, but you're so fast getting into your next question, I may have to answer that one as well. So just in the UK, we have the interesting example of a number of the constituent nations of the UK are very interested in having their own TLDs. It looks as though we will certainly be in the frame for one of those, but perhaps one of the other constituent nations of the UK will end up with its own domain, and that will obviously be an interesting development for us. It's part of a broader political process, this is Scotland we're talking about. You know Scotland is seeking to position itself as really on the runway towards full independence from the

United Kingdom. So that's big politics. It's hard to really stand in the way of something like that I guess.

And you're asking about kind of competitive effects, I think maybe two insights from the thinking that we've been doing are worth sharing. One is there's clearly going to be a premium on getting shelf space, registrant shelf space for all of us now, because if we're going from an environment of 200 top level domains to 1,000 top level domains or maybe 500 top level domains, that means it's going to be harder to get registrar's attention, and that in turn may have an impact on the way that we think about structuring and selling our TLDs to make them as attractive as possible and also have as few unique features which make life harder for registrars than they would otherwise be to actually sell and serve the TLDs. That's one possible impact.

The other thing I think is worth thinking about is what we start to see is very significant economies of scope and scale developing for all firms who end up with a [catalog] of say 20, 30, 40 TLDs. And that really change the market dynamic in a way that could be quite unpredictable. I don't think any of us really know, certainly we don't know what impact that will have in terms of the underlying economies of functioning in this particular market. So that's another interesting thing to look out for when we actually open the envelope in April and see who's got what applications.

Byron Holland:

Thanks, let's pick up on one of the points you raised there which is around the dynamic between registries and registrars. And maybe we could ask the panel if there's any comments in terms of the – let's call it the shifting dynamic that may happen in a 500 channel universe, versus the one that we have right now, and what are we going to do about it, from the different point so view.

Eduardo Santoyo:

I suppose that really depends on the kind of domain you're applying for your referring. For instance I believe that based on our experience I believe that it's

completely different if you're going to apply or you're referring to an open genetic TLD, or we are referring to a for instance or a more sponsored or precise or cultural, linguistic TLD, something that for instance you may really find a focus on a very specific territory.

For instance we just started with maybe seven registrars, seven, and nowadays we have like 25. We are really not in a hurry on getting more and more registers on board. Why? Because what we realized is that the ones that really bring more value to our domain are the closest ones, the ones that are geographically in our area. The big ones around the world really don't care. So the point about the shelf space, yes you have a point there, but at the end of the day, many of our customers are just going to the closest register in geography. Why? Because again, it depends on the kind of domain, it's the kind of many, many people have never ever before registered a domain in the past, never ever. It's the first time they really – okay, there is something that's called a domain, it's somehow represents me, so what I have to do to get one.

And then the kinds of questions you get are really amazing. I mean people really have no clue about what all that is. So you have to help them to understand the process and ease that as much as possible. Something that a local registrar understanding the needs of the people and so may join you in promotions and things like that, but the big one focusing for the whole world, will never give anything for you. So again my viewpoint is that it really depends which kind of domain are we talking – TLD are we talking about.

Byron Holland:

So I think that's an important point, right I mean you're very honest about who your customer is, who you're serving and how you're going to get to them, and you're okay with that. So I think that's critical in terms of thinking about your own strategy to be honest with yourself and understand your market.

Fernando, maybe I could ask you as the operator of a large registry back to the raw shelf space question, what if anything are you guys doing?

Fernando Espana: Yes, the issue about shelf space that is a reality today. We are competing for shelf space with registrars without channel, we don't sell directly to the end users that we are relying on the registrar channel to distribute our TLD. And one of the things that we are doing and we are preparing ourselves for the arrival of these new TLDs, we've been developing a marketing campaign that we're going to be launching pretty soon in the beginning of April, and we've done a lot of market research and we're focusing our marketing activities, the specific segment instead of trying to market to the entire United States for example.

So we are going to create marketing activities. We're going to work with registrars because they are the ones that are actually going to be taking the order at the end of the day, and we're going to work with our registrar channels to implement that marketing. We will drive the traffic to them and let them make a sale. So that's one of the activities that we're working on as we prepare for the new TLDs.

Byron Holland: Definitely an evolving strategy for you guys.

Fernando Espana: Yes.

Byron Holland: Thoughts in the room? How are you guys changing or reshaping your relationship with your key registrars, and I use the term "guys" generically, please.

