
TORONTO – GAC Meeting with the ccNSO
Tuesday, October 16, 2012 – 14:00 to 15:30
ICANN - Toronto, Canada

CHAIR DRYDEN: Good afternoon, everyone. let's begin. As you know, our next session is a meeting with the ccNSO, and we have a few agenda items to cover. Perhaps I can turn over to Lesley Cowley, the chair of the ccNSO, to outline what they would like to discuss with us today. And welcome as usual to the ccNSO for joining us today.

LESLEY COWLEY: Thank you, Heather. And it's great to be back again. Good afternoon, everybody. And I know the GAC schedule has been under pressure this week. So keeping some time for us to come visit and converse with you has been very much appreciated.

So we have a list. People who know me will know I always come with a list. So apologies for that. But we thought we'd like to talk with the GAC today on a number of issues. Firstly, we have a presentation from SIDN, the registry for dot NL, and the Dutch government on some cooperative working they've been doing recently on the subject of DNSSEC. And, before those of you that have heard lots about DNS think this is a technical issue, no, we're not going to talk DNSSEC specifically. This is around the cooperative model.

Then we're -- following from that, we're, hopefully, going to move on to an update from GAC colleagues on the ccNSO work on contributions by country codes on ICANN and, particularly, also an update on our work

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

on the strategic plan, which you will probably recall we've presented to you on that issue before. And, finally, a quick update on the study group on the use of country names and the progress of the IDN PDP as well as the framework of interpretation working group that a number of GAC colleagues are also engaged in with the ccNSO.

So, without further ado, I'd like to hand over to our colleagues from the Netherlands for the start of that list, please.

THOMAS de HAAN:

Thank you very much, Lesley. I'm taking the floor as first one, but it could easily be Sieger Springer from SIDN next to me, because one of us has to do the beginning words.

As Lesley outlined, we want to exchange with you, share with you some experiences on the national level in the way we tried to promote and stimulate also the implementation of DNSSEC. What we will do is very shortly is an introduction of my colleague of SIDN. We'll introduce what DNSSEC is in a very basic way without getting into technical details and the way that SIDN itself has a very, let's say, good working methods and practice and which has been a huge success in implementation of DNSSEC. And I will say something about the Dutch government and the way we stimulate and we support implementation. Thank you.

SIEGER SPRINGER:

Good afternoon, everybody. Thank you for the opportunity to share some of our experience regarding DNSSEC deployment in the Netherlands. As Thomas said, my name is Sieger Springer. I'm



responsible for marketing, communication, and new business at SIDN. You probably already know SIDN; but, just to make sure, we are the registry for dot NL. SIDN is a private, independent organization. And we work -- ah, the presentation is missing. Sorry. There it is. Let me repeat.

We're an independent, private, not-for-profit organization. We are responsible for the dot NL name space since 1996. This name space has grown over the period of more than 15 years time from 10,000 domains to over 5 million at this moment.

This makes us the third largest ccTLD in the world, but we are also happy to say that we are one of the safest ccTLDs. And that is according to a McAfee study, which was recently held.

Throughout the years, SIDN has invested to make dot NL and better and safer zone. Therefore, it also made sense to us to also invest in DNSSEC. DNSSEC is widely acknowledged to be an important addition, and it helps to make the DNS more secure.

Next slide, please.

Okay. Although most of you are probably familiar with DNSSEC, I shall briefly explain what it is and what it does. I'm not a techie, so it will be really simple. I hope, it's enough.

It stands for DNS security extensions. And what it does, it ensures that sender authentication and data integrity of DNS is ensured. Yeah.

Simplified, we can say that, when an Internet user looks up a domain signed with DNSSEC, they have a certainty that they don't end up at a



malicious Web site. And this used to be a real big issue. Next slide, please.

There's only one big issue; and that is mass adoption with DNSSEC has not really taken place yet, although several countries and CCs and generic TLDs have introduced DNSSEC.

