Chris Disspain: Is what's called a Chair's draft. That does not mean that I sat down and drafted it. It just means that I sent it out. And eventually of course, when we finally get to the end of this, there'll be a final paper with recommendations for policy.

So, the document that's out there right now, the Interim Paper, isn't agreed, isn't finalized, it's just a sort of first second draft of ideas and thoughts and that's kind of what we're going to talk about today. Because there are a couple of things in that that are really, really important.

So we've made some basic assumptions. And if anyone has a problem with anything that I say, doesn't understand it or doesn't agree with it, please say so.

So we've made some basic assumptions in the Policy Development Process Working Group.

We've assumed that – what's Bart done here? Okay.

The structure of the IDNC WG proposals is followed. In fact, I think we can ignore that slide and move on.

Here we are, basic assumptions.

IDN ccTLDs are ccTLDs and should be treated in the same manner unless the nature of being an IDN does not allow for it. So the reason for that is – hi Bart – the reason for that is very simple. I can think one thing that makes them different which is that you have to agree to abide by the IDNA protocols which you obviously don't have to do for an ASCII ccTLD. But other than specific IDN stuff, the basic assumption is that they are the same. Okay?

So the delegation, re-delegation and retirement policies for ASCII ccTLDs apply to IDN ccTLDs. So we're not interested in having a different set of rules for an IDN ccTLD than for an ASCII ccTLD.

The proposals are limited to selection mechanisms for IDN ccTLDs and this is really, really, really crucial. At the moment, the proposals are limited to non-Latin scripts. Now, you will remember in the Fast Track that we said this is for non-Latin scripts only. We are discussing in the Working Group whether extended ASCII should be passed as an IDN.

This is my personal view. My personal view is no. Extended ASCII is ASCII. So, if you want to have a ccTLD in extended ASCII, you need to amend the rules, because right now you get one ASCII ccTLD. So if you think about what an IDN ccTLD is – so I'm not saying you can't do that but in this process it's non-Latin. We'll get back to it in a second.

So there are some overarching principles – association of the IDN ccTLD with a territory so it all shoots back to the ISO list – if you're not on the ISO list, you can't have one.

They're all ccTLDs so there's no difference in the sense of them being ccTLDs.

And obviously there's an overarching principles to preserve the security, stability and interoperability of the DNS.

Now, the purpose of the introduction of IDN ccTLDs is to provide accessibility for those for whom ASCII is inaccessible. That was always the original understanding. That there were large groups of people in the world for whom ASCII was inaccessible because it wasn't written in a script that they could understand. And that was the purpose.

So there's a difference between me not being able to speak German but still being able to read the letters. Whereas, not only do I not speak Arabic, I can't read the script.

So that was the original purpose. And that's why – if you shoot back to that – we need to have this discussion about whether you extend it beyond Latin scripts.

Rolof?

Rolof: Chris, I think now you have an overarching principle that says it's non-Latin and you have another one that says it's non-ASCII. So you're confusing me a bit.

Chris Disspain: Yes, you're right. When you're in this, we tend to use them interchangeably. What I mean is, IDN ccTLDs go back to ASCII because what happens is – behind the Arabic is XN "dash dash" and that's ASCII. So we really shouldn't use ASCII because it gets confusing. It's the Latin script. But the problem with that is that when you come to talk about extended ASCII which you need to talk about in order to have this debate, you have to go back to ASCII. But I'll try and do my best.

And I do understand.

So let me see if I can chunk this down.

If France – so France uses extended ASCII characters right? Or what I call ASCII with accents. And in fact the Netherlands has one I think, right? Several?

Okay, so let's use the Netherlands as an example. So you've got Table 3 or 4 extended ASCII characters. Okay. So if we say that extended ASCII means it's an IDN, so therefore you can have an IDN ccTLD, then do we then say but only if you use at least one of the extended characters in the name that you want? Because if you don't use one of the extended characters, then it's effectively ASCII.

So our current thinking is that effectively in order to allow you to do that, we'd actually need to amend the ASCII rules, the existing ccTLD rules rather than creating a new of rules for IDNs. And that's not what this is about and the charter for the policy development process is not about doing that.

So the danger here, if we were to say IDNs include Latin scripts, is that it would simply be a back doorway of you getting .Netherlands. And if you remember from our discussion in the GAC yesterday we're still saying that it shouldn't be possible and so on.

So we need to a lot more work on this but I think where we are right now is that non-Latin scripts only for IDN ccTLDs.

This is all the normal stuff.

The string should be non-contentious within the territory.

It's the criteria that determine the number of IDN ccTLDs. So we're not saying you know, you can have six or twelve – the criteria decides how many.

And it's an ongoing process.

My guess is that by the time we get to Brussels – and I don't know if you'll agree with this Bart – but my guess is by the time we get to Brussels we'll be able to have a full discussion. Because the interim paper will hopefully have got to a point where there is consensus in the Working Group on the overarching principles and so on. And then the next stage from there will be to move onto the final document.

Are we headed in about that direction do you think, for Brussels? Does that sound right?

Okay, are there any, does anyone to ask any questions or talk about this?

We're in grave danger of running early here if we're not careful.

Okay, so everyone sort of understands – I'm not asking agreement because we're way too early for that – but everyone's comfortable with what I've said? Excellent! All right.

Unknown male: (Off microphone, inaudible)

Chris Disspain: Thanks. You will notice that I did not mention this Latin stuff in the meeting with the GAC yesterday because I suspect that they would, it might have been a much, much longer discussion and in depth and they're involved in this Working Group anyway. But if you – those of you who were there – if you go back to the discussion we had about their interim principles – their interim principles basically suggest that the GAC's view would be that any country can have any IDN ccTLD in any script if it wants it. And we are going to need to have this debate at some point about whether we want to maintain the uniqueness of the ccTLD being the representation of the country – so that uniqueness may cross languages and scripts – or whether we actually want to blow the whole out and just say well, if it's run by a ccTLD manager and endorsed by the government, it's a ccTLD and if there's seven million of them, there's seven million of them.

But Bart's got the number, is it seven thousand living languages? So there are seven thousand living languages. If every ccTLD had – or every territory had a ccTLD in each one of those seven thousand living languages, there would be 1.5 million ccTLDs. And I think there might be some root zone scaling issues with that. And also we'd have a lot more members which would be fantastic.

So we do have to have this debate because, you know, and again now speaking entirely personally, I think that the – I'm in favor of fewer rather than more. The purpose of the IDN ccTLDs was to solve a very, very specific and incredibly important problem which was that the people in China could not access properly the Internet because they didn't have ASCII keyboards or they didn't understand .CN or whatever. And that was always the reason for doing this. And somehow I think along the way certain governments and certain individuals have gotten to a point where they think okay so now this means that I can have .Netherlands or what have you. Anyway, we'll see.

Okay, Gabby are we able to move onto the next session? So who do we have? We're going to get a report on the Fast Track.

So experiences learned from the Fast Track so we have Marina? Marina could you come up? Young-Eum are you here? We don't have Young-Eum, okay. And we don't have Manal yet either. But we're five minutes early so.

Marina, would you mind starting yours and then we'll get the others to… Yes? Okay, come sit down.

Marina Nikerova: Hello dear colleagues. My name is Marina Nikerova, I am from .RU and I will say a few words about .RU and .RF to update the information.

Okay once again, excuse me.

My name is Marina Nikerova. I am from .RU and I will say a few words about .RU and .RF to update the information.

Last year the .RU national domain has shown great results. The number of the registered domain names was over 37% compared with 2008. And the made up two and a half millions.

Of course the economical crisis has had an effect on our performance and our growth was slower than in previous periods as you can see on the picture. But nevertheless, I can say that .RU domain out trends any other TLDs in the world by the domain registration goals.

And the reason of this results was expansion of Internet penetration in Russia, especially expansion to Russian regions.

In the capital cities, such as Moscow and St. Petersburg, Internet penetration rate is over 70%. But in regions, only 17, it's difference. And so the many of Russian telecom companies are focused on the regions. And expand their efforts.

So we notice that the users are up here. It's young people, it's seniors and households. In fact, all (inaudible 00:17:46) are not fluent in English and so we expect they may (inaudible 00:17:50), a critical audience for our future Cyrillic .RF.

About .RF. We divide the launch of the .RF on the stages. It was to make sure all of the categories of the users (inaudible 00:18:17) such as Internet societies, government agencies, trademark owners, political parties and so on, to make them sure that their rights are completely protected.

And we start to find now how many domain names will be registered in each phase of the project. At the moment, we have about 9,000 registered domain names in the .RF and we expect they might make 10,000 until late March then 15,000 until late May, 20,000 during the summer and another 2,000 at the end of August. And also we plan to start the open registration of .RF at the first of September.

That's all I'd like to say at the moment, thank you for your attention.

(applause)

Chris Disspain: (off microphone) Do you have any questions at this stage? Okay, let me know then. Thank you very much.

Marina Nikerova: Thank you.

Chris Disspain: (off microphone) So now we're slightly challenged because we have (inaudible 00:20:04 – 00:21:10).

You can take a moment to compose yourself.

Manal Ismail: Okay.

Chris Disspain: Okay. So we're going to have the second Fast Track presentation because Manal has sprinted to the room. And your slides are up on this computer and I will move them when you tell me to.

Manal Ismail: Thank you.

Chris Disspain: Okay?

Manal Ismail: Thank you.

Chris Disspain: We'll just wait for them to come into the remote participation room. Yep. Almost. Yep, okay.

Manal Ismail: Okay, thank you.

Chris Disspain: Speak very closely.

Manal Ismail: Okay. I really apologize for being late, I'm sorry. And thank you for the opportunity to share with you Egypt's experience on our IDN ccTLD delegation.

First, as you may all know, it's two phases, it's the string evaluation and the IANA delegation phase.

We've been through the string evaluation phase which currently passed various mostly. And this makes me stress the importance of the cross constituency - early coordination and cooperation between the different Advisory Committees and the different Supporting Organizations – which really led to a very clear steps, smooth implementation, reported progress and predictable output.

We are now through the IANA delegation phase. It's not yet over. So there is not much to tell but I think we should have had IANA on board with us during the Fast Track process itself. Just for the sake to have things clear and avoid any surprises on both ends from the IANA side or from the applicant side.

Things as simple as filling the template was a bit confusing for us. The domain name was not really clear whether this should be the XN "dash dash" thing, the Arabic string itself or the English translation. So I think the interface should have been part of the process.

As for the national preparations within the country, we are now working on the policies, the marketing, the awareness.

So regarding the policies, I really think we should think out of the box when we talk about the policies. It's a very different language, a very different culture, a very different market and probably very, very different problems.

It won't help if we just inherit or copy whatever is being implemented even in our own ASCII top level domain.

The Arabic, for example, is right to left, it's written right to left and it's understood right to left, so for example, if we say Cisco company, in Arabic it's company Cisco. So if we have a second level domain company or CO, I mean, it might not be as easy as it is in English. And over and above, we don't support abbreviations, we don't, it's not common. So again, the domain name tree should look different and we have to think and not just inherit what's already there.

We have, it's very important to try to maintain and build on the end-user experience, the current user and the browsers have to be consistent, their behavior, the way they use the domain names should be consistent. So we have to think really how the user would think in order to make sure that we're satisfying the end user's need.

We have also to make sure everybody is aware about the domain name. Until very recently, some of the people we met thought that we are going to have the domain .MASR, so we had to explain this is going to be in Arabic, fully qualified in Arabic and the domain name is going to be Arabic all the labels. So we have to make sure this awareness reaches the end user and how this would be a value-added to the end use. The registrant itself and what's allowed to be registered, what's not, what are the technical limitations and what's supported and what's not.

For example, the (inaudible 00:27:39) will not be supported so this has to be conveyed to the registrant with its implications, positive or negative.

Also the registrars and the consistency in applying the rules on all the registrations.

So all this is awareness and know how that we are currently going through.

The marketing and the branding is also something that we are working on right now.

We're trying to make sure that we come up with the right messages, addressed to the right target groups, at the right time.

For example, if we're going to go through phases, then we have to come up with the right campaign at the right time, be it trademark owners or opening up for individuals, we have to know who exactly we are addressing. And we have to bear in mind that a good portion of our market might not be even online users right now. Because we're trying to outreach to the community that was suffering from language barrier and that might not be online right now.

Finally, as we always say, the IDNs is not the goal by itself and we have to continue and go beyond this. We have to make sure we have enough content in our local language and that we have the right tools, applications and online services. Because it has to be a value-added. We cannot say to the users using Arabic that you can browse but not search for example. So we have to make sure that all the things that would help the user in using the Arabic language is there.

Next please.

The straightforward benefits of the Arabic domain names would be identity and culture protection of course. Easier guessing, learning and recalling of domain names and definitely accuracy in trademark protections because it's now going to be a one to one thing, it's not going to be liable to more than one spelling which has been the case before and which we have been suffering from.

This also implies some opportunities, so if we go to the next slide.

We expect growth in the number of users and hopefully breaking through new user segments. We are currently talking about around 17 million Internet users in Egypt while we have 55 million subscribers in mobile. And I think this discrepancy is mainly because the mobile has an Arabic interface and supports Arabic and was able to break through very, very, very different segments of the country and of the market.

So we hope that we have the same breakthrough with the Arabic language being supported on the Internet. And again, the population itself is 80 million so the potential is there.

And definitely breaking through the new user segments and growth in numbers would, from a governmental perspective, improve the figures, statistics and breakthrough and at the same time is an extension to the market for the private sector itself.

We also see an opportunity in increasing online communication services and activities and specifically the e-government services which was a little bit hard to promote with the URLs being in a foreign language.

We also hope that this would increase the local online content and be a good opportunity for the local content industry to grow. And definitely we hope that we see more ISPs of our regions have the knowhow and compete within the registrar/registry businesses. We currently have only two from our region.

So I think with this, this ends my presentation. I really hope it shed some light on where we stand today and may of help to the process itself and to others who may be going through the process.

Thank you.

Chris Disspain: Manal, thank you. I have a question for Manal but does anybody else?

Can we, can I, we need some more volume on this, this is just way too low?

Hello, is that any better. Okay.

So if anyone has a question? Have a think about it while I ask mine.

Manal, we've kind of talked about this before, so it would be right to say that the Fast Track process – the actual getting the string evaluation etcetera – you think that that was fine? I mean, it seemed to go quite smoothly and you didn't, you understood everything and it was – but then when it got to the next bit which is the IANA process, things were unclear. That's basically what you're saying, isn't it? Yeah?