Annebeth Lange: Hello, Annebeth Lange .no. Of course the relations with the registrars will be even more important than it is. And as for Norway which is a small, very specialized registry, actually, not looking for a lot of registrations, but those

which we have should be a quality domain name. So I think in the future it might be that we're talking about shelves here and shelf space, but you might have the produce in the cc that is something special, that it might be a quality product that you at least would like your cc and then in addition, the other geographical things like .Oslo in Norway, I don't think it will be a competition, it will be more a complementary products with those having, they will both have a Norwegian domain name, and a domain name in the city where they belong. So you shouldn't be too afraid actually that this will be less registrations.

Lisa Fuhr:

Lisa Fuhr from .dk. We're thinking of actually going into marketing .dk, because we've never done that before. We have a lot of domain names per capita, but it hasn't been a problem before. But what we would like is to raise the awareness of being Danish and the .dk as a brand for Denmark. And that might be challenged if we are going to have a city TLD. But we don't know if that's coming, so we just want to start up and becoming more like the national brand, and furthermore, I think it's very important that we compete on being like Annebeth says, a quality TLD, being cheap and good and secure. But I know everyone says that, but we really work on our service, because we haven't been challenged before as a ccTLD, but now we are being. So we've got to raise the awareness of becoming better.

Byron Holland:

Yep [Alan], and while we're getting the mic to, may Marta I was just going to say from the vantage point that you occupy what do you see here.

Marta Tellez:

Actually I wanted to go back to Beth's point, what she said about in their case for instance that .Oslo would be an opportunity, and no threat for the ccTLD, and this is how country codes should see the new gTLD. And I go back to my initial point, I've been dealing with cities for over three years, since the program was raised in 2008, and we have been stopped by the country codes, by the

ccTLDs from the government, saying like if the ccTLDs are against it, we cannot do it. And I couldn't understand how they couldn't see the advantages of the program, and that's why I made that question on the time line, who were opposed in 2006, who were opposed in 2008, and who is still opposed. Because I think there's been an evolution on thinking on the adoption of the new gTLD program from the ccTLDs.

Byron Holland:

Yes, because I have to say just in my general discussions, I don't really hear any antipathy towards it, it's a fact of life. People aren't negative about it in any of the discussion that I've have. Young-eum?

Young-eum Lee:

Not negative about it, but kind of worried about it I would say, .kr [NIC]. As I said yesterday during my presentation, the domain name space is considered to be the right of the government in Korea, so .kr doesn't have desire to run another or an additional gTLD, but because we have started an IDN, we have lots of users. We don't have registries, we have resellers, we have what we call resellers. And we are actually trying to help the resellers become registries. And as the IDN .kr which is [Hangu] catches on, and as more IDN gTLDs are being operated, I mean there is partial hope that the IDN would catch on, but then there is also the worry that if – no, I'm not going to say that.

We are kind of worried that the IDN gTLD that may be designating a city or a part of a country, we are concerned that it be run in an appropriate way.

Byron Holland:

Thanks, Young-eum. I want to just pick up on another thread that was in the comments from Alex, and that's around sort of normalizing policies and interactions with the registrar community, be they technical or policy-based, so that you're not too different. If you're too different that can get translated as hard to deal with and if you're hard to deal with in a 500 channel universe, you maybe float down the list.

Let me just direct this one towards Adrian, I mean you see that from the service provider perspective. Any thoughts on that in terms of how unique should we be or can we be before we start to make it hard to deal with us. And I hear that all the time, as .ca we have Canadian presence requirements, and I get from our registrar community all the time. You know we're unique on that front, it's hard to deal with, they've got to write code for it and etc., etc. So I mean I personally hear that comment all the time, which now is usually followed with something blah, blah, blah, gTLDs.

Adrian Kinderis:

Yes, it's an interesting one, because I believe it ultimately comes down to value. If you have a product that has value, then it won't matter, the barriers to entry, people will want to sell it. And what I suggest to all of you is do a bit of a value review if you like of your product, and you don't necessarily need to mention anything.

Don't lose the culture of your TLD just to try to proliferate numbers, because you'll end up hurting in the long run. You bastardize the brand we call it in marketing terms. So I don't necessarily know that you need to try too hard, but you need to make some decisions about where you want to go.

The theme I'm trying to say is about understanding your strategies as a ccTLD. The better you understand that strategy, the better you understand your value proposition to your constituents. The better you'll be able to do things like marketing and target them and then ensure that when the tsunami does come that your constituents understand what your place in the market is, and yes, other TLDs will have a place in your market, in the market also, rather, but at least you will have done your part about educating those people about what your brand does.

And maybe that means that you have certain eligibility criteria. Maybe there is the local requirements and maybe there is a verification upon registration. These things are valuable. They add value to a TLD.