And this is due to a so-called chicken and egg or bootstrapping issue. I shall briefly explain that. DNSSEC can only be effective if a lot of domains are signed in a zone, making this worthwhile for ISPs to develop and thus completing the DNSSEC chain of trust.

DNSSEC can only be useful or successfully implemented if these three players implement DNSSEC. There's another issue which makes for this bootstrapping issue. At the registrant business level, there's not really a business case. That makes the registrars and ISP very important, also, for the successful implementation of DNSSEC are reluctant to invest in DNSSEC.

So next slide, please.

So what did SIDN do to solve this or to tackle this problem? We focused on three key areas and simply said we had to make sure DNS worked the registry level. We started a project along with DNSSEC step-by-step in 2009. And the project was finished only last May when our systems were ready for our registrars to massively sign their domains.

Another very important factor is awareness for DNSSEC. So we worked on that more or less simultaneously with the technical implementation of the DNSSEC at our registry level.

So we helped to inform registrars. We held workshops explaining DNSSEC, and we trained them throughout the Netherlands with an online DNSSEC course.

And also we worked with other stakeholders. Netherlands is known for very important players in the Internet like SURFnet and NetLabs. And we also work with the government to create a DNSSEC dedicated Web site explaining all there is to know about DNSSEC.

There was a good example of cooperation with major players and stakeholders. We also sponsored software development of software suppliers to the registrars and to ISPs. And you have to think of initiatives like open DNSSEC, bind, and power DNS in the Netherlands.

But we also engaged in active promotion and PR of DNSSEC. Our technical experts wrote various articles in leading magazines in Holland and gave presentations on DNSSEC throughout the country.

But the main theme of this presentation and also breakthrough is that we had DNSSEC at high-level registrants. And this registrant was our own government. In close cooperation with our government, we got DNSSEC on the comply or explain list of the Dutch government. Thomas will later explain what it is.

But it means that it is virtually mandatory for government Web sites to sign and government ISPs to validate DNSSEC.

The third thing we did at SIDN we came up with a financial incentive for our registrars. This is to overcome the bootstrapping issue and giving them this business case for implementation of DNSSEC at their level.



And we gave them a discount of almost 8% on a yearly basis, and this is more or less set for a period of two years. So every domain site in our zone the registrar receives a discount of 8% of its yearly fee.

So what was the result of all this work? We set out a schedule to go to an ambitious number of almost 1 million signed domain names in 2013. Thanks to our initiatives, we worked together with the government and all the other stakeholders. We managed to really make a big progress, and at this moment, we are at over -- well over a million signed domain names making Netherlands the biggest DNSSEC zone in the world.

I would like to give the work to Thomas who can highlight what the government has done and why DNSSEC was important to them as well.

THOMAS de HAAN:

Thank you, Sieger. As you see, this breakthrough had nothing to do with our government. But in this case it was a trick which Dutch people are known of. They are very keen on their money, meaning that this financial incentive was really a major breakthrough, which I don't know if it works for other countries, but it works in the Netherlands.

On our side, our part is, let's say, more on hands-off -- sorry. Yes. And next slide, please.

Our part of the story is more on a different level. I think we, as Sieger said, we have a -- we have a government standards body which we also saw from our ministry, which, basically, in order to promote open standards and to promote interoperability, we decided that we need a couple of important infrastructural and so on service level standards to



be included. It's not easy to get on the list, and there are many requisites for really demonstrating that this -- you should be on the standards list. When you're on the standards list, it means that all government agencies should comply and should in every -- let's say, ICT project which is self-contracted or doing yourself, they should use the standards. If they don't use it, they should have big reasons to explaining why you don't do it. We call it the comply or explain list. I think many other countries know the same system. DNSSEC, as Sieger told, was presented by experts in SIDN to be included. It's an independent body. So we couldn't, let's say, force this to be on the list, but, of course, we used all the supports which we could give to have it quickly listed on the list. Same we did with IPv6 already, I think, one or two years ago, which means IPv6 is also compulsory for government agencies.