Manal Ismail: Yes, yes. We had a very positive experience with the string evaluation phase. It went so smooth and we had, we've been reported on each and every step that we're passing and more or less it was within the timeframe that's expected. And then with the very first email that we received that we've passed the string evaluation and now it's the IANA delegation and we had the URL, I checked the URL and I was not sure what exactly is…

Chris Disspain: Yeah.

Manal Ismail: And even as simple as filling the template, I mean.

Chris Disspain: Yes, because the IANA template hasn't changed. So to allow for the fact that when for example it says what string are you applying to delegate. Of course, up until now, it's only ever been the ASCII string, so you were unclear weren't you about whether you were supposed to put in the Arabic string or the XN "dash dash" string? Okay. And even whether the form itself would accept Arabic characters. I mean, we don't know that. Okay, all right.

Gabby? Tina Dam has a question. Okay.

Hi Tina.

Tina Dam: Hi. So it really wasn't a question. I just wanted to mention in relation to Manal's and your conversation on the fact that the string delegation didn't go, or isn't going as smoothly as the string evaluation was going. And it's one of the things that we had listed in the staff experience of the process is that we needed to make that transition more clear. So I just wanted to mention that from the staff's side, we've heard that from others as well and it's something that we're trying to see what we can do better for future participants in the Fast Track process and it was one of the things that I had also mentioned for the ccNSO PDP on IDNs moving forward that you know, we kind of need to make that transition a little bit better than it is currently.

Chris Disspain: Thank you Tina. I think it's also a price you pay for being one of the first.

Tina Dam: Yes, that's, you know, it was nice to be first but it also means that you might run into whatever problems exist and I'm just to clear that at least the string evaluation was going well.

Chris Disspain: Thanks Tina. Manal?

Manal Ismail: Yes, Tina, I'm very happy you're with us remotely and I grasp this opportunity to really thank you for all the efforts that you've put to the IDN process and it's with your efforts that everything went smooth and really thank you for this phase.

Tina Dam: Well, it's been my pleasure and of course it's also my job, but I also hope I get to see you sometime soon, along with everyone else. You know, hopefully if not before, then at least at the Brussels meeting. You know, I wish I was in Nairobi but not able to travel yet but soon hopefully so that's great.

Chris Disspain: Thanks Tina. Any questions for Manal?

	Hiro. Gabby, could we grab a microphone for Hiro please?
Hiro Hotta:	All right. Thank you Manal. I have a question. Are you going to set some restrictions on .Arabic, are you going to introduce the IDN ccTLD completely independently from .EG space? Meaning that the registrants are the same, something .EG and something .your country name are the same ones or very independent?
Manal Ismail:	It's not going to be the same registry, if this is your question, but definitely we are in full coordination and we're working with them on giving some privilege to people who are already registered under the current ASCII to have their Arabic thing of their domain names.
Hiro Hotta:	Okay, thank you.
Chris Disspain:	So did I understand you that it will be a different registry? So you will have two ccTLD managers? Okay.
	All right, well if there are no other questions would you please join me in thanking Manal?
	(applause)
Manal Ismail:	I apologize again for being late and for having to go even before we finish this session, sorry for that. Thank you.
Chris Disspain:	Thanks Manal.
Manal Ismail:	Thank you.
Chris Disspain:	And our final presentation on the Fast Track experience is from Young-Eum and over to you.
Young-Eum Lee:	(off microphone, inaudible).

Young-eum Lee: I mean, this percentage could still, I mean, the rate of requests of from IE6 and lower users and other users, it may still hold. And this is what we are very worried about and this is what we're trying to deal with.

And so as you can see, I mean, we have very serious issues that we have been dealing with and that is why we have not been able to apply for an IDN TLD so far.

Well, future plans. We have been cooperating; there has been extensive cooperation among the local Internet community in terms of KISA, the ISPs, the registrars, the users, the registrants, experts, IP and the Korean Communications Commission, the KCC. And they're very heavily involved in the KINNF and they have been involved in the IDN Advisory Committee and we are still cooperating and there is going to be continued cooperation.

And so we hope to apply, get most of these issues resolved and we hope to apply for a Fast Track during the second quarter of this year.

During this year we are trying to finalize the registration policy within KINNF with regard to the reserved and blocked names, sunrise policy, registration fees, and dispute resolution.

Now once we have this resolved, we also have to go through an additional legal process, because Korea has an Internet Names legislature that says that we need to acquire government approval for Internet domain names. And so it has to go through the Internet Names Policy Evaluation Committee – actually I'm a member of that – I'm actually have been involved in the IDN Advisory Group as well as in the KINNF, and I'm also involved in the Evaluation Committee.

And then the KCC has to finally approve it. And we hope to begin registration in 2011, which is next year.

Thank you.

Chris Disspain: Thanks Young-eum. Any questions? No questions. All right, Young-eum, thank you very much. We're to move on to our next topic now which is the ccNSO review.

Now we've got two things happening. We're going to have a presentation from the gentleman from ITEMS if you'd like to join me, Tom that would be great. And I believe that Jean-Jacques and Marco should be joining us shortly to brief us on the process of the ccNSO review.

But as a starting point…welcome.

Herve Rannou: Hello, good morning. My name is Herve Rannou, I represent ITEMS International which is a consulting company based in Paris. And we carry out different studies in France and different parts of the world. We carry out some…

Unknown male: (off microphone, inaudible 00:12:22)…have you sent the presentation to them?

Herve Rannou: Yes.

Unknown male: Oh, I'm sorry, it's not on the remote. I'm sorry. The remote participation.

Herve Rannou: Okay.

Unknown male: So we want to do that as much as possible in sync.

Herve Rannou: Is that a problem because it's just introduction before?

Unknown male: No you can carry on.

Herve Rannou: Okay. And we carry out the different studies in the information technology sector and that's the reason why we have been chosen by ICANN to run the ccNSO survey.

Okay. Now I need the slides.

Chris Disspain: Are the slides uploaded Gabby?

Herve Rannou: Okay. Just a part of the process, we have started the survey last November and now we are quite in the middle of the survey. And we are supposed to deliver first report around one or two weeks. And this meeting is important for us because after the survey online, it's occasion to meet the maximum of people and to discuss about their feelings about what they feel ccNSO strategy, By-Laws, operations and something like that.

So I will now use the aims of the review. It's first to establish how effectively the ccNSO functions within the broader ICANN system. And to determine whether any change in its structure or operations is desirable to improve its effectiveness.

So we have I think we are focused our energy to get the maximum response rate because it's important for us to have a legitimate assessment and at the moment we have received 85 responses. And we would be delighted if some of you could respond because it's online and the survey it's open and we will continue to (inaudible 00:15:25).

So we have received 59 responses from ccTLD managers and the other come Manager/Director, ccNSO Council Member and so on, and then we have had direct contact with some key people, specifically in the regional organizations.

So we are going present now with the result of the survey but it's just important to say that the survey, it's a part of the assessment. What is important to us is that first we assess and we use the survey really to understand what people think of ccNSO and to understand what the results of what the ccNSO is doing.

Tom Mackenzie: Yeah, I think it's important really just to emphasize that last point. That this, what we're presenting today is really just interim findings. This is just what we have conducted between mid January and mid February is a survey of ccTLD managers and this is just one prong of a multi-pronged approach to making an assessment of how well the ccNSO is seen to be functioning within the broader ICANN system. So please do bear that in mind.

What I'm about to present are not conclusions, they are the findings of the survey.

And obviously the other prongs include the meetings that we are going to be having and we have been having this week, with the representatives of the GAC and the other Supporting and Advisory Committees within the ICANN system. And so it's with the complete picture that we'll be formulating our recommendations in June.

So this slide here just shows you the kind of response that we've had. And in fact, the figures have slightly changed, they've gone up. We now have about 51 I think or 52 responses from actual members which is, as far as we're concerned, quite a good response rate, that's 52% exactly of the membership of the ccNSO. So we think that's a highly significant response rate from them. And we also have a very, well what we consider is a fairly significant response from non-members as well. You can see we had 20 responses there which is corresponding to 29%.

And there you have a list of who has responded. So here – if you can see your name, thank you very much for taking the time to take part. If you don't see your name there or the name of your country, what are you waiting for? We

would like to hear from you and if you can respond before the end of this conference, so much the better.

Chris Disspain: Tom? Sorry. I don't see our name and I have responded.

Tom Mackenzie: I know and I was going to talk to you about this because…

Chris Disspain: So I can quite happily do it again although I can't guarantee that my answers will be the same. Because I can't actually remember what I said but I have to say that is slightly concerning if I have responded and others – I mean, I'm not saying, I mean…

(inaudible, audio skipping 00:19:27 – 00:19:51).

Tom Mackenzie: In fact, follow up emails with other organizations as well, CENTRE and LAC TLD and AFTLD to…

Unknown female: But if you want to get to it now, where do you go?

Tom Mackenzie: Oh, I'll show you. Actually I've got a link to it. It's still online.

But I think obviously this is of concern. I mean, we set it up so that it was a very simple process for – well what we hoped was a very simple process – for inputting information and submitting at the end. So obviously you needed to click the submit button but…

Chris Disspain: Yes, I've done that before.

Tom Mackenzie: And then you do at the end get a confirmation saying that you have submitted the information.

Chris Disspain: Yeah. Let's not…

Tom Mackenzie: Okay. So well, the only kind of key to this particular list of countries is that you can see there the ccNSO members, you can see the non-members in red and you can see those that identified themselves – it might not be an actually accurate list – but it's those who identified themselves as members of the ccNSO and also Council members.

Unknown male: Yes, in the list of ccTLDs appear Columbia like non-member and Columbia is member of ccNSO. Maybe you want to take the survey but you need to put in the list of members.

Tom Mackenzie: Okay. This is, you know, these kinds of points are very important and what we are presenting here is actually what people have reported to us. This table is, you know, an actual representation of what we have received. And

obviously it could be corrected and actually in all information collecting exercises there are errors but sometimes, well, we have to admit that we make errors ourselves, but in some cases, people do not fill in relevant boxes, they do not click relevant boxes – for example, stating that they are a member of the ccNSO – which kind of, so we have to go and kind of double check afterwards.

Unknown female: Can I just say, Columbia joined quite recently so they probably filled this is in before they joined.

Tom Mackenzie: Oh, okay, well there you go.

Chris Disspain: So Tom, just so that we don't spend the rest of this time with people questioning stuff, my understanding is that all of this stuff will be checked so we don't have to worry about it. It'll all be sorted out so that's fine.

Tom Mackenzie: Okay. Well so now simply what I'm going to do is that what we are and we will be conducting this review according to a set of questions, 13 questions that were – well actually specified for us by ICANN at the beginning of the process. These questions are framed at the top of the slide and I'll just run through them quickly.

So the first question was, has the ccNSO been effective in achieving its three objectives as defined in Article IX of ICANN's Bylaws?

And you can see here there is just a really clear expression of satisfaction with this in relation to the development and recommendation to the ICANN Board of global policies relating to the country-code top-level domains.

So there you have a total of what, 68% of people saying that they are either reasonably or very satisfied.

Chris Disspain: Sorry Tom, there's a question not a correction. Because of course it's actually 100% of people who are totally satisfied. Will we be able to know at some point the break up of members and non-members who think that.

Tom Mackenzie: Yes, yes, yes.

Chris Disspain: Right. Okay.

Tom Mackenzie: As I say, I mean, you know, our report is going to break down what members are saying, what non-members are saying, what members of the GAC are saying. But it would take us all day to present findings of that sort of, that detailed at this stage.

So the second part of that first question was, so it's nurturing consensus across the ccNSO's community including name-related activities of the ccTLDs. There again you have a very high satisfaction rate, what 64%?

And finally, the development and recommendation to the ICANN Board of global policies relating to the country-code top-level domains, people's satisfaction again, 68% either reasonably or very satisfied with how the ccNSO is functioning.

So here we have coordinating with other ICANN Supporting Organizations, Advisory Committees and other constituencies under ICANN. I mean, basically you can see the same pattern every time. A high satisfaction rate with a few people who either think that it's not very effective at all which is a very small minority usually.

Now the second question we are going to be looking into is what internal or external elements – if any – prevented the full achievement of the ccNSO's objectives?

And there you have a breakdown, with the complexity of the Policy Development Process – which a lot of people identify as a real kind of difficulty. The protracted negotiations – 50% there.

Effective communication about the mandate of the ccNSO is 42% think that that was a problem, an obstacle.

Limited access to information in other languages apart from English is still identified by 33% as a block.

And difficulty reaching consensus regarding the development of policies for the global ccTLD community, 48% again.

Question three – What general or specific measures can be imagined to enhance the effectiveness of the ccNSO?

This was not a multiple-choice type question. So what we have done here is just synthesized or drawn out what people were tending to say.

And so you have need for better, more readily available information about the precise purpose and function of the ccNSO, that's just sort of simply communication about what the ccNSO is, does it have a mission statement, this kind of thing.

Measures taken to improve the planning for meetings.

Availability of information again, in other languages apart from English.

A greater level of interaction needed between ccNSO and the other Supporting Organizations within the ICANN system.

Again, the complexity and protracted implementation of the PDP mechanism is a problem.

Chris Disspain: Can I stop you, with a question? I'm not quite clear – I'm sorry, I'm confused – if one of the highly rated survey, effective, reasonably effective was the cooperation between the ccNSO and the other Supporting Organizations, then this also appears here as a measure that can be taken to better enhance the effectiveness of the ccNSO – I don't understand the correlation. If the vast majority of people think that the cooperation between the other Supporting Organizations and the ccNSO is effective or very effective, then that presumably means that this appears on here as a specific measure because the people who weren't satisfied put it on. Is that basically correct?

Tom Mackenzie: Well I think what we have found is that we have to very careful about how we – and we will be very careful – about how we present this information. Because there are many people who for example may be satisfied with one particular aspect of how the ccNSO is functioning and they will express that. And then what we have is a second sort of layer of information that's coming in, it's when people are commenting in writing. Now, just the thing to say about the comments in writing is that they are useful of course, because, well, but they tend to be quite critical. And we're perfectly aware – and don't worry – that we are perfectly aware that when people answer in writing, it's usually because they've got some sort of "bee in their bonnet" about something. So we're going to balance that, you know, not to sort of give you the impression that actually people are very unsatisfied with the way it's working. But I think the reason why we're presenting it here is – well, congratulatory sort of news is interesting for you – but in some ways the criticism is also useful.