Dot au for example has a good reputation because of the strict requirements we have. It hasn't retarded our number of registrations, you know over 2.5 million. We're one of the more strict countries in that respect. But it's been well sold. And Chris Disspain will tell you that .au does what it says on the team, and we can continue to add value into that name space and promote it as a trusted name space. So once you've done and you get all your ducks in a row there, I think it's very easy to look at how you're going to go forward.

Byron Holland:

Any of us making changes in any way, be they technical or policy or relationship with the registrar channel in advance of the coming tsunami or tidal waves or whichever you pick.

Well I know certainly from a .ca perspective we did and some of the more technical. We had a proprietary registry, we went to EPP last year, we've tried to make it much simpler for registrars to become accredited in our world, and for registrants to get a .ca. So I know we have done a number of things in advance to try to streamline the process and I guess arguably be more consistent with the .com environment. Eduardo, you had a comment?

Eduardo Santoyo:

Yes, continuously we are reviewing the process, reviewing the relationship that we have with the registrars, because we understand that we need to allow them to have an easy deal with us. They need to win money, selling .co and that's the point, they don't have to be charged, with a lot of support customer in order to try to be the specific or particular condition of some specific domain. We understand that and we are continuously reviewing our requirements and our relationship with them about that point.

But I want to add something else regarding the past point of the discussion about the relationship between us as a registry and the registrars. At the moment we have almost 24 or 25, I'm not completely sure registrars, but one thing I have sure, how are we gaining knowledge of registrars. We are not considering them

as a generic commercial bridge. Every single registrar that we are dealing with has been specifically considered and which will be their contribution to our goal in a market. And how can we help to work with them, in order to help them to sell our product .co. And we have a very close relationship with each one of them and we never trade them as a general – as registrars, completely individuals one by one to dealing with and conversations and (inaudible) and commercial commitments, that's one of the things that we are doing.

Byron Holland: Fernando.

Fernando Espana: Yes, one of the things that we are doing is also solidifying some of those relationships with the registrars, but we're also going beyond the registrars. There is a lot of resellers who sometimes are larger than the registrar itself, so we are focusing on reaching out to the reseller and then working with those resellers to create a demand and that reseller has to work through a registrar. So we are exploring those areas as well.

Byron Holland: If the relationship in some way is going to change with the registrar, has anybody considered going direct? Zero? Has anybody even thought about it, you know as part of thinking about strategy.

Female: Just a thought, but it might be necessary for ccs that are not selling directly today to do that in the future. We talked about the relationship between the registrars and the registry and especially those registries that perhaps are quite restricted and have more troublesome ways to sell the domains for the registrars than through these channels. So that's also a challenge for the ccTLDs to think that way. That might be a problem.

Byron Holland: Marta, have you seen that in your travels? Any thoughts on that?

Male: Well, it was somehow related to what Annebeth said. Again, it is our experience, I cannot speak on behalf of a big gTLD standard one, but a sponsored one, a small sponsored one. Again, the most committed registrars are the geographically close ones, they're really the ones that understand the people, the market and the reasons, the ones that will [bet] for you and put some resources there.

That has an advantage and a disadvantage. On one side, you get them, I mean they are really convinced that you have a problem, they are on your community. They belong to the community, so they really are engaged for that.

The disadvantage is that many, many times at least in our case, we don't have the registrars, so they are small in terms of worldwide standards, so when you are asking them, okay what about starting a DNSSEC program so we can start offering that among the first ones in Europe, blah, blah, blah. Okay, yes, it's nice but I don't have resources. I don't have money. I don't have people. I don't have time.

And on the other side if you go to the foreign ones you say the worldwide vision or European wide or whatever, then we have the other way around, I mean they really have the resources, but we as a registry count almost nothing for them. So the commitment is much, much lower.

And then also know the paradox, usually the ones that do better are the local ones and not the foreign ones. That's quite amazing. We are not expecting that. And we've seen some resellers that became ICANN accredited registrars, with a gTLD they must be ICANN accredited registrars. And from [geo] they are just growing and becoming among the [fifth] ones. So that's a paradox that we were not expecting, and the other way around, a big name – a well-known names that are really doing very, very few.

Byron Holland: Yes.

Male: Hi Byron. So just an interesting example from our experience of looking at the Wales opportunity. So at the moment within .uk we have over 100 registrars who are based in Wales that we sell .uk domains into the Welsh community.

Byron Holland: How's that?