And one thing which I can add is that DNSSEC, of course, is a little bit different than another open standard, which maybe are more targeted to services and other applications. And DNSSEC is, of course, infrastructural wide. It's international. It creates a complete chain of trust, basically, in the DNS to be sure that the domain name you asked for is the domain name it says it is.

And, therefore, because of that and because of the fact that DNS is relatively young, we also put a lot of effort in stimulating this. We also cooperated in the first export group with SURFnet and other Dutch agencies or Dutch institutions to promote it.

And, being part of this government standards body means, of course, that we should implement it ourselves, which is, I think, an important



thing, because, as a government, we should also act on things which we promote. So we should lead by example. Next slide, please.

Yes, I think we already covered this. Our presentation we gave, we hope it will give other governments also a way of using themselves or maybe taking over this practice we have in the Netherlands. Of course, we also, from both SIDN and ccNSO side, is the GAC side, we are also interested in other projects, other countries to implement the DNSSEC. And maybe people would like to share this.

So, in case there's any questions, we don't have a Web site reference. But we can, of course, afterwards give you more inference by e-mail about where we -- you can find this best practice we have used. Thank you.

CHAIR DRYDEN:

Thank you very much for that presentation.

The scribing is taking place. It's just that we can't see it, because the server that's supposed to be streaming the scribing is down. So we will have a record of this meeting. Okay.

So thank you again for that presentation. Are there any questions or comments for the -- yes. Please, Norway.

NORWAY:

Thank you, Chair. And thank you very much to SIDN and Netherlands for this presentation. You mentioned, Sieger, that you had sort of virtual training and so on. So my question is what kind of feedback have



you got from the registrars? So they, in general, I suppose, when you have a million domain signs, that's quite a lot. I suppose, in general, they have been cooperative and good feedback. But, because that is -- I think, different countries, I think, have been discussing what about the registrars, the technical complexity of adding DNSSEC into the DNS management and so on. So I was just, in general, what sort of the feedback from the registrars? Sort of, are they, in general, happy and they have gone -- they have gone through all the sort of training and skills requirement that they need to actually do the job and so on? So that's the question. What's the kind of feedback you've gotten from the registrars in general? Thanks.

SIEGER SPRINGER:

Thank you for the question. I think, like in many countries, the registrars have been reluctant to take up DNSSEC. But maybe also thanks to our training and promotion of DNSSEC, they have become aware that DNSSEC can also be an opportunity for them. And that's what happened in Holland. Many of the early adopters amongst the registrars have used this to promote themselves as an extra special secure registrar to their clients. And that's a major change in their perspective to DNSSEC. And I think that's a very good -- how do you say that -- benefit from our program. So we really helped them to change their view on DNSSEC. We showed them that it's secure; the technology works; and they can real really focus on their business at the moment without hassle of making things work because it works perfectly. Is that clear?



CHAIR DRYDEN: Thank you very much. Next, I have Singapore, please.

SINGAPORE: Thank you very much, Netherlands, for sharing with us your success of DNSSEC implementation. I just want to know DNS also depends on the collaboration of ISPs. I just want to know are all your ISPs supporting the DNSSEC implementation? And, also, do you give any incentives to them just like the registrar? Thank you.

NETHERLANDS: Thank you. We are currently working on this next phase. Because we made the first step with the registrars. And we have got some volume just to also convince the ISPs to take up DNSSEC and validate the domains. But we are currently working on it. We're working on continuation of this project. But, of course, it's very important to finalize this chain of trust with the validation of DNSSEC by our ISPs. So that's the next phase in our approach to implementing deploying DNSSEC in the Netherlands.

CHAIR DRYDEN: Thank you. Are there any other questions or comments? Lesley, please.

LESLEY COWLEY: So one of the reasons why we wanted to put this on the agenda today was a very recent example of a registry and the government working together. So, using that kind of frame of reference, I wondered if there



were lessons that you've learned, not from working on DNSSEC generally. But, in terms of cooperation, what's worked well? What maybe you would do differently if you had your chance again? What issues are transferable to other examples of working together?