And then so just to get to end of this list – a more systematic use perhaps of Internet-based tools as an alternative or perhaps a complement to actual meetings. I know these tools already exist but there are some highly, you know, very powerful systems in place now to help in the formation of groups thinking about different issues, whether these be sort of language issues, script issues, you name it. This might be something that you could think about.

Now, here we go, simple multiple choice question – overall, were the initiatives carried out by the ccNSO since its establishment consistent with its mandate as defined in the Bylaws?

So there you have a very clear, "Yes." This a membership question. This is only the membership who answered here. You have a very clear "Yes," with 81%.

Overall, were the initiatives carried out by the ccNSO since its establishment consistent – so that's the same question – and it's the written responses you get.

So perhaps more critical, certainly more critical. And you see that what they, what the people highlight is that the ccNSO is too caught up in political matters and no focused enough on technical understanding or a practical attitude towards the DNS.

Although the organization has evolved, there is still no clear understanding of how it fits in with other SOs and ACs nor what its objectives are.

And the ccNSO's scope as defined by its Bylaws is too often exceeded.

And then finally, the ccNSO is perceived by some to be lacking still in some cases to be lacking in independence.

I'll run through them, I've got about another six. But I'll go through them quickly.

Okay. So what are the ccNSO members' understanding of the mandate of the ccNSO?

So there you have a very clear 96% of respondents indicate that they have a "good" or "fairly good" understanding of the mandate of the ccNSO. But this does contrast – it seems there is a sort of disconnect between people who say that they have a very good understanding of the mandate of the ccNSO but then what they go along to identify as the main reasons or the sort of value that they perceive in their membership – they highlight things like networking opportunities, having a voice within the broader ICANN system and the exchange of best practices. So there's clearly value in the ccNSO but it's…

Chris Disspain: But those are consistent with the Bylaws. They may be using different words but they're actually consistent.

Tom Mackenzie: Okay good.

What are the understandings of the other SOs and ACs does not – there's really not enough information here – we'll be answering this question during, or we will be seeking answers to this question during this meeting.

Let's go on to seven – does the ccNSO have a continuing purpose within the ICANN structure?

Well there you go, the answer speaks for itself, 78% "yes", 15% "no."

So salient issues among the majority who think that it does – what the ccNSO has achieved in terms of pushing forward the agenda on IDN ccTLDs, DNS security awareness, etcetera. There you go.

And, oh yes, that was important. A mechanism for giving ccTLDs really a voice within the ICANN system.

But there's the salient issues among the small minority who think that there is no future for the organization. The ccNSO is still perceived by some to be deaf to the concerns of smaller ccTLDs, no-renewal or slow or no renewal at the management level, it's bureaucratic, costly and relatively little to show for itself.

As I say, I mean, this is not information that we are – this is stuff that's coming out of the survey.

Does the rationale for the ccNSO as spelled out in the Bylaws need to be revised and in which sense?

So there you go, 82% think that the rationale remains an accurate definition for the purpose and function of the ccNSO.

However, there you see that breakdown of 33% still thinks that there is no need for change in the function and operations. So that's still the largest group there.

29%: there is a need for some change and 19% think there is really a need for profound change.

Here we are, we're getting through.

Does the ccNSO operate in an accountable and transparent way? Are there any changes to the ccNSO's ways of operating that might enhance its accountability and transparency?

So, really no problem, 79% think that it does operate in a transparent and accountable way. Blah, blah, blah. 21% that it doesn't.

And then in the written responses, you get a kind inverse – well not exactly inverse – but you have 15% who just say, really well, it's absolutely fine – but

you have 75% who, without being critical, think that well, you know, there's room for improvement.

Okay, we're nearly through.

Are the ccNSO's internal working mechanisms suitable and sufficient to guide all aspects of its present work?

People – well just the basic thing to say here is that people say that they are satisfied. I mean, when you give them a yes or no type question, they say that yes they are satisfied with the PDP. But then when you get into the written responses, they're really in two minds about it. They think it's long and slow and you know, difficult.

Chris Disspain: Tom, what would be really useful I think is if we could know in the final I think version of this, the percentage of those who said – they'd answer the yes/no – the percentage of those who actually provided original response.

Tom Mackenzie: Yes.

Chris Disspain: Because you might get one person providing an original response, so it would be useful to know that, of the 37 people that ticked yes/no, 2 provided a written response. Okay?

Tom Mackenzie: Sure, sure. You can you're an expert in these things. We will do that.

Yeah, so just really to finish on this thing, when comparing the two sort of systems that you've got for policy development, there was a clear sort of sense that people favor the Working Group method, model.

Now two more slides and that's it, we're done, including this one.

What mechanisms can be envisaged to further support the efforts of the ccNSO to enlarge its membership to further existing and future ccTLDs?

Where this information is coming from, the section of the questionnaire that this coming from, the information here is coming from, is a non-members of the ccNSO, that quite important group of non-members who responded. Saying that well, you know, we don't really understand what it's for. And so they claim a lack of communication, there's a need for a more systematic translation of documents into several languages, some people claimed that there needs to be a more equitable regional representation on the Council and there should be a limit to the number of terms for ccNSO Council members and again, there's this question of a tool, some sort of a more powerful tool for the constant exchange of information.

Okay, so the final two questions.

As you can see, we haven't really been able; we haven't collected information from the survey that's relevant to these actual questions. So we'll be informing these with the interviews and other aspects of our review.

And finally, that's the link to our questionnaire if you have not yet participated.

And that's it folks.

Chris Disspain: Thank you very much. If you – Gabby could you email the link out to all the lists again and just say, "Look, if you haven't already," – actually what would be really good is if we actually sent out the slide with the list of countries on it and said, "As far as we're aware, these people have responded. If you have responded and your name is not on this slide, then you need to do it again," okay?

Excellent.

Do we have any comments or questions? Rudolf?

Gabby, do we have a microphone?

Rudolf Mayer: Thank you. Rudolf Mayer from .NL. A remark and a question.

The remark first. I received the link for the questionnaire from a Gmail account and that's normally considered the suspicious resource or suspicious source. So wanted to verify if this email actually came from the organization that was doing the review. So my recommendation would be use another account for this type of email than a Gmail account.

Tom Mackenzie: Well actually there's something say about that. What you received was prior to the start of the survey, I sent out – because what we found that we needed – one problem we had was checking people's email addresses, the accuracy of people's email addresses. Now this turned out to be a real problem. About 20% of the information that we got was not being received and we received an unbelievable of mailer daemons and things like this saying – so what we had to was basically we had to send out an email checking your email addresses. That email there was sent out from – it was called a ccNSO/ICANN at gmail.com. Simply because it's a very good mechanism for getting a quick response. The actual survey was not a Gmail account at all. It was – the entire survey…

Chris Disspain: Tom? I'm conscious that we're running out of time and that was only a comment, not a question, so let's move…

Tom Mackenzie: Okay so but to wrap that up, it was not a Gmail.

Chris Disspain: Fine.

Rudolf Mayer: In general, my recommendation would be not to use a Gmail account for anything if it's for professional activities.

Tom Mackenzie: Okay, all right.

Rudolf Mayer: The second one, I might be confusing this with another survey, but did you have a system to verify that the response was actually coming from the party that was indicating who they were? I seem to remember that I just had to fill in, "No, I'm .NL," "Yes, I'm," the applicant or the party responding to the survey, I had to fill in myself and I seem to remember that there was no system of verification. Is that correct? Or am I mistaken?

Tom Mackenzie: Well, yeah, we have to identify where responses were coming from and so we had, you had a name field, you had a country field.

Rudolf Mayer: Okay, I'll clarify my question. Is it not true that it was possible to fill in the survey on behalf of somebody else by just filling false data?

Tom Mackenzie: Well, we tried to evacuate that problem by only sending the link to people who were identified as respondents.

Chris Disspain: Rudolf, please guys, sorry, I understand this is an important discussion but not right now because we have to move on. We're running out of time and Jean-Jacques is here and he needs to talk to us.

    Tom, Herve, thank you very much, stay there, don't go anywhere. And we'll get back to that later on.

    So Marco, Jean-Jacques, over to you.

Jean-Jacques Subrenat: Thank you Chris. Can you hear me? I don't know how good the mikes are here. Is that any better. I'll try to train for this.

    So I don't know how much you have been told about this. I just want to recognize the presence in this room of Demi Getschko who is a member of the ccNSO Review Working Group. And the other members and I don't see them just now here but I do make a point of giving their names again – Alejandro Pisanty, Demi Getschko who I just named, Vittorio Bertola and Ram Mohan and myself and I have the honor of being the Chair of this Working Group.

    The staff members you do know.

So there are two or three things I would like to point out to you at this stage as background material for you.

The first is that when we charged by the Board and by the SAC to set up this Working Group and to set up its terms of reference, after that I wanted to make very clear that this would have the widest geographical distribution as possible. We didn't want to have only responses from let's say Western Europe or northern America. So we went to the trouble of verifying that the Statement of Interest from consulting firms would be known in other parts of the world. So I'd just like to signal that particular details. Marco can give you a very run down on that which is in itself quite interesting.

The second thing of course is to point out that this survey which has just been presented to you by Tom Mackenzie is just a survey. It's just one item, one element of the overall review process of course and it's not the review. It's preliminary material on which to work.

The important thing, of course, is to have this validated by the community and that's why we are also here today in addition to all the other methods which will be used for the validation.

And I think that in state of this, I want to underline the openness and the effort at transparency to which we are held. It's not a choice, we are held to that.

And finally, I would like to point out that a timeline has been proposed. If you have any comments on the timeline, that too would be very interesting for us to know as a Working Group.

I wanted to make my comments very short because I'm really looking forward to an exchange with you and thank you very much for inviting us to your meeting.

Chris Disspain: Okay, so, thank you Jean-Jacques. Marco did you need to say anything or you're under control?

Marco Lorenzoni: That's technology, that's technology. I was looking for wires.

Just a few words. Marco Lorenzoni, Director for Organizational Reviews in ICANN. Just a few words on the timeline. Reviewers will deliver the final report by May and the report will be presented – will be immediately published of course – and then presented to the Brussels meeting.

So working backwards, they started already, they worked from home, that's a new structure for our reviews. Usually our reviews start at one ICANN meeting, we prefer to change the way we do usually reviews in order allow

reviewers to come here to conduct interviews with already having digested some preliminary and fundamental information about the ccNSO, about the ccTLD world in order them to target better their questions to you.

It is very important for them and for you to know that this occasion of meeting with key stakeholders here in Nairobi is for them an occasion both of gathering further data. So investigating even more on the main elements of the terms of reference. And to somehow validate with you their preliminary findings from the review.

That was just a very brief presentation.

Chris Disspain: Thanks Marco. Are there any – now – any questions or comments – Matteau, you had something. Gabby could we organize a microphone, please?

They're very possessive of it.

Matteau.

Matteau: Thank you Chris. Apologies for coming in a little late to the presentation. But from what I gathered, you've been especially focusing on the survey that's been conducted. But my question actually would rather be for Marco I guess, or for the Board members but it's about the scope of the review. I think in the last – yesterday for instance – a few concerns were raised within and from the outside of our community about some financial aspects, financial contributions for instance. And I would like to know whether the scope of the review includes some financial aspects or whether this is outside of the scope?

Marco Lorenzoni: Okay, thanks. No, there is no specific remit on covering the financial aspects but reviewers are free to add further elements to their analysis if other further elements emerge during their work for the review. They are not supposed to issue recommendations on the financial aspect but of course, they are free and they are invited to raise and underline any kind of further aspects even going behind the terms of reference that could emerge from this phase.

Chris Disspain: Thank you. Do we have any other comments or questions at this stage?

Okay. I would encourage you – if you have already arranged to have an interview with these guys, fine – if you haven't, because I know they have nothing better to do than interview you all, I'd encourage you to go up to them and ask them to find some time to talk to you. Because the more people that they talk to, the more information they get and the better the accuracy of the review will be. So I know that some of you already have arrangements or have already spoken to them but, you know, if you haven't, please do so.

Jean-Jacques Subrenat: Thanks Chris. I'd just like to make a general remark. It's that the purpose of this consultation and the prime objective of the – at this stage of the work – the prime objective of the Review Working Group is of course to make sure that the questions which are put to the community are the right ones. It's better to have more questions than not enough. But I surely want to make sure that your concerns are reflected in the best possible way in the final review. So I would very strongly support what Chris has just recommended. Is that you make sure to make your views known to the reviewers at this stage. Thanks.

Chris Disspain: Okay. On that, if we're done, we're done? Excellent. So could you please join me in thanking the four people sitting in front of you right here.

(applause)

Okay, it's coffee time. Now, coffee is still in the basement? Is it? Gabby, do you know. Oh, there is coffee here. Okay. Maybe.

Unknown male: It was planned that we come, (inaudible 00:00:05) should share this decision, however he couldn't come, so that's why I'm here.

I don't think I need to introduce anything. Lesley Cowley would like to speak about self regulation or regulation development in U.K. So Lesley, please go ahead.

Lesley Cowley: We've got 35 minutes for this session, just in case you think I'm over-running, okay?

Okay. Hi everybody. I think I know most of you in the room but for those I haven't met, I'm Lesley Cowley and I'm the CEO of Nominet.UK.

As Andre said, this presentation is about regulation and self-regulation within the U.K. but I don't want you to get the impression that's all we do. So I'm please to say this week we signed .UK. So there are other things going on apart from this.

Anyway, this presentation is about how we became the subject of government attention and as a result of that, a bill that is currently going through the U.K. Parliament called the Digital Economy Bill.

It's about some reforms to our constitution and it's also about how we engaged with our registrars to affect changes to our constitution. And I think there are some learnings there that we can share with you.

Apparently there's a Chinese proverb which says, "May you come to the attention of people in high places." I'm not sure how that translates. But we certainly came to the attention of people in high places recently.

And back starting in 2005, we had several unsuccessful attempts at reform within Nominet. As a result of that, the government wrote to us to in effect suggest an independent review.

That review was published in 2009 and following the recommendations of that review, we developed proposals that we consulted on during 2009. And this all culminated in what we called an Extraordinary General Meeting in February, just last month.

At the same time, the Digital Britain Report, a government report, stated the intention to get the reserve powers to intervene in the domain name system in the U.K.

And as I said earlier, that's currently going through Parliament. In fact, the bill was in our House of Lords just yesterday.

I put a lot of text up on this slide because I know that this will be of extreme interest to a lot of lawyers in the community and I put some details in the other slides. I'm not going to speak to all of the detail, but it's there if anyone wishes to refer to it later.