Male: All week everybody's been popping, so I'm trying to avoid that. And a number of those who are ICANN accredited, so more than 100 registrars, number of ICANN accredited registrars, one. So that presents an interesting challenge. One of the way of addressing that challenge would be for Nominet itself to become an ICANN accredited registrar for the purpose of selling .Wales and .(inaudible) domains. Of course that immediately brings with it a very interesting question about if you like the positioning of that as something which would be about enabling a resale channel for a new gTLD rather than displacing the channel and the positioning of that has to be done, I think extremely carefully, so that people are clear that what we're talking about is something that's expanding choice, rather than elbowing people out of the way and taking on a role for ourselves.

Byron Holland: Yes, that would be a very delicate discussion I would think. Interesting problem, I had no – registrars there and only one can actually sell your new product.

You know Adrian made a comment and I'll paraphrase, but basically unique is good, maybe a little stronger than the way you said it. But fundamentally a

point of differentiation is going to our value proposition. It's going to be what makes us valuable to that end user.

When we're thinking about that, or when you're thinking about that, how are you approaching the problem? I mean there's the obvious, we are the local, but then what else makes this unique and how do you tease that out and create value from that such that the registrar is going to want our domain? Anybody thinking about that and how they're doing that? I know – any comments from the panel?

While you think about that, certainly in our registry, we've been trying to work on it and we all have a unique dynamic, of course we have .com next door which colors our whole perception. So how do we differentiate ourselves, .com is the market share leader in North America, in the Canadian context too. So our focus is on security and trust, there's a national piece that we focus very heavily on, play on that, but then on security which we do by having relatively strict requirements, but then if you go to independent validators like MacAfee or those types of folks who look at all the registries in terms of malware and bad behavior and all that kind of stuff, you know we're the dark green. And that's something that we sell and that we justify at a higher bar, bar for entry, but then the benefits. So that's one way certainly that we at .ca have looked about, how do we create value that's distinct from competitors today and potentially tomorrow. Question?

I was giving people time to come up with answers and comments, but also questions, sorry, go ahead.

Matt Serlin:

It's Matt from .au. I think my comment is probably more related to the implied component that a registrant in Canada would actually want to purchase a .ZA is that it's actually covered by Canadian law. So the actual person at the end who's purchasing from myshow.ca knows that the consumer protection agreements, the laws within Canada are actually going to protect them. So I think there's a value for ccs and the fact that your local laws will protect the end consumer.

Another point also from the issue you mentioned earlier in terms of how we see the value of .au versus say .Melbourne. We don't really necessarily take it as something that can competition to us. It's probably going to be more that it's actually complementary. The issue we probably see is more whether the state government or the Council or whoever is actually going to run it is going to have the right policy. The issue for us as a country code is are we going to end up having to intervene in some way. And that's a genuine concern for us. And that has absolutely nothing to do with Ausregistry or whatever, it's more the policy that sits behind it, and whether you, the state government will allow Brussels .Melbourne or the Prime Minister Sachs .Melbourne or whatever it may be, and then it looks bad on us. And that's probably our genuine concern.

Byron Holland:

I'm going to come back to a comment you made there that I think is really important. First Roelof.

Roelof Meijer:

Yes, so in answer to your question after a long time of pondering on that of course, it's very much like you. First of all, I think we have something unique and it is the link to the territories so to speak. And secondly, we have the intention to be one of the best registries around. And it's from a technical perspective, but also from what you call security, or maybe it's more safety for the internet user. So we like who we are in the dark green. If we compare ourselves to our peers and that's something that we communicate and we push as an advantage.

It's the question though how long it will be an advantage, because the difference since especially in the dark green area are very small.

Byron Holland:

Good point, any thoughts on that from the panel right now? I just want to pick up on a point there about ccs generally speaking mean that if you have them and if you're dealing with people who have that they and you are subject to the laws

of the land. And that's certainly in the day and age of domain seizures become something that we could pick up on.

I've had a couple interesting discussions here, and actually I would encourage you to look at some of the work that Bertrand is doing on this subject. And that's about applying territorial law into cyber space and how that works. Because certainly in the Canadian context, it would be easy for me to say they got .ca, don't worry about what happens with SOPA and all that stuff down there.

On the other hand, we as a community probably have some obligation to have that whole notion of you know one internet and not a whole bunch of wall gardens. And how do you work that balance, because what you say is absolutely true, but if we all did it, what would we end up with. And I don't have an answer. Adrian.

Adrian Kinderis:

I don't know that it's directly related to what you just said, so if you want to take any comments on that, I'm happy to wait.

Byron Holland:

Any thoughts on that? Any comments on that?

Adrian Kinderis:

I wanted to pick up on something else Matt had said that triggered something. And I think that as a ccTLD operator or manager or delegate, you have a real opportunity here to position yourself as an authority, and I think what you should be thinking about is this end user confusion that is absolutely going to exist, and is a necessary part of this process.