SIEGER SPRINGER:

Well, the main thing is I think trying to find or look up each other even earlier than we did with DNSSEC. So we have a close relationship with our government. Internet security and stability of our zone is very important. So we already discussed those things on various levels. But, in the case of DNSSEC, we could have looked them up a little bit earlier as well. But, nevertheless, we are very happy with the result. And the way we work together is very open, direct, and I can say also successful.

THOMAS de HAAN:

Maybe you can add to this that we are a small country. But we also have a very, let's say, direct line, as Sieger said, meaning that you can -- if you have this direct line and you have the trust, which is, I think, essential between both parties, and then you also you can realize things much more quickly than otherwise. So you have to have a very close cooperation and getting to know each other very well. For example, I think we mentioned it; but we didn't mention. It wasn't on the sheet. But SIDN organized a web seminar for government agencies in order to get acquainted with DNSSEC and in order to learn to teach them to implement it. These things are relatively very easy to do for us. It's just a question of, let's say, a couple of weeks and getting the people together. So, if you have the trust basis and the direct links, then I think you have almost 80% of the job done. Thank you.



CHAIR DRYDEN: Thank you for that. Did you want to add, Roelof?

ROELOF MEIJER: Yes, please, Heather. Thank you. I'm Roelof Meijer. I'm the CEO of SIDN. Thomas has it on his slide. I think also the governments can really help this kind of a process by leading by example. They can give the good example. But also, by adopting a technology, they create quite a large demand. And, although it is difficult to accomplish across all ministries, even a single ministry as a start makes already a big difference. So it's giving a good example and creating demand as a government.

CHAIR DRYDEN: Thank you. Okay. I see no more requests on that agenda item. Perhaps we can move to the next.

LESLEY COWLEY: We will indeed. Okay. So the second item on our agenda was an update for GAC colleagues on discussions regarding ccTLD contributions to ICANN, which is a long standing subject and also our current contributions on the ICANN's strategic plan, for which I'll turn over to Byron Holland and Roelof Meijer who are chairs of the ccNSO working groups. Byron, if we can start with you.

BYRON HOLLAND:

Thank you, Lesley. My name is Byron Holland. And I'm president and CEO of CIRA, the ccTLD for dot CA and here in Toronto, also your host. So welcome all of you. It's a pleasure to have you all here.

I would just like to take a moment to, before I get started, echo the comments that we've just heard from Roelof in terms of government support around DNSSEC. As operators trying to roll it out, it makes a very significant difference if governments can stand by our side and adopt DNSSEC. So I would strongly reiterate Roelof's comments there. That said, I'm chair of the finance working group. A number of you have heard from this working group before, most recently in Prague. I will take you back there just for a moment, because it was in the Prague meeting where we had certain expectations of ICANN to produce financial information to help us in our work in -- better understanding and determining what an appropriate financial contribution from the ccNSO community to ICANN would be. With Xavier as the new CFO, they had been using, prior to him, a tool known as the expense area grouping. But Xavier was not confident that it was accurately reflecting what we needed in terms of information and at that time suggested that we needed to find a different path. That waylaid us a little bit, but also has provided us an opportunity to step back and reflect and were we on the best path possible anyway? Because, fundamentally, the philosophical underpinning of the dialogue at that point was a fee for service oriented model. ICANN provides services to the cc community. We should pay something for them. What was that number? It was a pretty straightforward fee for service oriented model.

During the Prague meeting and over the course of the summer and in dialogue with Xavier during that period, we believe that possibly there's



a better course, a more holistic approach to the relationship between ICANN and the ccTLD community. And that's one based not so much on a service -- fee for service model but from a value exchange model. As you know, the CC community is very different from the G space community. We do our own policy development. We're beholden to the jurisdictions that we're in. We have our own register channel, own registrar channels, et cetera.