But basically for the U.K., the Digital Economy Bill was looking at television, looking at radio, looking at online copyright infringement, the classification of video games and buried in all of that was also several paragraphs on the domain name system.

Importantly, the domain name system bit was that the Secretary of State could intervene in domain names. It extended the role of OFCOM which is our regulator too.

The report then turned into a bill, that's how legislation works, very briefly, in the U.K. And there are some very specific clauses in the bill where the government in effect is seeking some reserve powers. And again, I have provided the detail on the slides, I'm not going to talk through the detail, but it's there if anyone would with to refer to it.

But my abridged version of this is that if they decide to do so, there can be a report prepared and it's important to realize that that report covers the domain name industry in its entirety, not just the registry. So it covers registrants, registrars and the registry. Not just the registry.

And the concept introduced in the bill, that if there is some sort of serious failure then the government has the power to appoint a manager of the registry.

They also have the power, if there is a failure, to alter the constitution of the registry itself.

So those are some quite severe powers. They would not be introduced without necessary consultation and reports, etcetera, but our regulators see this really as if there are some sort of serious failures, that they have the tools by which they could step in and intervene in some way.

Linked to the bill, there were a number of fact sheets published and I've put some of the extracts from those fact sheets up there for you because I think

some of the phrases there are very relevant to a number of us in this industry and in effect the first fact sheet – there were two – the very first fact sheet is about providing additional information and voices the U.K. dedication to self-regulation and stresses that there are not current government plans to intervene. But does lay out the need for some sort of safety net and what that might be used for.

And there was a second fact sheet that was also produced part way through the process and that highlighted some very strong government confidence in the current management of the registry, which if you're a registry manager, that was rather nice to have, obviously. And it also laid out some examples of where the U.K. government thinks self-regulation is currently working well.

A number of you will have seen the activity we did just before Christmas on counterfeit goods and domain names used with counterfeit goods and I'm speaking on that in a session tomorrow. We also have a phishing lock and we have the well established Dispute Resolution Service. And those were considered to be examples of where the government believes self-regulation is working well.

So that's the kind of backdrop, the context during which we were trying to affect these constitutional changes. And there were a very complex set of changes being considered. As you're aware, previous attempts to change our constitution had not all succeeded – some had – but not all.

We also had a very low turnout of registrars, our members now, within the U.K., those are in effect one and the same thing. We have 3000 registrars in the U.K. which I know is probably much more than many of you and there became over many years a real issue that many were happy with the work we were doing and therefore just viewed us as a supplier. So they felt – they didn't feel a strong need to be very involved and very engaged.

There was also a subsection of our registrars – and still is – that did not trust the management or the Board of the company.

So, a small challenge.

Basically what we did – we developed a series of proposals through consultation and then we consulted on what we were going to propose. So hopefully to surface any disagreement with the proposals.

A key proposal for us was that Nominet should conduct our business for the public benefit. And that, in effect, is how Nominet has always conducted its business. But crucially, that wasn't part of our legal constitution.

And in order to get that resolution through, we knew that we would need nearly 67% positive votes to succeed.

We were proposing that in a number of different forms and I can into that in detail if anyone is particularly interested but each of the different resolutions had different hurdles to affect.

And the EGM the week before last, I'm pleased to say, passed all of those proposals, which was a major, major milestone for us.

The second set of proposals was about changing the Board of Nominet which prior to this consisted of four elected Directors from the registrar community and two Executive Directors. So these resolutions were about changing the Board to add independent Directors and more Executive Directors and also updating things in line with corporate governance best practice. Those were passed too.

In addition, we had a strange measure in our constitution that meant that prices were set in effect by the registrar community. I wouldn't recommend that provision but that existed in our constitution and had for many years. And there was a proposal for that to change in order to let the Board set registration and renewal fees.

We also, lastly, had a proposal to try to have a next stage of this process to develop some ideas about how we could get more stakeholders involved in .UK policy particularly, but also in the general involvement. And those resolutions passed as well.

To get those resolutions through for us and at the bottom of this slide you'll see we actually increased the amount of participation from around about 16% to nearly 39%. And that took a lot of effort. That took a lot of time.

And just some learning to share with you about how we did that.

It as a long process with a lot of meetings and a lot of discussion. And in effect, we found that that was key towards engaging people in understanding why change was needed and hopefully supporting those changes.

We also previously perhaps weren't very good at letting people respond to consultations, so a bit like ICANN consultations really, you've got to be a real detail person to be able to respond and sometimes responding can take you half a day for example. So we found we had to make it much easier for people to say, "yes," or "no." We had to summarize our proposals on a whole number of different levels, providing detail for people who love detail, providing condensed versions, providing executive summaries.

We also did quite a lot public relations activity, making sure that people were aware of the consultations, aware of the votes and using Twitter, Facebook, etcetera to raise awareness and engage in dialog.

And I know there are mixed views on the social media within this community, but as a method for increasing the diversity of people who engage with you, I would strongly recommend that from this experience.

We did videos. I think Gabby is going to put the videos on the shared resources page so I'm not saying they're fantastic videos but they certainly were a good way of explaining the issues to people, and particularly for us, about having Board members in front of our registrars explaining the issues and why it was important for them to get engaged.

And finally, we had an in-house team who actually rang every single member of those 3,000 to encourage them to participate and to encourage them to vote.

So a very big project for us. It had Board level leadership and Board level involvement at every stage which was great. And I have a member of my Board here today on the ICANN experience now that he has some spare time following this project.

I'm happy to give further detail maybe to people who might be going through a similar experience. It's not one I'd strongly recommend. But clearly the need for change at Nominet was crucial for our future and now that has taken place so I think we're moving to a new era.

Thank you.

Unknown male: Thank you very much Lesley, that is very interesting. Congratulations on a great development in your registry. Do we have any questions for Lesley?

I don't see anybody so thank you very much and the next presentation was planned to be from Jorg Schweiger but I don't see him in the room. No. So then the next presentation is from Sieger Springer and he will speak about the technical development in .NL registry about EPP and DNSSEC.

Unknown male: Can I, Mr. Vice Chair? I just wanted to – it's me here, hello – I just wanted, since we're among friends, it's Sieger's birthday today so bear with him please.

(applause)

Sieger Springer: Well thank you very much. Can you hear me all right? Okay.

Good morning to you all. My name is Sieger Springer. I'm working at the Dutch registry SIDN and I'm responsible for marketing communications and new business.

Oh, okay, I'm sorry, it's unplugged. Here we are.

So I would like to introduce you to two subject that have been keeping us busy lately and those subjects are the introduction of EPP in Holland and some update on DNSSEC.

So, to start with, EPP and SIDN.

SIDN is among the last large registries to switch to EPP. We've been working on it for almost a year now and maybe even longer but as I can recall, over a year, and we will make the switch on March 17th. We will go live with over 1900, almost 2000 registrars that will make the transition to EPP. EPP is, of course, an important industry requirement and a major step towards better customer satisfaction.

So as I said, meeting the needs of our registrars is a key objective of this project. It is also therefore that we wanted stay as close as possible to the standards as possible – the EPP standards of course. And as a result, all major processes have become paperless.

As I said, 17th March is our big date and interface and processes will be changed at the same time. So we are talking about a Big Bang scenario.

If you look at the process we went through, we went really through an extensive and elaborative program to consult with our constituencies, many of the registrars of course. We created a task force and we consulted them over all the proposed changes we had for the processes at SIDN.

They were quite useful and we created a group of five registrars giving example of the mixture of our diverse field of registrars. That was very important to us because we also had to include the knowledge and the meaning and the meaning of the smaller registrars let's say it like this.

Down the process, we also created or asked a group of registrars to help us pre-test our software. This happened at the end of December and well, that went quite good, I must say.

As you can imagine, during this whole process, communication played a vital role. Apart from consulting with the registrars, we held regional events to update them on upcoming changes, sent out various mailings and called almost all of them to urge them to go over to EPP.

And finally, to make the transition as easy as possible, we supported the development of open source client apps and we created the test environment well in advance for those third party people developing client apps and we also published a list of those clients to our registrars.

So, what's the status so far?

Almost 90% - we had a survey at the beginning of January – almost 90% of our registrars were already aware of the upcoming release date in December. So they were aware of that. That sounds very good.

And they even said they liked our communication efforts, so that's also good.

And as I mentioned, in December, our testing registrars also said, thumbs up, good job, you can start going live with this project.

And even – we had our loaded performance tests – went very well. We really met our system requirements quite easily. So that's promising too.

So, we were confident all worked properly and announced the date for going live well in advance, giving also the registrars a good period of time to test the connections with this IDN.

So that sounds all quite good and actually it's all good as well. But at the same time, we've noticed that communication with our registrars has proven quite difficult. We've been trying to reach them for at least 20 separate occasions and what you see is that, well, we are a week away from this live date, but still a number of them haven't tested our system. So we are, again, also in the end, still urging them to go over to the EPP standard. But it's been very hard work for us and it still is. So that may be something to take into consideration if you want to make this transition to EPP yourself.

Communication is paramount but it's no guarantee that everybody will listen. That's at least our experience.

Now something on DNSSEC implementation and adoption. You may have heard, SIDN will sign the zone just a month after the root has been signed. The main reason for this is a smaller risk of wrongly configured (inaudible 00:22:06).

Then again, we have a "friends and family" phase after that where we will create a limited number of domains where people can test. This will be a manual process, maybe with a simple web interface, and we still haven't decided on the policy on who will or can join this.

One of the main obstacles of course of implementing DNSSEC is the adoption of the local Internet community and especially, of course, the registrars. As you all know, it's hard work to get DNSSEC over and the importance of DNSSEC is not really appreciated in our constituency. So what we do?

We try to have a proactive approach and consult with our local Internet community. We created therefore a platform called DNSSEC.NL – you can have a peek on it – it's also in English and you can well, try to learn and see what we are doing. There's a number of issues we are, of course, highlighting over there. We tried to do, how do you call that, to show best practices, best practices from Holland, but also from abroad and it's important also to mention that we are doing this with a number of important Dutch stakeholders.

I name a few (inaudible 00:23:39), Power DNS, KPN, GOFCERT and of course, also the Ministry of Economic Affairs.

What is the task of this platform?

It's aimed at finding solutions for open issues that are blocking widespread DNSSEC deployment in the Netherlands. Well, the platform focuses on DNSSEC deployment for all the .NL ccTLD space, the Dutch ISP market and the Dutch law and for Dutch local Internet community as stakeholders.

We also are performing some research and that's mostly of course with the technical community. Well known parties STO and SurfNet are joining us in this.

And finally of course you all know there are a number of issues. We try to handle those issues ourselves in a way we feel comfortable with.

We have more or less a company philosophy that if possible we would like to work with open source software. And we are working together with, for instance, Nominet and .SE, creating open source (inaudible 00:24:54) for DNSSEC. It's open DNSSEC and what can I say about it? Other parties involved are NetLabs for instance, SurfNet again, SEDN of course, KRI is a consulting company from Sweden.

What are these operational issues then? Well we try to follow a careful approach with respect to the known and unknown issues. Of course, the key is to avoid problems arising. Then we have secure transfers. DNSSEC transfers are an issue because during the transfer you need to keep material both from the losing as from the gaining DNS operator in the zone. This requires some kind of collaboration between them which might be or might cause troubles in the end.

Last but not least, key rollovers, they could lead wrongly configured systems and we urge you also to look at our website, DNSSEC.NL, for some more information. Where we have (inaudible 00:26:00) concerning key rollovers.

Well actually, as you might have seen, I'm not an expert on DNSSEC issues. I'm a marketing guy, I'm in new business. But of course, DNSSEC is partially new business for us and it's in fact also residing in our new business team. You may know Markus Travaille who is the expert on our team. He's also joining us this afternoon for the DNSSEC session with the ccNSO.

What I would like to highlight is that you could have two approaches – a passive one, just enabling DNSSEC and that's safe but is it really effective? Or – and that's what we are doing – we are promoting this active – not pushing DNSSEC but trying to stimulate DNSSEC adoption and offer tools and knowledge to registrars.

That's a little bit what I wanted to say about DNSSEC and EPP. If you have questions, don't hesitate to ask. It might be that Rudolf is going to jump in if the technical level is too detailed for me.

So thank you very much.

Unknown male: Thank you very much. Are there any questions?

Unknown male: Oh yes, thanks for the presentation. I just ask one question. Since you are a business guy, I'm kind of wondering what is your business plan for the DNSSEC deployment? Thank you.

Sieger Springer: Well actually, as you know, getting a business case out of DNSSEC deployment is quite hard. We have also got some other interests of course and that is making the zone, the Dutch .NL zone more safe and secure. So I think you can translate the business case into this kind of reasoning.

Unknown male: Actually, do you have any plans raise the price for .NL domain names once the DNSSEC is deployed?

Sieger Springer: No.

Unknown male: Nothing major? Okay, thank you.

Unknown male: Any other questions? If not, I have one question for you.

I wanted to ask you, do you have some time planned – what will happen after the "friends and friendly face," do you have some plans for full deployment or?

Sieger Springer: Not yet.

Unknown male: Not yet.

Sieger Springer: Not yet but we are working on it.

Unknown male: Okay.

Sieger Springer: It's all part of the interactive.

Unknown male: Okay. No other questions? So thank you very much and this session is closed.

Thank you.

Chris Disspain: Could you thank Andre and Sieger and Lesley please?

(applause)

And could you all wish Sieger a happy birthday for today?

No, we're not singing.

No, the ccNSO does not do songs.

We are – our next session is a brief update from the Nominating Committee – Wolfgang is joining us.

Gabby, does Wolfgang have slides apparently?

Wolfgang Kleinwachter: Thank you Chris. Thank you for the opportunity to talk to you for a couple of minutes. My name is Wolfgang Kleinwachter, I'm chairing 2010 Nominating Committee.

Every year the Nominating Committee, you know, has to select some members of the community to fill open positions – leadership positions – in ICANN's various bodies.

The Nominating Committee was established in the reform process, I think in 2003 and it has the duty to send or the right to send eight Directors to the Board, three members to the GNSO Council and the ccNSO Council, and five members to the At-Large Advisory Committee. So that means half of the Board members make their way to the decision making table of the ICANN Board via the Nominating Committee.

And so far the Nominating Committee has indeed a very crucial role to play. And also at this moment, it's important to stress that the Nominating Committee works totally independent from the ICANN Board. That means that while we'll consult with the CEO, we do not accept any advice or recommendation from the CEO, we are interested in the perspective of the existing ICANN Board but we make our decisions totally independent from the Board.