And what role you have to play in educating folks within your jurisdiction about what these new gTLDs are, what they mean, how they're different to what yours is and so on and so forth. Because believe me if you offer customer service,

your phone will be ringing, and people will have questions. I saw a .tree today, I saw a .banana, what the hell are these things, you know?

And are you in charge of them, and they'll be ringing you up and yelling at you that I can't get one or whatever it is, so there is an implied position and role that you I believe have to play in becoming the authority on the domain name industry within your jurisdiction. And the better you can do that, actually the better you'll be servicing your ccTLD in the same way. So I think that that's probably you know something you should take away and have think about is what role do you have in ensuring that end users understand just like you're trying to understand the implications to the ccTLD and to domain names with the new jurisdiction.

Byron Holland:

That's a great point, anybody on the panel doing that kind of educating in your landscape right now.

Male:

With our limited resources yes, we try to do things like that. I mean we have phone line games that for example, we call it games, but in fact it's just the multiple choice question thing, and then you get points as you answer, and then we leave links to a Wikipedia or whatever, so people can answer, what we want them is to answer and to get the right answer. And then we give them a digital diploma and things like that.

What we do is basically for instance we have on security, safe surfing for instance. And then but that's one way, another one is with sensor, we are working on a program that they organized with a Belgium institution that is encouraging as to the schools to really do web pages about the European themes. And there they have a contest and on that, so you introduce children to using the technology, and then well to be aware, so our first step to get into that sense. So I completely agree with Adrian about that sense that I would say that any TLD

should have toward its community or its environment or whatever you want to call it.

Byron Holland:

Eduardo?

Eduardo Santoyo:

About this domain we have some [keys that] probably he's interested to share with you. One, we have a very close relation with the Colombian law authorities, with the Colombian Policy, with the Colombian Ministry. The report incident center in Colombia is also an entity what we have a very close relation to follow what is happening in the use of all the .co and how can we work together in order to prevent the misuse of the domain.

We also have rapid compliance process where we – in which we are a moratorium on a random basis the space of .co looking for malicious activity and very well identified and malicious activity as phishing, malware, [bots], child pornography and others. And one we get information about that, we share with the Colombian authorities, we also thought – well, first of we share with our registrars, because in many cases they are establishing their voices in their (inaudible) with their users, with the registrants, that kind of behavior is not allowed. Then we are given notice to that, that this is an abuse of the domain that in the case that policy that they have and of course the policy that we have with the domain in order to – they take action, taking down the domain, because it's against their policy and our policies.

But we are also following very closely the discussions with ICANN in general not, the discussion has been done more for the registrars, the individuals under contract with the registrars, the relation of the WHOIS, and the relation of the policy within the GNSO as a whole community. And because we also think that the internet is one we need to do something in order to help others if our resources been used against some local community overseas, or not in Colombia. And then trying to identify what can be done by us in order to help

to protect that community, because we can have a domain registrar in Colombia, hosted in Colombia or whatever, making a criminal activity or bad activity in some other country. I guess we need to do something in order to help that country to protect our registrants.

Byron Holland:

Shifting gears a bit, we've talked about paramount about the landscape and some of the strategies and the things that we're doing as registries. Now, we'll just shift a little more into marketing and communicating and educating people to help build our brands and serve the community as well. I'm just wondering as we go through the introduction of gTLDs, have people started to shift any marketing or communications that they're doing. Have you changed your marketing strategies at all? Do you have a marketing strategy? I guess introducing a marketing strategy from none would be a change. No? Steady state?

Jörg Schweiger:

My name is Jörg Schweiger .ee. We didn't change anything and one thing I would like to raise in the presence of new gTLDs, I think the question would be are these new gTLDs setting up generating a market of their own, so are they really offering a certain value proposition that is something completely new that is not comparable with the services that we are providing, right. And if you feel that the new gTLDs are in a way not complementary but are really targeting just the same market, you are targeting well for sure. Then you've got to do something, but this and only this will be the case, then well you might have already reacted to gTLDs because with respect to the new gTLDs or the gTLDs that are coming up now in that respect they wouldn't differ from the existing gTLDs right.

So basically for me I don't think that you do have change anything within marketing strategy as long as you feel that the upcoming gTLDs are just the same kind of business you are more or less doing yourself. If you think that they offer a new value proposition, well then it's really a question of where do

those guys going to register? Are they going to register with you or are they going to register with some new gTLDs, but even then if this would be the case, then you're not going to lose any singular domain, so probably the answer might be well certainly for me, no not yet.

Byron Holland:

Agree? Disagree? I have a louder mic now. Lesley.