So what we've been discussing, like I said, is a more holistic approach where we're looking at the value exchange from ICANN to the CCs but also from the CCs to ICANN. And some things are fairly straightforward. In terms of putting a number to it, we have secretariat support. ICANN can very clearly identify how much that costs, and they can probably make a very good argument that we should contribute to those costs.

We, on the other hand, can also make that case. And, as the host here, I can very clearly and specifically tell you how much it costs to do this. And that's part of our contribution into the ICANN fold, let alone the actual cash contributions that the CCs all make. But there are other more shared areas, like IANA services, root zone management. Very important to us. But we're certainly not the only ones who use that. So what is an appropriate percentage of that shared activity? So we're looking at a more holistic way. But we're also looking, not just at the purely objective financial elements that we can crisply calculate, but also what other values do we bring? When ICANN talks about internationalization, what does that really mean? Part of it is you're all here. But part of it is we're the feet on the street in all of these countries. We're the ones with offices, speaking the languages,



responsible for local Internet communities, bringing those communities' voices forth.

We actually help underpin the multistakeholder model. Is that of value? I think we would certainly argue that, and ICANN also argues that that is the case.

So there's both an objective pure finance-oriented component to the relationship but then also a more subjective value exchange between the parties. And that's really the way that we're approaching this dialogue right now.

As mentioned, we had hoped to be a little further along the path. But, having experienced the speed bump, we've also had the opportunity to reflect and we're going to be working on the value exchange model between here and the Beijing meeting. And we've done some preliminary work. Xavier has provided some preliminary numbers on some of the subject areas. So I'm cautiously optimistic that we're going to be able to find a path with this redefined approach to it. So that's where we find ourselves today. Thank you.

CHAIR DRYDEN:

Thank you very much for that update, Byron. As a result of the exchange that we had with you in Prague, we did include some language and advice, in fact, in our communique. And there were two main points that we made that -- regarding financial budgeting and allocation of resources between and within the different constituencies of ICANN, we expressed that this is a matter of fundamental importance in our view and also advised that there be the necessary tools. And we



thought this was urgent for reporting on the distribution of allocation of financial resources between and within ICANN. So those are the two main points we made.

And a few days ago we received a response. Firstly, ICANN has responded or the board has responded that they have implemented the infrastructure required. And then, secondly, that ICANN is developing with the board a set of financial reports on both the ICANN operations and the new gTLD program. So that's our response, which sounds like we're working on it, if I may paraphrase in that way.

BYRON HOLLAND:

Well, first off, thank you for putting that in the communique. Because I certainly think it is beneficial to the cause that we believe in. I would echo that. Having worked with Xavier, I think that our -- the finance working group certainly believes that more sophisticated tools are in place. There is without a doubt a much higher degree of focus on this space. And I know, from my dialogue with board members, that I think we have their attention and they're definitely working on it.

CHAIR DRYDEN:

Thank you. Are there any questions or comments for Byron on this? U.K., please.

UNITED KINGDOM:

Thank you, Chair. And thank you, Byron. And this is an important issue. No doubt about it. I just wanted to add, as you may have noted, from



the high-level meeting yesterday, if you were able to attend that or heard reports of that, that the U.K. and Denmark have proposed for consideration as an issue for the second accountability and transparency review under the Affirmation of Commitments that transparency and accountability on all financial matters be an issue for that review. So I just wanted to underline that as a recent development on this area which signals, certainly, U.K. and Denmark's concern that -- that the deficiencies and perhaps scope for improvements in accountability and transparency be looked at by an independent review team. Thank you, Chair.

CHAIR DRYDEN: Thank you, U.K. I have United States, please.

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA: Thank you, Madam Chair. And thank you, Byron, for your presentation. But I also really want to thank you for managing to pull off what you said you could do yesterday, which is to change the weather. So thank you for today's absolutely beautiful weather for us. I really appreciate it.

Secondly, I was quite taken with your very innovative, far more creative approach to the issue of financial contributions. And I do hope you will continue to keep us posted because I think it's not only pragmatic, but it's creative at the same time. So I think I certainly welcome that.