The Nominating Committee itself is populated by the various constituencies of ICANN – I think also the ccNSO sends somebody to the Nominating Committee – we have 15 voting members and interesting point is that the Chair and the Advisor to the Chair and the Associated Chairs, are non-voting members. That means I myself have no vote in the final decision making. I steer the debates so the decision making power in the Nominating Committee is in the hands of the 15 voting members which are delegated to the Nominating Committee by the ICANN constituencies. I think this is an important element. We chose that the transparency, accountability and democracy within the ICANN structures works.

So what we have to do – this year we have three positions for the Board, one position for the GNSO Council, one for the ccNSO Council and two for the At-Large Advisory Committee.

The deadline for submission is April 2. We decided to do it April 2 and not April 1 so that people do not think this is just a joke. So it's very serious so that means that one day if you consider to send an SOI – SOI stands for a Statement of Interest – this is what you have to do if you want to apply for one of the leadership positions. Everything is on the NomCom website and you have to fill in this SOI so it's very simple. And additionally you need three or four references, you know, from people who know you who would just send another one page to the Nominating Committee and saying, "You know, this is a good guy, I support his candidacy for one of the positions."

So that means all the information is on the NomCom website. The decision will be made after the Brussels meeting. And then the people take their seat in the various Boards and Committees after the December meeting of the ICANN Board.

So as I said already, you know, we are working, you know, also on different timelines. The time for the Board Director is three years, the time for a Country Code Council member is also three years, while for the GNSO Council and the At-Large Advisory Committee it's only two years. So this was the wisdom of the founders of the Nominating Committee that they had this different timelines and we just work on the basis of the Bylaws.

The selection criteria – this is important. You know, well known, and this skill is, you know, for all leadership positions in ICANN.

The first criteria is you have to love the Internet. And the second criteria are always the same – you have to love ICANN but you have to be critical against ICANN. I invite in particular people who are not satisfied with ICANN, who say, "Okay, ICANN did not deliver this or that," because as long as they criticize from outside, this is useful but very often not helpful. It's better if as a critic as ICANN you join the community, you take a leadership position and then you try to improve it.

So and these are all the criteria which are also now description which constitutes the basis of our work. This is integrity, objectivity, intelligence, sound judgment, open mind, capacity for thoughtful group decision-making. And certainly you have to understand ICANN's mission.

We are very interested to get people also from outside the traditional ICANN community because ICANN needs fresh people. ICANN needs the next generation, the leaders of tomorrow and in particular the Councils are very good place where, you know, all the younger people can make their experiences.

And I think this is important but however, you should not be a total outsider. You should understand what ICANN is if you apply I think this is certainly a criteria. And then you should be ready to serve as a volunteer, without compensation, other than the reimbursement of certain expenses. This is also part of the ICANN culture. And you should be aware about this. There is a discussion and probably there are some questions about compensation for Directors and I can certainly answer this question if this comes.

And you should have ability to communicate in English. I'm very positive for geographical and language diversity within ICANN and it was also mentioned in the survey that multi-lingualism in ICANN is an important issue and documents should be available in various languages. So that means I encourage in particular people either from countries and regions where English is not the first language, to apply. Because we need the different cultures in the ICANN community.

However, it's very helpful if you communicate in English. So that means, this is, this coin has two sides. So that means to have diversity of language is important but it's just a barrier for the day to day communication if you are not able to communicate at least basically in English. And so far, you know, we have to look on both sides. We have to have the language diversity but there should be also a basic knowledge to communicate in ICANN otherwise, you know, the efficiency of your collaboration within the ICANN bodies remains low.

So as I have said already, you know, we have certain criteria for diversity and I said this already, it's rather simple, go to the NomCom website, send it Statement of Interest, an SOI to us until April 2, and then it's done. And so far this was my short statement.

I have at the end two wishes what I expect also or what you can do to help to improve ICANN and to help the Nominating Committee to make the right choices.

Number one is if you could also send this message to your friends and colleagues that you talk with people where you think this could be a good candidate. Encourage them that they should go to the NomCom website, should consider it, there are still three weeks to go.

And the second point is last year we had around 70 or something like that applications, and we have only seven positions to fill. So a lot of people who apply will be frustrated after the final decision because my personal experience – I was in three NomCom's so far – is in the outreach phase, you have a lot of friends then after you make the decisions you know, you lose a lot of friends because they are not selected. So this part of the process.

However, you know, if you apply for the first time, you will remain now in the pool for at least three years. So there is a box which you can click and say, "Do you accept to be considered to remain in the pool if you are not selected?" And I think this is important – this is an application not only for this year – though this will continue, you will remain in the pool for at least three years for 2011 and 2012.

And the final word is, it's a very confidential process. And this is also important to understand. That confidentially does not mean there is a conspiracy, that 15 people behind closed doors, you know, make a deal, you know, for some friends of theirs. This process is really very, very democratic and not predictable and as I said, even I as a Chair have no voting power. But why it's confidential – that's the idea to protect the candidate. That means if you apply and will not be selected, nobody will know that you have been not selected.

There's a huge difference between elections and selections. In elections you have an open campaign, you argue in favor of you and then you risk to lose. But in the selection process, thanks to the confidentiality principle, the candidate is protected. That means that nobody will know if you are not selected and then you have two other chances for the years 2011 and 2012.

Chris, thank you very much and I'm certainly available for questions.

Chris Disspain: Thank you Wolfgang.   Any questions for the Chair of the Nominating Committee?

Okay. Well please join me in thanking Wolfgang.

(applause)

Wolfgang Kleinwachter: Can I just use this for one other announcement?

Chris Disspain: No. Because we're late. Did you want to talk about the summer school?

Wolfgang Kleinwachter: I wanted to just thank you for all the people who support the summer school and the next one will be in March in Sao Paolo in two weeks and end of July in Germany.

Chris Disspain: Thank you Wolfgang.

Right. Regional organization updates. So we're looking for Keith Davidson, who's apparently regional organization, Peter Van Roste, Erick Iriarte Ahon and Eric Akumiah.

So we're going to have our presentations from the regional organizations then Kim has recovered sufficiently to be able to talk to us about IANA and then we're going to have a presentation from our lunch sponsors, CNNIC.

Can we just get on with it?

Eric Akumiah: Good morning. I just want to do a quick update of AfTLD activities since the last ICANN meeting.

Yeah, next slide please.

In terms of membership, we have had three more new members join AfTLD, we have two other members still in process. We've also increased the number of associate members from two to five since the last ICANN meeting.

Next slide please

At last Sunday we had our AGM and we had two retiring Directors in the persons of Vincent Ngundi and Mohamed El Bashir and they have been replaced by Joe Kiragu from .KE and Alione Troare from .ML.

Next slide please.

Well activities since ICANN 36, we organized an initial Registry of (inaudible 00:43:48) in Dakar for ccTLDs in Africa, we had 14 countries presented and 31 participants.

Since last Monday we started an IROC workshop here for English speaking ccTLDs. We had 13 countries participate with a total of 22 participants.

We also had our annual meeting on Sunday 7 March. And on Monday we signed an MOU with AFNIC to cooperate in capacity building and other areas.

Next slide please.

Planned activities.

AfTLD will be at the African Internet Community meeting in Kigali to make presentations. We also plan to be in Brussels. In October we're planning to do an Advanced Registry (inaudible 00:44:59) both for French and English countries in Abidjan. And we plan to be at the next ICANN meeting, the last ICANN meeting for the year.

Next please.

Well projects, we are still, we are almost about completing our new website. We planned to have launched it here but we haven't been able to do that but hopefully within the next month it will be up. Our newsletter is almost ready, we'll publish it and send it to major lists.

Membership drive – we continued to get other African countries who are not members of AfTLD to join and also we have encouraged a lot of our members to join ccNSO.

We also want to focus on strategic partnerships moving forward so we can be able to leverage on the core competencies to be able to develop the organization.

We also plan to start collating monthly statistics for African ccTLDs. As of now we don't have those statistics and pretty soon we're going to get all those things done.

We are also working with the SSAC to develop the capacity for African ccTLDs in the region.

Well, yes, we have revised the timeline for our 5-year strategic plan. It's still in process. Hopefully at the end of the year, we will be able to launch our first operational plan.

Thank you.

Chris Disspain: Thank you Eric. And now Eric. Or should we do it in a different order, would that be easier?

So who's going next?

APTLD. Okay. That would be Keith Davidson I should imagine.

Keith Davidson: Sorry about the holdup folks, the two minute presentations from me this week and the wrong one in the wrong place.

I'm Keith Davidson, Vice Chair of APTLD and will provide a report on what we've been up to.

Our membership is currently 38 members from 72 possible ccTLDs in our region. 18 associate members. A total of 56.

It would be fair to say that our last year has been a somewhat introspective year in many regards. We've spent a lot of time re-thinking our strategy and so on. Having come through a history of quite a light membership in our region, our main mission was to grow that membership and our ambition was to get to more than half of the ccTLDs in the region. Having done that, we didn't necessarily have a second branch of strategy as to what to do when we achieved that membership. So the challenge has been to try and work forwards from there.

We engaged a new General Manager at the start of 2009 and lost him at the end of 2009 so we are currently going through a recruitment process – we held interviews is Kuala Lumpur last week at our – just after our AGM – and we're in the final stages of attempting to identify our successful candidate. And I think, you know, it's very hard to make progress in a regional organization without a manager.

At our AGM we also had two new Board members come on board. So the membership – I'll ensure that Gabby gets this presentation so that you can have a look at the ccTLDs who are now members.

Over the year we've continued our work in the area of IDNs for ccTLDs and our members and as an organization, we are very interested in the ongoing PDP.

Meetings coming up this year. We met in Malaysia last week as I said. There is a scheduled meeting for Sri Lanka in June to try and coincide with going on

to the ICANN Brussels meeting. And then a meeting in Jordan potentially September/October 2010, potentially on the way back from Vilnius IGF.

We collaborate as always with our friendly sibling organizations, particularly in our region but the fellow TLD organizations as well. And I think we're expanding our mandate particularly in the area of the IGF and APTLD Board and some members are actively engaged in the Hong Kong regional IGF as scheduled for June. And a potential Oceania Pacifica IGF at a date yet to be determined.

We have one new initiative and that's a disaster support fund. With a number of disasters, geographical disasters in our region in the past year, it's brought to mind that, particularly in some of the small island states that when disasters occur, it's very difficult to resurrect an infrastructure and so on, so we're establishing a cash reserve and also a list of people who can provide some efforts to assist in moments of emergency and providing technical support for rebuilding registry or infrastructure services.

For more information, the website and Secretariat addresses are there or if you wish to raise something with me, thank you.

Chris Disspain: Thanks Keith. Any questions for Keith? Okay, so we'll move on to Peter and CENTR.

Peter Van Roste: Hello? Good morning everyone. My name is Peter Van Roste, I'm the General Manger for CENTR. We are the European platform for ccTLDs. I'm going to give you a quick overview of our activities.

As always I think the intention of this type of session is that you get an idea of what we're doing and then we can later on engage in a debate. So I'm not going to dive into too many details.

First of all and very important, we have a new Board. I think three of my Board members are here – Annebeth, Alberto, and Juhani who is also our Treasurer, Matteau is here too but he's attending the GAC meeting and there's Sabine who was stuck in a snowstorm somewhere over Zurich.

I'm not sure about that.

CENTR as an organization operates – I mean, we are really a hands on organization that provides workshops and platforms for its members to do the work, to exchange best practices – we do that online and offline. Online we have a website with lots of content that is accessible to members. We have mailing lists. Offline we have General Assemblies and workshops.

For the ccTLDs amongst you, if you're interested in attending any of those, even if you're not a CENTRE member, contact me.

The newest workshop is the marketing workshop which has now already taken place two times and it's becoming quite a standard in our activities calendar.

We still have our ad hoc IGF Working Group and we are thinking about an R&D Working Group to think beyond DNS things – ONS for instance.

So as I mentioned, we have a Board of five Directors which you saw the picture of. We just hired a new staff member, an Australian, who will be helping us with support for the Working Group. I think that's an important characteristic.

Keith Davidson: What, you mean you're taking them back now after having shipped them out for so many years.

Peter Van Roste: Yeah, well, that was good experience though.

We participate in IGF together with the other regional organizations. We organize a workshop, "Lost in non-ASCII translation" on IDN's obviously and we're planning to organize a workshop again in the IGF in Vilnius as well together with the other regional organizations.

On top of that, IGF has a full support to move on, as many of you will know, IGF is ending, it's nearing the end of its term, it's very important I think for everybody involved that they can proceed like they're doing now. So we'll be sending out, again, a strong statement not just to IGF and to the GAC but also to the members, hoping that they will transfer that message to their national governments for the votes in the U.N. in New York in June.

We had our tenth anniversary the highlight of which was a high level dinner with European stakeholders – European Commissioner, Parliamentarians and permanent representatives in Brussels.

We're going to repeat that exercise this year right before our General Assembly in Brussels.

Last year – I already mentioned I think on my previous briefing – that we were going to produce a movie – well the movie is now done and it's available on YouTube. You can use it. What it basically does is it explains in layman's terms how DNS functions. I'm sure that it will give the techies amongst you a high blood pressure to watch it because obviously you have to simplify the message when you're trying to explain something as complicated

as DNS in two minutes time. But have a look and if you can use it, feel absolutely free.

The next step is follow up movies on particular aspects of DNS such as DNSSEC.

Yes, this is how the, a screenshot.

Just to give you an idea of what the CENTR community is currently thinking about, day and night – DNSSEC, escrow, Service Level Agreements, pricing, Dispute Resolution, all things related to abuse, EPP interfaces and governance models. So these are just the topics from the most recent surveys. I think it gives a clear idea of what's on our mind.

Yes those are our magazine, Domain Wire, which you can download from the website and use parts of it that can be helpful.

And for the ICANN meeting in Brussels, since we're based in Brussels, we'd be really thrilled to have you in our office so please pay us a visit. Maybe not all at the same time since our offices are rather modest. But I really would welcome you to our premises.

Thank you.

Chris Disspain: Thank you Peter. Any questions at all for Peter? All right. So and now finally, Eric.

Eric Iriarte: Thank you. I like part of that cooperation between CENTR and LACTLD, we use the machine of CENTR, thanks Peter.

I tried to put very quickly an update and…

Chris Disspain: For those of you who are wondering, we're waiting for the presentation to be loaded up onto the Adobe Connect so that other people can see it remotely. And so far no good. It's coming. Excellent.