Lesley Cowley:

Disagree so much. I think I guess that depends on how good your current marketing and media strategy is. So I very much like Adrian's comment earlier and you know actually there's an opportunity here, there's going to be a lot of confusion. If you already have a media profile as being a commentator or an authority in that space, great. You will be approached by the media in your country. If your media strategy currently is not to do media interviews, then I think you absolutely will need to adapt, and I think you will need to adapt in order to retain your own brand, your own cc profile. And we could view that as a threat, we could view that as opportunity, it depends how good your current strategy is.

Byron Holland:

Marta. Maybe I could ask – go ahead.

Male:

I do think you need to be careful here because and let me qualify this by saying if your strategy is for growth and to continue to expand within your market, it would be ridiculous of you to think that you're not going to be impacted by new gTLDs.

These guys have paid a lot of money to get one of these things. They're going to invest heavily in marketing to get into your consumers. So I think personally that if you don't have, and just following on from Lesley's comment, if you

don't have your marketing strategy documented and ready to roll, you should start working on it, because you're going to need one if your strategy is for growth.

Although you'll have benefits for your TLD, do you believe that intrinsic value that I was talking before, but I will also do the same, and they're coming in numbers. So they'll be hitting your markets, they'll be filling your billboards, they'll be doing everything to try to create them as the authority within your, and that's not just another geographic, that's every single TLD. They're going to be fighting very, very hard to hit end users.

So you've got an opportunity right now because you're engaging with your consumers, you're engaging with those that are on the internet in your regions to – you can get ahead of the game. These guys will not be delegated until the start of 2013 at the earliest. So the beauty of all this is that you've got a bit of visibility, and you have time to react. So get off your backsides and have a good look at what your business is doing and you'll be okay.

Byron Holland:

Okay, I think we're going to use that. I can see that as a quote being tweeted somewhat. Please.

Female:

Well, I agree with was it Adrian, your name, yeah, whatever, sorry. No but to us it's important of course to be visual but also to be not, it's not to have a growth strategy, it's more to not decline in number of domain names. And another thing is that I would be very sorry to be mistaken for another TLD that is of poorer quality or like if we a city TLD that we are not going to run, I would be sorry to be in that pot without having made .dk say well we are another TLD.

Byron Holland:

And the rebuttal.

Jörg Schweiger: Jörg Schweiger for the transcript once again.

Byron Holland: Can you speak a little closer to the mic.

Jörg Schweiger: Okay, I'll give it a try. So to be a little bit provocative once again and coming back to the strategy of growth and strongly opposing what Adrian said, for example if I do think of new gTLDs specifically of brands, am I supposed to lose any .de domain to a new gTLD that well, reflects a certain brand? Well, might be the case. True, but then as new gTLDs seem to be a little bit expensive, it wouldn't be that amount of domains I'm really facing to lose, right.

Secondly, let's take a [Geo] TLDs, all right. Obviously I might lose some domains because people start to register with .Berlin or .Cologne, or something. But still the amount of domains I might lose is not horrific. And then we got typical generic domains, and I doubt that under .de, I would get any of those registrations that are meant to address a global market, so I'm not going to lose anything here as well.

So as to this, I do not see that really my growth is at risk in any way, or that I'm facing a massive decline.

Byron Holland: I think probably one of the important threads as Adrian says, even if your decision is do nothing at least make sure it's a conscious decision that supported by some rational, logical thought. It's underpinned by something. At least be conscious of it, and that's a decent strategy. Peter did you have your hand up?

Peter Van Roste:

Thanks Byron. My name is Peter Van Roste from CENTR. I just wanted to add three things to the discussion that I haven't heard – that I didn't hear before in this room, but which I picked up from previous conversation that we had in CENTR with in particular registrars.

First of all and this addresses a comment that was made about the discrepancy between ICANN accredited registrars and registrars in general. One of the registrars commented on that; that that distinction will actually fade away because of the ever increasing importance of resale channels. So that would probably take away some of the edge of that argument, that because there's only one in a hundred accredited registrars, that domain would not be sold through those, so that the new gTLD would not be sold through those channels.

And then two practical comments that we got from registrars advice for ccTLDs. One is a thing not to do, that is do not make any changes through your processes or EPP the moment the window opens, because you will be placed at the lowest priority, all resources will be pretty busy with implementing new gTLDs so avoid that at all cost.

And then the second one was think about prepayments. With the new gTLDs coming up, registrars that are willing to sell them will have fork out loads of money just to be able to put them on the list. Everybody who would preferably work for instance with credit cards or any other tool that makes their life easier would definitely climb in that priority list pretty significantly.