And, finally, I did want to concur that we certainly consider you -- and I'm just speaking for myself, but I could be surprised if colleagues would



disagree -- that the ccTLD community is a very valuable, if not invaluable -- I suppose that's a better word -- you know, members of the community here and that you should absolutely be invited to partner with ICANN and with the GAC. We should all be part of the internationalization efforts. But I think it's good to sort of keep reminding those who are developing those specific initiatives not to really superimpose new things without sort of consulting with the people whose feet are already on the ground. So I wanted to concur with that. Thank you.

CHAIR DRYDEN: Thank you, United States. Shall we move?

LESLEY COWLEY: We'll move on. So our second element of that discussion was an update on the ICANN's strategic plan working group, which GAC colleagues will remember is something also where we have feet on the ground and have talked about this with you before. Roelof?

ROELOF MEIJER: Thank you, Lesley. Yeah, once again, my name is Roelof Meijer. This time I'm speaking as chair of the ccNSO strategic and operational planning working group.

You're probably aware that ICANN published a draft strategic plan 2013-2016 in September. As a working group, we went through this plan. And our first conclusion was that there was very little change with -- in respect to the previous version of the plan, the 2012-2015 version.



A second conclusion was something like over 90% of our recommendations or suggestions for improvement of that earlier plan had not been implemented in the present version.

We had a session with ICANN staff. And, during that session, it became clear to us that there was so little change in the plan for at least for one reason and, of course, the new CEO had not been really taken up in the process, which is, I think, fairly logical because the plan came out something like mid September. I think that's about a few weeks after he started.

It also became clear to us that ICANN expects that the whole process of coming up with a strategic plan and the way the strategic plan looks will change somewhere in the first half of next year.

So, on the basis of that as a working group, we recommended that ICANN stops working on that '13-'16 version of the strategic plan. Because there's not really a point in doing so. The present plan is relevant until 2015. We know that long before that, there will be something else, hopefully, better. What we heard from, in the first highlight of intentions, we think that quite a few of our recommendations will then be taken into account. So there's not really a point in proceeding on this way. It's also -- I think ICANN risks sending out the strange message if you come up with a plan that extends until 2016.

Well, you know in 2013 already you're going to significantly change it.

CHAIR DRYDEN: Thank you for that update. Are there any comments on that? On the strategic plan? Okay. Well, we can certainly take note of that. Thank you.

Italy, please?

ITALY: Just a question. Is this the result of the working group is public?

ROELOF MEIJER: I will repeat myself along the same lines as the public forum. It's really public, but we will also do two things in writing. The first is that we put what we just said in writing as input for the present process. And, as input for the new process we will come up with a high-level document of a major recommendations on the previous versions of the strategic plan that have not yet been taken into account.

LESLEY COWLEY: It's also public, Stefano. We had our engagement with the board this morning. And this was a topic of discussion there. And, in addition to Roelof's comments, we also talked a little bit about areas of the community giving input and then not feeling as though you are heard. And that was of concern to us. Now, the ccNSO is not most certainly expecting all of our suggested changes to be taken into account.

And it's quite difficult when an area of the community makes input and it seems to go into a black hole somewhere and none of it be reflected in the strategic plan.



So very much I think the ccNSO is looking forward to the new process and to exploring how all of the areas of the community can feel that they have input and either that's been taken on board or understanding why a different path has been taken.

And I'm sure under the new leadership that there is a commitment to doing just that.

ITALY:

Okay. May I just say something. This is important for us, and although the GAC never entered so directly in the strategic plan or in commenting the budget and so on.

But in view of the new review panel on accountability and transparency, no doubt that this is, for us, good food for thought.

HEATHER DRYDEN:

Thank you, Italy.

Are there any more requests for the floor? No. Okay.

Lesley.

LESLEY COWLEY:

Okay. So item number 3 is the Framework of Interpretation Working Group update, for which Keith Davidson, the chair of that working group.



Just a reminder to colleagues, this is a working group where the ccNSO is working closely with the GAC. It's of high interest to many of us, if not all of us.