Eric Iriarte: Thank you. This is the first time that I cut in a presentation because it's not my language, the problem.

Normally I have problem with English but this time is technical problem.

And LACTLD was created in 1998, so we have twelve years, we celebrate twelve years on the final of this year.

We are based in Uruguay but our offices are in Lima.

We changed our Bylaws the past year to accept affiliates. The affiliates need to be TLDs in historical relation with Latin America.

With that, we increase in the past year and now we are 31 members, 24 are full members, the last one .HT, and 7 affiliates and the last three was .ES, Spain, .MOBI and .PT, Portugal.

We have our General Assembly normally in May. And the next will be in Curacao, Netherlands Antilles, so you are invited.

A quick update of the things that happened to us was the situation, the special situation with the ccTLD .HN in Honduras about the fact government tried to take the ccTLD physically take the ccTLD. So LACTLD sent a letter to the international community about that.

Normally when we're thinking in Latin America, we're thinking Spanish community but also we have a big community that people that are speaking English also in Portuguese and French and that so we need to start to include that community, especially in the Caribbean areas and our staff talking English, French, Portuguese and Spanish.

We have four workshops this year, ACRP, Legal and Policies, Technical and Security Issues and finally about commercial aspects. We have support of ISOC and ICANN for the Technical and Security through Delta Risk.

We started a Twitter, this is our designation, you can follow us. On Facebook too. And the final, at this moment we will have a new website, we need to bring more information to the community.

And we had in the past 45 days two big earthquakes in the region – one in Haiti and another in Chile. In the first case affected directly not only the operation of the ccTLD, it affected the people, some members of the staff lost families and relatives. So the community gives support technical to them like with mirrors and especially Brazil help a lot of them and the Dominican Republic that's half part of the (inaudible 01:04:19) where is IT. And also we give support to them especially for the people, finally the ccTLDs is not only the technical aspect, is more the staff and the people.

And in the case of Chile, was biggest and strongest earthquake, but was more easy because they have some contingency program about earthquakes so no was the technical issues a big deal. It was more about the presence, complication in the communication but finally four hours after the earthquake we can make contact with them and the community was informed about that.

This year we will continue with our newsletter containing the name of the domain. We have the possibility to put in paper like in our regional

organization. We participate actively in CITEL – Inter-American Commission of Telecommunications and also we will have relation with CTU – Caribbean Telecommunications Unit – to have contact with the governments in the region.

We have a fellowship program for each workshop to help especially in developing countries to participate in our workshops.

We have a monthly report of statistics which LatinoameriCANN Project.

And we have started with LACNIC IPv6 deployment program to have IPv6 at the final of the year in all the ccTLDs in Latin America and Caribbean.

We made a book, reference book, about legal aspects and we are working in policies, technical and commercial issues.

Our next workshop will be in Guamont in the Dominican Republic, you are all invited. It's about attack and contingence response program and especially about how working against the disasters, natural disasters.

In May we will have our policies and legal workshop with our General Assembly in Curacao.

In September we will have our technical aspects workshop in Uruguay.

And finally, the third commercial aspects workshop in the same place as the ICANN meeting. At this moment it may be up here that this meeting will be Cartagena.

No more? Questions?

Chris Disspain: Any questions? Young-eum?

Young-eum Lee: Yes, Young-eum, .KR and also the Co-Chair of the Wildcards Study Group. I would just like, I was waiting for everyone to be done to first express my gratitude to Erick Iriarte for his help in offering to inquire about the Wildcard situation to the LACTLD members and I would also like to ask APTLD to reach out to its TLD that is engaging in wildcarding to provide us with more information. We are formally trying to enlist the help of the regional, enlist the help of the regional liaisons to help us gather information about individual cc's. And I know some of them are not members of your regional organizations but I do see that for example that .TK and Samoa are members of APTLD so I would appreciate your help. Thank you.

Erick Iriarte: Thanks for the words and I include Eduardo Santoyo that is the new ccTLD .CO General Manager, just re-delegated in the past month. Eduardo is there.

He will be helping us in this and maybe we'll be the host of the next ICANN meeting in Latin America.

Chris Disspain: Thanks Erick. Anyone else? All right. Well could you please thank all of our regional organizations?

(applause)

And now, somewhat late, 24 hours late but nonetheless, still here, with an IANA update, we have Kim.

Kim Davies: You really should be glad I wasn't here 24 hours ago, it wouldn't have been pretty.

So my apologies. I wasn't here to present here yesterday. I had a bad run in with some local food but all is getting better.

I am here to give you the update on our IANA root zone management, so hopefully I can touch on a few issues of interest to you and as always, any questions will be fielded as you wish.

So firstly, I wanted to update you on the technical conformance testing that we're doing. For those that were in Mexico City last year, more or less exactly one year ago, we started rolling out a more refined set of technical tests for TLD managers. And these are the tests that we do when we receive a change for the root zone.

And what I did then was I presented some summary analysis of the amount of compliance against those technical checks that we do for the meeting and since then, we've started monitoring against those new sets of technical tests, and it includes a few additional things that we didn't do before. And we've also more routinely flagged some of those issues. So in the past whereas we perhaps didn't check rigorously against all those criteria, now we check against all the tests and we inform TLD managers of issues when they make a root zone change.

So just one measure of compliance is the amount of network diversity amongst ccTLDs and this was the map that I showed in Mexico City as of one year ago, the amount of AS diversity and don't blink, you might miss it, but I'll just transition to the next slide. This is it a year later. So there's been a couple of changes and I think in the positive, but more or less the one's in red are the ones with no network diversity and they're the ones of most concern. In effect those TLDs are reliant on a single network operator which, if it had, you know, network difficulties, the entire TLD would go off line. So ideally we want to have TLDs in at least two diverse networks. Obviously more is better. But having it in just one is of somewhat concern.

Just for comparison, this is what I presented last year in terms of network diversity over IPv6 and it's really showing the same characteristics, although here we don't have a minimum requirement of two diverse IPv6 networks, we only apply that for IPv4, but nonetheless I think it gives a useful illustration of network diversity under IPv6. So again, this slide here is last year and I'll flip it right now to this year. So I would say that, for those few that have changed, almost all have just slightly improved in terms of network diversity, and I'd say the notable exception there is Russia. And I don't mean to point out Russia for any other reason than they're huge on the map and it's pretty obvious but they've gone from having one IPv6 named server to none so their named servers are not visible over IPv6.

This is another graph I showed last year, I showed it up to 2009, it shows the progression of diversity over the previous five years up until 2009. And it showed, you know, a steady increase. And I just updated that with another year's worth of data. So you'll see there that IPv4 diversity has increased just a little, and both TLDs with any kind of IPv6 and TLDs with IPv6 and on diverse networks has also improved.

So in terms of like the summary take away percentages that are probably the most useful way to look at this. These are the numbers I presented last year. We had TLDs with open recursive name servers – and just as a reminder, these are name servers that are vulnerable to a number of security attacks – secondly we have those without diverse IPv4 connectivity – those without diverse IPv6 connectivity, those without any v6 – and finally, TLDs with referrals that can fragment. And I won't go into too much detail because I know we're pressed on time. But more information on what those mean were in the Mexico City slide deck on the ccNSO website.

But, those were last year's figures let's just quickly look at this year's. 2010. This number is more concerning to me. We've had an actual increase in the number of TLDs with open recursive name servers and that should be of concern because I would expect it to be going the other way. And I'm not quite sure that is but it deserves some follow up and investigation. As I showed you on the maps and the graphs, these have improved. We now have only 34% of TLDs have no IPv6 and only 6.4% lack diversity of their IPv4 named servers. Finally, we've had a pretty large increase in the numbers of TLDs whose referrals can fragment. This is really an indication I think that TLDs are, in a sense maturing, they're adding more named servers to provide better redundancy and those named servers they have are adding more v6 glue. So it basically increases the response size that we see in the root zone. But nonetheless that's somewhat of concern and I think that over the next trimester before the next ICANN meeting I suspect we'll do some outreach on that to try and improve that number.

Next topic that I wanted to update you on is the IDN Fast Track.

So far we have received 19 applications for string selection. That process is where you ask for a string to be accepted as a relevant representation of the country's name. Of those, only four have been got through that process. And all four of those since submitted applications to IANA to do the domain delegation process.

One thing I wanted to highlight is there seems to be some confusion that – there's actually two separate processes there. And I'll not go into detail now but some are not clear that there's actually two separate processes involved.

So just to – a little stick figure diagram. This is the process that we have today for – not Fast Track – but for regular ccTLDs. So for you ASCII TLDs, this is what happens.

The proposed sponsoring organization comes to IANA, it submits a bunch of supporting documentation to IANA which IANA then evaluates. Eligibility for a ccTLD comes from the ISO standard. So we take not only the qualifications of the sponsoring organization but also eligibility through ISO. And in turn, you know, provided you meet the criteria, the sponsoring organization gets their top level domain. So that's the current ASCII process.

So what we've done for the IDN Fast Track is take that process and keep it. So we still have that process, although we don't have that eligibility from the ISO list anymore. The eligibility now derives from the Fast Track process. So we have this whole new process at the beginning called string evaluation. And during string evaluation, what happens is you have both the sponsoring organization – proposed sponsoring organization – and the government of the country coming to ICANN and there they submit supporting documentation for the string. That's not clear from this diagram but that's different supporting documentation. But that supporting documentation shows that, you know, .whatever is the correct way to represent that country's name in a certain script.

In turn, ICANN through a separate process will come back with a string approval which involves technical expertise and external consultants who then come back and, you know, approve that string for delegation.

But all that's happening in that first process is acceptance of that string as an appropriate representation of the country. It says nothing about the sponsoring organization as an appropriate operator of that domain.

So that assessment then comes later, so what happens is, now we go back to the original IANA process, but that sponsoring organization with that approval from ICANN adds it to the regular supporting documentation they

would have already provided to IANA, in terms of whether the sponsoring organization is appropriate, whether they have technical competence, operational competence, whether they have local Internet community support and so forth.

So that's kind of a summary of the process. And, you know, looking at it a different way – and I'll just flip through this really quickly.

These are the two phases. So just using a hypothetical example of Greece. Greece comes in the first phase and says, "We want to use this string to represent Greece." That evaluation is performed by this new team at ICANN and that's done with outside experts. That's done with specific eligibility criteria. It's a new process, it's a web form. And that takes a minimum of two weeks but I guess based on the past few months experience, it takes about one or two months.

Then in phase two, you ask, "Can that string be delegated to a specific organization and inserted to the root zone?"

That is the evaluation performed by IANA staff. That uses the standard criteria that we've used for years. Standard root zone process and that can take three or more months. So that's the longer process. I would say it's the much more substantial evaluation process.

And to be clear, I think it's really important to highlight the two are assessing different aspects of the proposal.

The first phase is, "Is this the appropriate label, string for that country?" Second is, "Is the appropriate operator for that domain?"

Next topic I'd like to briefly touch on is signing the root zone.

This is the quick flow diagram and I won't go into any real detail here except to say TLD operators that sign their zone, submit their data to IANA, IANA submits it to DoC, DoC submits it to VeriSign – so it's exactly the same process that we have for regular root zone changes today. The difference is that once it's at VeriSign, VeriSign then signs the root zone, but it does so with a key that's been signed by ICANN.

I don't know if there's been presentations on the differences between KSKs and ZSKs but I won't go into details. I gave a presentation, actually two presentations about it this week already that go into some detail and I can certainly point you to those if you're interested.

I mean, in summary, right now we're rolling out DNSSEC signed root. This progressive roll-out is going from January to the middle of this year. Until it's

fully deployed, it's kind of a state where we're exercising some of the problems that might occur, but it's not actually possible to validate against the signed root zone today. Even though the root is signed today.

The good thing is there's been no significant issues identified so far. Once we're satisfied mid-year that everything is going well, it will be finally implemented and it will be fully deployed.

More information is available at root-dnssec.org.

One thing – accepting the DS records from TLD operators. More or less the same process that you do with NS today. TLD operators should deal with IANA in terms of maintaining DNSSEC.

Final topic for today – WHOIS data accuracy.

You know, we often test the accuracy of the WHOIS data within the IANA return database and it's not necessarily a scientific endeavor it's more a case of we need to contact people and it either works or it doesn't. And because it's a relatively small community of people we deal with, it's the 280 TLD operators, you know, we get a good sense of how many work, how many don't, we know which ones work and which ones don't.

One thing we don't do though is we rarely have need to send physical mail to TLD managers. You know, we might call them, we fax them, we might email them, but we never send you guys letters, we never send you any other kind of communication. So one thing that crossed our minds a couple of years ago was how do we verify the accuracy of some of these addresses. So we started doing this in 2007 – we sent Christmas cards to all TLD operators. And we did it again last year just to try and check how many addressed worked and which ones didn't. And I would say there's a bit better accuracy than last time, that's more or less anecdotal, but I just thought I'd share with you some of the issues we're facing.

First one is, we can't mail Georgia, and I'm just guessing that Georgia is also a state in the U.S. and I think the post office is just thoroughly confused right there.

Chris Disspain: Can I just make it clear, you mean the American post office is thoroughly confused right there.

Kim Davies: Yes. These were dispatched from the USA, so yes, the U.S. postal service, Tbilisi in Georgia, they're probably not that familiar with it. So I'll give them a free pass on that.

But here, I guess this is the most concerning one to us and it's sort of shows I think a real problem that we don't have a good handle how to fix which is here's a bunch of letters that were rejected by the U.S. postal service for legitimate countries. So we can just zoom in on what the country names are – you have Palestinian Territory, Timor-Leste, Christmas Island, Samoa, Guernsey – there was more. But the U.S. postal service doesn't recognize these as countries. And…

Chris Disspain: I wonder if Nigel's on, I wonder if Nigel's online by any chance. Nigel, if you're online and you haven't exploded yet…

Kim Davies: Now I'm certainly very interested in feedback on how we can get these delivered. One of the root zone management staff is actually Palestinian herself and she suggested – she's run into this problem with Palestine all the time – she always writes on her letters, "via Israel" underneath Palestine and seems to get through that way. But, you know, maybe we need to do some more on improving the addresses so we don't have this problem.

But finally, speaking of Israel, this was the most confounding response we got back. For some reason, Tokelau, we got the stamp back that it's not Israel which I thought was pretty self-evident.

But on that, thank you very much and happy to take any questions.

Chris Disspain: Anyone got any questions for Kim? John. Can we have a microphone? Thank you.