Byron Holland:

A couple of good comments to pick up in there, one is around a code freeze when this starts to happen which I think is probably a pretty good point. Any thoughts from the panel on a couple of these issues? Are people consciously saying I'm going to have a code freeze during this period? And are folks also thinking about new gTLDs are probably going to be pretty amenable to different payment schemas and this has typically the cash on the barrel head business, with not a lot of credit often. Are we really going to have to adapt our payment methods if gTLDs are offering all kinds of payment options. Adrian.

Adrian Kinderis: Yes in terms of code freeze following the advice that some registers have given they've already starting focusing on new gTLDs today. So they're already revamping their systems, especially the larger registrars, they have massive systems that they have to revamp, so they're already doing that today. So if you come up with a change to your policies or your technical implementation, yes that is very true, they're going to put you at the very bottom, and they're not going to worry about it until after the launch of the new TLDs.

Byron Holland: Yes, I think that's pretty sensible that during that plus minus six months or period, we're not going to be want to be subjecting registrars to have to do too much on our behalf, absolutely. Ed.

Ed: Yes, I'll give that horse a good flogging, at least a dead one. Once again folks with respect to the registrars and whether they're going to have money in their account, are you going to have to change things, because they're going to spend elsewhere and that whole product space on the shop shelves, I think that once again you know I can't stress enough about how much value you build into your product. And if you have value they will come. There will always be someone out there that is trying to sell a product that is under served, and it's up to you to help identify who those people are. Everybody is thinking I'm a registrar and I'm a member of the registrar stakeholder groups, I'll be careful what I say here but I think the registrars are doing a fair bit of chest beating. But we've got all the power. If you don't have us, you're not going to get anywhere in the new gTLD and even to those in this room, who they represent. I don't necessarily think that's going to be the play.

For every Wal-Mart there is a boutique store just around the corner that does just as successfully, you know and success defined on their own terms. So I wouldn't be brow beated about registrars, I really wouldn't. I think what you

need to concentrate on is focus on your product. Focus on marketing your product and making your product attractive to consumers, because as soon as there is a need and a demand built up, there will be people that step forward that want to sell that. That's just my opinion.

Byron Holland:

Roelof.

Roelof Meijer:

Just on changing or not changing your market strategy, I don't think we should forget that there are already existing gTLDs. And we consider them to be competitors in the Dutch domain name market. So we have a marketing strategy that is already adapted to its effect. There are others that offer identical services or similar services or service to a specific group that is also a potential or an existing .(inaudible) domain name. On the other hand, I think we shouldn't be too confident, and maybe I should, you probably won't agree or probably most of you won't agree, but I think it might be helpful to make a parallel with the incumbent telcos, and at the moment that the telecommunication market was liberated. They also thought that they were the experts, they had the markets, they had the experience and my God are we happy that we have alternatives now? They're still very important and very often they're still the largest player in the market, but they're definitely not the best.

Byron Holland:

Yes, that's a great point. Certainly, I think this conversation has been had before that you know this is not unlike a deregulation of what had been a pretty highly structured closely held industry, and what does that look like, Telcos, Airlines, you know it probably hasn't gone that well for most of the incumbents in those spaces. Is there a parallel to draw here? Online question?

Female: Yes, a question from the Adobe room, it's [Manuel Jesus]. He is asking what will happen with the distinction between ccTLDs and gTLDs when the new TLDs like .county and .city begin to start up?

Byron Holland: Does anybody from the panel?

Male: Well, that's something I wanted to answer right now because we're running out of time.

Byron Holland: You're right in that space perfect.

Male: And I want to rescue that cat that knows how to fly and how to swim but maybe does not jump properly. As you said there are certain and there would be much more, many more domains or TLDs that are going to be caught in that trap. I mean we're going to be using suit for gTLDs like the big ones com, net and such. But because of our way of working, because of our size, because of our local rules, not all of them are going to be based in the US, for instance regarding privacy, regarding seizing or whatever else, phishing or whatever, so we have to start thinking about how ICANN itself at least on the gTLD space if not the ccTLD space is able to restructure and find spaces and rules and bylaws that really fill the needs of those new TLDs.

And I'm sure that for the gTLDs this is a must. I'm not so sure about the ccTLDs and the gTLDs. I would say that something has to be done too, but they haven't thought of that, so maybe you have more, are more able than myself on that point. But yes we need to really start thinking about breaking the blocks and playing with smaller pieces.

Byron Holland: Anybody else on the panel want to weigh in on that one? Marta?