I'm just, what amazes me is that we haven't had complaints from people in those places that they haven't received your Christmas cards.

Unknown male: I heard a very funny story from somebody that worked at Network Solutions when they first started charging for domain names and apparently FedEx came up one day, backed a truck up to the office and said, "We can't deliver these things because we don't know what these two character codes mean?"

Unknown male: The question I had was are you able to give us any indication when the first IDN ccTLDs may be delegated?

Kim Davies: The answer is no because the processing is confidential until they are approved. What I can say is the next Board meeting where they possibly could be considered is April 22nd, plus or minus a few days, but I think it's the 22nd. So the next possible date they could be approved is April 22nd.

Chris Disspain: Keith.

Keith Davidson: Kim, just a suggestion that may be useful for the Pacific Islands that you haven't been able to reach. New Zealand postal service does know where these islands are so perhaps if you wanted to mail duplicates to us so we could then post them from within New Zealand, we could do that.

Chris Disspain: Thank you Keith.

Kim Davies: Thanks.

Chris Disspain: Anyone else? Andre.

Andre: I just wanted to ask, are you (inaudible 01:26:12) TS record submission. So did I understand you correctly that we will be able submit you GS records before the root is signed and we will have those records since the first day the root is signed?

Kim Davies: Yeah, that's absolutely our intention.

Andre: Excellent.

Kim Davies: I think – in my more detailed presentation – we said that one to two months prior to our launch date, so probably around the May timeframe we should have that available.

Andre: Excellent. Thank you.

Chris Disspain: Thanks Andre. Anyone else? Okay. So can we all please thank Kim.

(applause)

All right. Now. Thank you Kim. We're almost done for the morning. We're going to have a presentation shortly from .CN if you'd like to get ready to do that.

Gabby can we deal with the logistics of tickets and where the lunch is?

How do people get there, where is it, do we know?

Unknown female: Yes, it's close to the staircase.

Chris Disspain: Okay, so lunch is in a room called – I'm sorry – why don't you use the microphone and you do it.

Gabby: So lunch is an area called the Delegate's Lounge and I think it's close to the staircase and I have tickets. So it's first come, first served, so those of you who are nicest to me can get a ticket. No, I will stand in the door at the end of

this presentation and Bart will stand at the other door and we will hand out tickets.

Chris Disspain: Thank you. Excellent.

Before we go our CNNIC update, we are running a little bit early and I just wanted to read you something.

Yesterday afternoon in the joint Board/GAC session, the ICANN CEO Rod Beckstrom made a statement about security. And this is obviously very relevant in respect to our discussions with him yesterday about DNS CERT.

Now I don't have a transcript – it's a quick note from the audio – not 100% word for word but speed typed so fairly accurate.

So I'll read this out and then we can send it out or whatever.

"Under the Affirmation of Commitment Paragraphs 3 and 9.2, ICANN has a responsibility for the security of the domain name system. The DNS is under attack today as never before. I've contacted the top 20 CEOs of companies and they confirm. The DNS is more fragile than it has ever been and it could stop at any time. It's never stopped before, though the Kaminski attacks slowed it down. It could have fundamentally damaged the DNS, which is used more than three trillion times a day. Your economies depend on it. It could stop or it could be materially damaged. Parts of the system are in your countries. I will be writing to you (that's to the GAC members) asking what is happening. We are seeing new levels of wildcarding at the telecoms, synthesis of DNS operators providing false information. But the system is under severe attack. As CEO of ICANN, I met with heads of security from the three largest countries in the world and they are concerned. I am concerned and sharing this because we need your help. We will be looking for your information and advice on your CERTs and what is going on. I have experience with CERTs in several countries but we need to learn more. I wanted to express my concern to the GAC now because I don't want to wait until Brussels."

So, I'm not really quite sure what to say after that, but Rudolf, you've got your hand up so…

Rudolf Mayer: Well it's just because last time I checked we would qualify as one of the twenty largest registries.

Chris Disspain: He didn't mean the twenty largest registries Rudolf, he meant the twenty top companies in the world, nothing to do with, nothing to do with DNS.

Rudolf Mayer: Oh, okay.

Lesley?

Lesley Cowley: This is an attempt at humor. Nominet is quite an active member of a number of business organizations within the U.K. and indeed I'm a member of CEOs group in the U.K. so I probably know some of these top twenty CEOs and I would be rather surprised if they knew what the DNS was, let alone had developed concerns.

On a more serious note, I most strongly feel that language and approaches like this are very serious. And particularly unhelpful to the development of constructive dialogue on this area. I would go so far to say as they almost feel like scare mongering.

Chris Disspain: I agree.

Lesley Cowley: That was my concern.

Chris Disspain: I agree. I agree. Hang on, I know there's a list of people, just hold on.

I agree. I mean, I don't know what you do Lesley, Rudolf, others, I mean, we are incredibly careful when we're talking about this stuff at home. Incredibly careful not to instill concern where it shouldn't be, you know, it shouldn't be.

The concept that you would scare monger for the sake of getting your own way, maybe I'm being unfair but it seems a little like that, is extraordinary.

Dimitri?

Dimitri: Thank you. Just small remark. If I understood correctly, you mentioned that 20 largest corporations, those (inaudible 01:32:48), it's very simple. I know personally as I work for one of these companies, we simply outsource all network activity out of the companies and nobody cares. It's operators who serve as the infrastructure for these companies.

Chris Disspain: Yes, but we are not talking about, yes all right. Rudolf?

Rudolf: May I suggest that we come up with a reaction from the ccNSO?

Chris Disspain: Sorry, say again Rudolf, I'm sorry?

Rudolf: May I suggest that we draw up a reaction to this statement from the ccNSO?

Chris Disspain: Yeah, I mean, maybe we should. Yuri. And then Calvin.

Yuri:	Yes at this ICANN there is a lot of discussion about DNS Cert and creating like own DNS CERT. So in this if it's serious, really serious, we want quick actions, we need to contact professional CERT.
Chris Disspain:	No, Yurie, I understand completely but we're not talking about, this is not a discussion about DNS CERT. This is a discussion about language being used to scare or to imply rather that the DNS is in imminent danger of breaking. It's got nothing to do with whether you believe – you're in favor of DNS CERT or you're not – okay? So it's just about the language that's being used, all right?
Yuri:	Too strong.
Chris Disspain:	Yes, exactly. Thank you. Calvin. And then Matteau. Calvin was first, then Matteau.
Calvin:	Yeah, I would have to label that language as untrue and irresponsible almost.
Chris Disspain:	Say again Calvin, sorry?
Calvin:	I would have to label that as untrue and irresponsible.
Chris Disspain:	Yeah. Yeah. And Matteau.
Matteau:	Thank you. I think it's very, it's a very strong concern for our community and from what I gather, I don't think the ccTLD community is really what Rod would consider as the most resilient part of the DNS infrastructure and therefore I believe it's important that we demonstrate that we are involved in this and that we care about this statement. But if a comment has to made, we must make sure not to appear as denying whatever situation there is but rather to urge ICANN or its CEO to share with the community whatever facts are behind this rather strong assessments because we're all involved and we're all concerned by this.
Chris Disspain:	Okay. I agree with that.
	Steven?
	Can I just – before you say something – if we're headed towards the possibility and I put it no higher than that at the moment – the possibility of making a comment, of sending something out saying we're concerned – we seem to be kind of heading in that direction. Paul, Paul, can you, take notes because you're going to get the job of drafting something this afternoon. Thank you.
	Steven?

Steven: I think his choice of language is simply appalling. I would like to point out that his choice of language may well be due to cultural issue given that he's American and his government for the last nine years has used this approach of fear and harsh language to browbeat. So I think it's a failure for this community though.

Chris Disspain: Thank you. Sorry, okay, I've got Young-eum and then there was a hand up over there, got you.

Young-eum Lee: Just a request to have the text available.

Chris Disspain: I'm going to send it out now.

Young-eum Lee: Thank you.

Chris Disspain: I'm just sending it out, right, I'm not putting any comment, or doing anything, it's just coming out as I got it. So Jurg and then Lesley. Thank you.

Jurg: Oh, I just want to express my concern about the language and just, I think this is really calling out for regulation and I don't like that at all.

Chris Disspain: Okay. Lesley.

Lesley Cowley: But trying to be more constructive, this may actually be an opportunity for a number of things. This may be an opportunity for some factual information to be provided to your GAC representative if they do not have that already. And an opportunity for some public relations activity about how the industry in your country is being responsible and responsive to the many threats that exist. So I say it could be an opportunity, not just within the ICANN community, but within your own country to raise profile and to actually explain how seriously we take this issue and how much is invested in each of our infrastructures and we continue to make that level of investment.

Chris Disspain: Thank you Lesley. Anyone else?

                     Okay. So I've sent it out. What I suggest we do is that we get Paul to draft something, a couple of us will have a look at it just to knock it into some shape – sorry Paul, that implied that your drafting would be rubbish, I apologize for that – and then we'll send it out to the list and see if we can agree that we should send it off.

                     Yes Dottie?

Dottie: It seems to me that it's important to focus on the word "technical," because the engineers and the technical people always tell the truth because they see

everything in black and white. And I think his lack of technical background is what causes him to be flamboyant about this. And we're really addressing the technical issues so I think it's important to sort of wrap it around that issue.

Chris Disspain: Okay. Thank you. Did Jorg speak? Yes. He did speak. Okay. All right. Thank you. We'll get something out to you as soon as we can.

And let us now hear from our lunch sponsors. CNNIC.

Unknown male: Thank you Chris.

I'd like to keep it quite short because everyone is dying for lunch and I understand. Okay?

Just this January CCNIC released a new statistical report about the Internet development (inaudible 01:40:14) in China. We would like to share with you some information about.

The left chart shows that currently our Internet users in China has been $384 millions and the penetration rate is 38.9%. You know, a year ago, the penetration rate is still below the average level. That's good news.

And the (inaudible 01:40:47) user takes up 90% of all the Internet users.

Last year we have I think we have a very, you know, dynamic growth of (inaudible 01:41:00) users. It accounted for almost two thirds of all the Internet users and actually, due to the development of mobile Internet, there comes some problems.

As you can see, we take a WHOIS accuracy special operations and say it's due to the big development of the Internet mobile network. (Inaudible 01:41:32) major reason that the that teenagers have got a mobile phone for each other and they tend to access Internet via their mobile device and this gives very big leap to the (inaudible 01:41:47). They took advantage of that and, you know, get some pong website to elicit the view page from the teenage Internet users.

Okay, so recently we have got public exposure by our national media that some criminals take advantage of that and register domain names with fake WHOIS information to evade law enforcement investigation. So we're under criticism from the public and we take a special action to remedy that.

What we have been recently doing is that for new registrants, the registrant should submit online application and for existing registrants, they should send a photocopy of ID card or business license to us and CCNIC will validate the WHOIS information against the materials on the WHOIS data.

Due to the, you know, huge amount of work we have just employed 300 extra workers to work for this specific issue. Yeah, that's quite a lot of work.

The progress here is quite good. And after two months lapse over 60 domain names have been validated with WHOIS accuracy and we identified 6,000 more with pong-related and this gets them suspended. And according to just released statistics, it says about over 130,000 websites, personal websites are suspended due to lack of the WHOIS information. But this is another issue because the websites of it is out of our scope.

Okay?

Okay, the last point about (inaudible 01:44:08) cooperation. We recently have quite active in this technical cooperation with our international partners. First is, we set up the (inaudible 01:44:26) lab to develop (inaudible 01:44:29) software. And we just opened a new research lab with Cisco on the addressing research. And we held a DNS org meeting last November and it turns out we got – okay – I guess that's all.

Okay, thank you.

Chris Disspain: Thanks. Are there any questions? Matteau?

Matteau: Thanks for this presentation. There are different scales on some issues between CCNIC and other parties I guess. My question would be, what's the impact on your new registrations by of these new rules, are you seeing any lower rate of registrations or is it flat? What is the impact?

Unknown male: Yes. The data is still, you know, is still preliminary but things like impact for the new registrations is quite huge. And our current registration is kind of, you know, decreased. But I don't have exact number right now.

Chris Disspain: Anyone else? Gentleman over there, behind you Gabby.

Unknown male: Hi, my name is Nicola Whidby (sp??), we are French registrar. And we are credited for .CN. And I was wondering if this new policy was only for a short amount of time or will be applied forever?

Unknown male: Oh, the special operation is just about six months but the WHOIS accuracy audit is going to be permanent.

Unknown male: Okay. So we will have still send information regarding new registrants?

Unknown male: Yeah, sure.

Chris Disspain: Thank you. Anybody else?

Okay, well, we need to say thank you for the presentation and a very special thank you for lunch. So thank you.

(applause)

Okay, lunch is now until two. We're back in this room at two o'clock for DNSSEC. Please be on time and see you then.

ccNSO-members-4-10mar10-en.mp3
00:32:11
Transcribed 03/30/2010 LNC

Unknown male: We communicate with registrars, how we communicate with registrant and so on. The first one is Anne-Marie Eklund from Sweden, from IS.SE. Anne-Marie, can you hear us?

Anne-Marie Eklund: Yes, I can hear you clear loud.

Unknown male: Excellent. So can you be a little bit louder?

Anne-Marie Eklund: Oh yes, of course. I can try to (inaudible 00:00:32) it better.

Unknown male: Okay. The floor is yours, start the presentation.

Anne-Marie Eklund: Okay, thank you very much.

                  Good afternoon ladies and gentlemen. My name is Anne-Marie Eklund Lowinder and I am working as the Quality and Security Manager at .SE, the Swedish registry. And as you probably all know already, we were the first TLD to deploy DNSSEC.

Unknown male: Anne, wait a minute. We can't hear you so we need to fix a little bit the sound.

Anne-Marie Eklund: Okay.

Unknown male: Just a second please.

                  Yeah, can you say something.

Anne-Marie Eklund: Yah, I can continue.

                  We are now turning to the registrars to make them more interested in DNSSEC and in deploying DNSSEC in their own environment and for the benefit of the customers.

                  Is that better?

Unknown male: That's much better.

Anne-Marie Eklund: Okay, thank you.

                  Next slide, please

So starting this year, we had set up a separate business plan for DNSSEC promotion I could say. We have an expansion plan going from 2,000 signed domains today, which isn't much considering the fact that we've been signed since 2005. But the expansion plan will be next year we will have 50,000 domains, the year after 100,000 domains that are signed and 200,000 in year after that.

For the moment we have not only ten but the fact is we have eleven registrars that are offering DNSSEC as a service to the customers. Next year we will try to raise that number to 15 and the year after to 25 and finally to 50 in 2012.