Marta Tellez: And I think when in the case of the geographics especially when we're dealing about the city, capital city or important city, I think the governments should play a role of education to the population, not only to the registrars as Adrian was saying before but also to the final user, to the consumer because it's the government who will have to deal and will have to explain what is the difference between the ccTLD and city TLD if there is any difference, or they don't get into their competition. I think that will make things flow better and easier.

Byron Holland: I think that would be helpful if governments did that, and I don't know I can count on mine to get that done, but it certainly would be. I think as we talked about before it does give us a space to occupy, to be the authority and to deliver that message if we can as cc's.

I just want to pick up on a point there about smaller and smaller spaces that I think is interesting in the context of this discussion. Are there folks here who are doing any market research or looking at very specific segments that are maybe underserved that we can speak to in a meaningful way, sell domains into? I mean there is a broad general national populations and beyond, but are there any particular segments that we feel as ccs we can communicate with better than we have?

Fernando Espana: Actually, what we've done is we've done a lot of primary, secondary market research, and we've actually built our marketing strategy on the segmented markets. Instead of focusing as I said before on the entire United States, we're going to focus in different regions of the country and we're going to spend our money in those regions with the marketing message that is going to drive the – well the goal is to reach that particular type of segment user.

So hopefully at a future presentation, at a future meeting, since we're going to be launching the program next month I can share what results and a little bit more details on the campaign; but yes we have, that's one of the things that we're doing. We're focusing on segment market.

Byron Holland: That's really interesting. I'll look forward to that one. Can you give us a little insight, like what kind of segment?

Fernando Espana: Yes, focusing a little bit on the Midwest of the US.

Byron Holland: So a geographic focus in terms of segmentation.

Fernando Espana: You'll hear more later.

Byron Holland: I'm looking forward to that. I'm looking forward to that. Okay, I've been given the official four-minute warning. So anybody who wants to make some comments or ask more questions of the panel, we've got about four minutes. Adrian, you had a comment.

Adrian Kinderis: Yes, I just would like to take the chance to potentially provide some closing remarks. And what I sort of got out of today, and hopefully if I made any sense at all and I do apologize, I'm a touch tired.

Number one get together your marketing strategy and I really like what you said earlier, if you don't want to, that's okay too. But make a conscious decision to do so. Don't just let time pass you by.

And so see yourself as a marketer, see yourself as an educator and an authority. And then the second one is not only – we shouldn't just be looking at whether you ccTLD is relevant in the face of gTLDs, but one thing you might want to do when you get a better chance also, is to helicopter out a little bit, and try to think about what you're doing to make sure that domain names in general are relevant, because not only should you be thinking about the impact of gTLDs, but what about apps, what about QR codes, what about Facebook, the whole garden of complete internet experience that requires one domain name within it – forward slash, you know?

So there are a number of challenges that we as an industry collected that we're facing and gTLDs is an internal one. And so I think it may pay whilst you sort of doing your risk assessment of your business with respect to gTLDs maybe put some thought to what as an industry you're facing as well and what you do as a collective to help combat that and make sure that domain names going forward are still relevant.

Byron Holland:

Great comment. Since we only have a couple minutes left, would any of the panelists like to make some closing comments before I pass it over to our Chair.

Male:

Yes, just to talk a little bit to what Adrian said, make sure you do have your plan. You should have a plan already for 2012, so get your plan together for the next two or three years and factor in all these new TLDs that are going to be coming on board. That should be probably the number one priority that everybody has.

Byron Holland:

Any other closing comments? No, we're good.

Eduardo Santoyo: Just one for the community-based ones. Understand really your community, who are you working for, which is the value proposition that has been mentioned before. I mean is that real, what are you going to provide. Do they really need it? You should understand the people you are working for and understand your market and focus on it beside what has been said.

Byron Holland: Thank you. Any final comments? Well, I'm going to pass it back to the Chair then who is going to have a few closing comments of his own.

Victor Abboud: Okay. Well I think this has been a real interesting panel, and within all of the uncertainty, the risk, I think it's provided us with a number of elements to keep in mind. For me the most important one is that do not walk into this with your eyes closed, not on auto pilot, you have to know what you're doing, even if you just keep doing what you've been doing all the time or if you change, do it because of a conscious decision, and of course if we give this time, perhaps we will be able to meet again and see how right or wrong we were about how this was going to evolve. I want to thank all our panelists and especially Byron for his great job as moderator. Thank you all.

[Applause]

Lesley Cowley: Thank you very much everybody and particularly to Byron and Patricio as well and the great panelists. We will meet again to discuss it I'm sure. We're just going to break for ten minutes now, and we will be back for the ccNSO Council meeting in ten minutes. Thank you.

[End of Transcript]