The DNSSEC business plan or this activity is running for a three year period from 2010 to 2012.

And we have quite limited resources. We have four persons working with this part time, they have a lot of other things to do as well, in contact with the registrars, but still. And we don't yet have decided on a specific budget for this activity. We are trying to make it as inexpensive as possible but still I think we have to put in some money in it but we haven't decided yet.

Next slide please.

This is an overview of the project plan and you can see we have 15 different items that we will take care of. Most of them are running during this year. Some of them will continue into 2011. And I will run quickly through every one of these points.

Next slide please.

To start with, back in December we made a market survey for the registrars and we only got 22 replies. We have, I think we have about 150 registrars, but still. Four of them were already offering DNSSEC out of the 11 I was talking about earlier. 13 have plans for DNSSEC whereas 9 of them have plans for this year. I think there is a big need for more information as you can see – 13 of the registrars want more information and 12 of them are interested in getting assistance in how to move forward in deploying DNSSEC for them and their customers.

Number two of the activities was we are collecting a lot of information regarding DNSSEC and one of these are the Certezza Report which is published on our website. And where we went through the different tools available and to see what they could offer for the registrar's point of view. We have the ENISA Report – I'm sure that you have already been aware of the fact that it is existing. It was about the costs and the result was more or less that it is the registrars that will have the most burden from the costs of

deploying DNSSEC – or the name service providers rather – but many registrars are name service providers as well so. And recently there was a CENTR survey asking among different TLDs who are going to deploy DNSSEC and we also have the existing DNSSEC registrars that we are interviewing and trying to get as much out from them as possible about what they want from us and what they want to happen in the future.

Next slide please.

So we are collecting the registrar's requirements and one thing that is very, very clear is they want tools that are easy to use and to a low cost, of course. And that is, I think we have a very clear demand from the registrars for OpenDNSSEC, which is – I will get back to that. So we collected a wish list so to say from the registrars and we published it in a DNSSEC Forum where everyone could comment on it from the registry and other registrars and then we made a final version which we delivered to the OpenDNSSEC development team so they could improve the functions and the features of the OpenDNSSEC (inaudible 00:06:17).

So next slide please.

OpenDNSSEC is a turnkey system for automatic zone signing and key integration so and it's a cooperation between .SE, Nominet, NLNetLabs, SIDN, SURFnet, Kirei and John Dickinson. And I'm sure you have already of this and as far as we know, there are a lot of TLDs who are looking into OpenDNSSEC for their deployment of DNSSEC.

So next slide please.

Number four is that we have started to run a registrars DNSSEC Forum where they can meet and discuss their requirements on different solutions. And we also offer them assistance with tests. We offer assistance with the implementation. And it's all published at "Registrars.se" which is a specific website we have put up for our registrars. And we have one part time external administrator available to advise them in different technical or administrative issues that they need to take care of.

Next slide.

The list of current solutions. We are trying to put that up and have very updated and accurate information about the different solutions that are on the market.

And next slide.

We are going to provide some benchmarks of the solutions together with the final demands that the registrars have agreed upon. We take those different current solutions available and benchmark them with the requirements from the registrars to make sure that the tools available work as good as possible from the registrar's point of view.

Next slide please.

We will have a test DNSSEC campaign where all the interested registrars can test DNSSEC in a production environment during a specific period of time. And we will probably use different examples of code. And there will be some workshops that will handle test domains. But it will still be in a production environment not only in a test environment. Because it's much easier to perform tests in a very production like environment where everything is happening in the real way, not only for test purposes.

Next slide.

When it comes to implementing DNSSEC with the registrars, we will have some OpenDNSSEC ready for tests no later than in May this year. And the registration may start at the latest in June 15th. And the implementation period starts in August. So all the registrars will be able to participate using the same project plan and during this time we will offer training, forum and meetings. We will offer technical support. We will adjust the EPP interfaces that we have if needed of curse. And we will perform a lot of tests before GoLive.

So this is our way to try to get the registrars on board and make them feel safe and have confidence in what they are doing when they deploy or implement DNSSEC.

Next slide.

So in the end of 2010, more registrars will start to use their DNSSEC solutions and we expect nothing else but small volumes from the beginning. But we will see more and more during 2011. And I know for sure that there are a lot of demands for this moment from domain holders in Sweden, most of them are banks and governments, but I know that the pressure is actually raising for the registrars to be able to offer this service.

One thing one can do is the marketing campaign of course, but there must be some sort of marketing campaign that the DNSSEC registrars can benefit from. And we will also have to be able to show some user benefit like, "What's in it for you?" for the domain holders or the customers. And I'm sure that you are already aware of, that is the hard part to explain for people, what is the benefit of deploying DNSSEC since it's actually putting some complexity on the current situation or the traditional DNS if I may say so. But

on the other hand, it's very hard to sell life insurance to people as well because if nothing happens and no one dies, you will not really need that insurance in the first place. But you know, the next step will be to show some really bad cases that happen and which wouldn't have happened if people had had implemented DNSSEC. I'm not sure where to find that kind of bad examples but maybe we will have to.

Next slide please.

Point eleven, item eleven will be improved information. And that will of course be, we are rewriting our entire information that will be published on our website. We will have training material which will be used in our different courses and trainings. We are offering OpenDNSSEC training on different occasions during this spring and also I think there will be in August or September, something like that. But there will be a time schedule up for a lot of different occasions. And technical information is needed of course as well. And finally, questions and answers – so that is improved information very roughly.

Next slide please.

We also offer training for security and other technical consultants within Sweden and we have a lot of very experienced and skilled consultants available for those who really need help to implement DNSSEC and we are offering them training as well. So I think that is a very good idea to get them on board as well so they can help in next stage of that.

Train registrars – that is very hands on, practical training and we are offering it in different parts of Sweden so they don't need to travel a lot. And mostly that will be in Stockholm, Gothenburg and Malmo. Maybe some other place, that depends on the demand and interest that we get in this kind of training workshops.

Next slide please.

I would like to mention – number fifteen is Loopia. That is our largest registrar who has approximately 250,000 domains. They are a pilot for OpenDNSSEC 1.1 and they do offer DNSSEC today. And have an ongoing DNSSEC development project. And they have a plan to reach 25,000 signed DNSSEC domains themselves in 2010. So I think we will have a lot of help from them and from the effort they're making.

Next slide please.

We have our own registrar, .SE Direct which still has approximately 350,000 domains. And we still offer administration of DNSSEC keys today through

our domain manager. But we do not offer DNSSEC as a service for new customers because we do not offer name services. So I think there will be, it will be possible still to administer your keys but we don't offer DNSSEC ourself as a service.

And I think that was my last slide and I believe I'm mostly in time I think.

Next slide and thank you very much. Are there any questions?

Unknown male: Thank you very much. Are there any questions? I don't see anybody so…

Anne-Marie Eklund: Okay. They're always welcome to send me an email.

Unknown male: Yah, sure. Thank you very much for a good presentation. Thank you.

(applause)

Anne-Marie Eklund: Thank you. Bye bye.

Unknown male: Goodbye.

Okay, and the next presentation is from Pavel Tuma. Pavel Tuma is working from CZNIC, Czech Republic and he's mainly responsible for marketing so he's really not a technical guy so I believe his presentation will be not so technical. So Pavel?

Pavel Tuma: Good afternoon. In the next couple of minutes – one, two, three, one, two, three – so in the next couple of minutes, I'll talk about the activities we've done, the approaches we've taken, the lessons we've learned in a technical, administrative and marketing areas to make DNSSEC deployment successful.

I think that the stats speak for themselves. We have almost 90,000 DNSSEC signed domains which is roughly 13% of the whole registry.

When we started to discuss DNSSEC with the registrars, we've borrowed the OpenSource model from Eric Raymond, early release often and we applied this kind of strategy to it. So we started pretty early, eight months before actual DNSSEC deployment. We started to organize the regular meetings with registrars, such as are the "contact days," I'm sure all of you have some sort of the meetings for the registrars. And we wanted to release out the test systems as quickly as possible. Of course, or naturally, we start with signing the CZ zone but that's not what the registrars actually need. They need the DS records, they need the end user records in the registry as well, so we released the testing system for that and for the end user records management in the registry, I think five months before the deployment. So all of them have enough time to play with and to test everything.

And what we learned is really important here to discuss and check with all of them their progress because otherwise they just promise something and at the end, two weeks before the launch they would say, "No, we haven't completed that yet."

We did a small survey six weeks before the public launch and we basically asked our registrars what are their plans after the DNSSEC would be launched. And they told us, all of them told us they will support DNSSEC. Half of them replied that they will use DNSSEC for themselves and some of them wanted to offer additional services regarding DNSSEC to the end users.

And at the launch day, we had all registrars, roughly 30 at that time, that supported DNSSEC.

What was the trick? How is this possible?

Once we released the registry that we are currently running, it's the FRED system, you probably heard of. We released the example client, software for the registrars. And we were quite surprised that 90% of the registrars used the client and haven't used the API to integrate the registry, integrate EPP into their own system. So with the launch of DNSSEC we upgraded the FRED client, there were no other changes other than DNSSEC added, so everything else was the same. But we've made this upgrade mandatory for the registrars. So if they try, after the launch date, if they try to connect to the register without the client, the server disconnects and tells you have to upgrade to new one. So that means that virtually all of our registrars support DNSSEC even if that means that it must be done manually if they don't really integrate, if they don't really support it.

But seriously, the numbers were – registrars with 35% of the market share at the launch date and now it's roughly the registrars with 80% of the market share that really supports DNSSEC and allows end users to use DNSSEC for their own domains.

In our registry it's quite a common scenario that we have roughly 50% of the domains, the registrar of those domains is the DNS operator of those domains, is the DNS host. So does that mean that this registrar has to do the DNSSEC voodoo with generating the keys, the key ikon and the signatures, if they have 100,000 domains like it means that they must generate 100,000 key ikons, etcetera. We try to improve that because – because we did it already once with the simple name server information in the registry.

So could that be improved? That was our question.

And the standard is that in the ccTLD zone there are so-called DS records. These are the end user records and the problem is they are calculated from the public part of the key and the domain name. So it's not possible to use the same DS records for more domains.

But there is a solution. This is the chart of the registry data structure. The top part of the chart is quite unsurprising. In the middle it's called the NS SET where we talked a lot of times a year so I won't explain that again – but it usually means – or the main purpose of name server set is that the DNS operators can re-use only one NS SET with more domains. And we apply the same kind of approach on the DNSSEC data. So we created so-called key SET and it consists of another Tech-C contact because usually the people responsible for the security are different than the people who are responsible for the regular infrastructure. And we changed the way the end users put the information in the registry. We don't accept the DS records but we accept the DNS key and…

(inaudible, audio breaking up 00:23:40 – 00:24:36).

So this is the area we want definitely to improve because no major ISP in Czech Republic supports DNSSEC and does not have the validating resolvers.

We do – for the ISPs, even for the end users, we do the trainings for basic DNS and DNSSEC as an extra module.

The experiences, they attend – the ISPs attend the trainings but as I said so far no major is on board.

And currently we are exploring the options of cooperating with the government, whether there is some space or the possibility to cooperate in here.

Just a quick mention of pricing. What we think – the DNSSEC is not the extra service, it's a feature, it's a feature of the domain, so we don't charge anything. But from the registrar's standpoint, it was seen on the market – after we launched DNSSEC – it was seen as an extra service so one of the main registrars called Active 24 introduced a so-called "Secure domain" product. They charged roughly two Euros per year. The service was quite successful. They told me their investment has returned in just four months of operation.

But now there is a slight shift on the market because it's not seen any more as an extra feature, as extra service. But it's now seen as a standard. We have two registrars, Web4u and Active 24, they signed all the domains they operate under DNS service and they do it for every new domain they register and they

host. They do the DNSSEC signatures and they secure the domain by DNSSEC.

In the communication area, we have a co-marketing program where we cooperate with registrars on marketing communications. The basic idea of the program is to split the cost – the registrar must come with a campaign supporting .CZ domains and then we split the cost of the campaign – registrars put 50% and CZ.NIC pays the other half.

And there is, of course, some maximum limit for this money. So for the 2010 co-marketing program we put in a DNSSEC bonus so the maximum limit can be higher if the registrar have a lot of DNSSEC signed domains. So basically we are giving 10% of the price of the domain back to the registrars for the marketing communication.

And because it's the second year of the co-marketing program, we have seen last year even one just pure DNSSEC campaign in the co-marketing program.

Otherwise, regarding the communication, we try to cooperate basically with everybody, with the registrars, with the end users, with significant end users like banks or media, which sign their domains. Or even the ISPs which enables the validation on their resolvers.

There's a special area of the end user communication. We think the increase of the awareness is always good because everything is interconnected so you can't just focus on the registrars and keep the end users without any attention. Basically we spread the word about DNSSEC. If you've been here on Monday, Andre was talking about the study on DNS attack. We presented this DNS attack live on a few conferences and tried to scare the audience. Because it's really, really very easy to run the attack, it's like 10 minutes of searching on Google and then another 10 minutes to find out how to run the exploit software.

We had last year the big marketing awareness campaign called Dobra domana and one part of the campaign focused on security so we promoted the DNSSEC even here. You can it at that address the part about DNSSEC.

And of course, even in the area of end user education, we cooperated with registrars. We try to get from them the manuals, how they enable, how the end users could enable DNSSEC in their registration system.

Definitely we would like to continue with such awareness campaigns and end user education. And one of the main tools of doing that are the DNSSEC tools which are currently at the beta stage. They are the output of our research labs. They are open source so you can get them, use them, you can download

the source code, you can involve your tech guys and improve them and, of course, spread them.

I will show the live demos of all of them hopefully, if I'm not, all right. Let's move to the first one. It's called DNSSEC Hardware Tester. And as you might know, there's a problem with the small routers and other devices for small and medium companies or the individual users – they are not DNSSEC compatible. So we created a tool that tests this kind of DNSSEC compatibility. You can download that at the address shown at the bottom of the page. There are versions for all the major operating systems. And the result of that, once you test some piece of hardware, the result is sent to the database and then you can browse – on the same web page – you can browse the database of devices which were tested and see the results.

Let me show how the tool looks like and what's the functionality. Okay, here we are. It won't take more than five minutes to go through, so help us to build the database once you are in home, connected over your small device or access point, go through it. And it basically, just eight steps which the first one is updated a list of the devices because otherwise you would have to type what is the vendor of your device, what is the type, what is the…