KEITH DAVIDSON:

Thank you, Lesley, and my name is Keith Davidson and I am from New Zealand and I'm the chair of the FOI Working Group and also vice chair of the ccNSO Council.

And the Framework of Interpretation Working Group was established around two years ago to look at the outcomes of what was formally called the delegations and redelegations working group which compiled a study of -- or an investigation into all of the redelegations and delegations of ccTLDs that had occurred since the inception of ICANN and reported a number of issues that related to those individual delegations and redelegations. So the Framework of Interpretation Working Group was established to provide a framework that would be more robust and provide more predictable results.

Next slide, please.

So today, this is the outline of the presentation I'll give. The scope of the framework, the process that we're using, the topics that we are interpreting, our recent activities, the topic of consent, the topic of significantly interested parties, and the topic of revocation, which are the three substantive chapters of our work.

Next slide, please.



For the working group, the applicable policies and guidelines are RFC 1591 and the GAC principles of 2005. There are a number of other founding documents that have been floated, but these two have met our threshold and provide us our guidance.

As I said, we're seeking to add color and depth to these existing policies and guidelines, and definitively out of scope is us inventing any policy or guideline on the fly that's under our remit.

For example, part of the work of the Delegation and Redelelegation Working Group was highlighting that there was no policy on the retirement of ccTLDs, so we've identified that as an area that needs policy. So it's its work to be done by another working group under a policy development process in the future.

Also, the IANA functions contract, including the contract implementation issues or procedures is beyond our scope.

And could I add that I also feel out of scope is for us to discuss matters relating to any individual delegation or redelegation, and that while we're happy to talk individually with people who may have had an unusual experience, we can't provide any advice in that regard.

Next slide, please.

The process is that we've divided our work into these various topics, themes, or chapters, and we work -- we initially have a draft on a topic which then goes to the working group, and we kick it around several times until we have what we believe is an acceptable consensus for a draft set of interpretations for that topic.



We then undertake a public consultation on that draft set of interpretations. We review the comments and input from that public consultation, and we prepare a final report on that topic.

Next slide.

We are seeking GAC support and ccNSO support for each of the final reports as they come up, and the GAC has indicated its support for that as a process but reserving its right to give a final seal of approval when we get to the end of the whole process, so a final review at that point.

And the intent is that the final report, the final framework of interpretation, be submitted to the ICANN Board by the ccNSO, including confirmation of support by the GAC and the ccNSO, and that by utilizing that vehicle, if it pleases the GAC to that degree, the GAC would be providing it to the Board as advice and, therefore, binding on the ccNSO and future delegations and redelegations.

Next slide.

The topics -- the three major topics. Consent, we have completed our final report which the GAC gave its interim approval for.

We have also completed our work on the significantly interested parties. And again, the GAC have provided some input, and we are preparing our final report and some comments on the GAC's input to that is being considered at the working group's meeting this Thursday.

We -- Our third significant area of work is what we're currently working on. That's revocation, and RFC 1591 refers to revocation of a delegation

of a ccTLD, and we're trying to understand that and what that might mean vis-a-vis unconsented redelegations.

And that's taken us quite some time. We were working on it in Prague, and we may finish our work on that topic here or it may progress a little further.

Once we've done those three major topics, we will finalize our glossary or terminology paper, and this is to provide a set of wordings to be used for delegations and redelegations by IANA so we've got consistent terminology and a consistent understanding of what that terminology might mean.

And then, also, working on recommendations for IANA reports and how they might be structured. And so that's the topic once we finish the rest of the work.

Next slide, please.

Since Prague, the working group has met six times by teleconference. We published a progress report on our activity since Prague, which is a link through the ccNSO agenda to this meeting. And as I said, we're currently working on revocation.

Next slide. Next slide, please.

The final report, if anyone is interested, the final report on consent can be found there. And it will be included in the final total document from the FOI to the ccNSO and the GAC in due course.

Next slide, please.



Next slide.

I think we've really covered that.

Next slide.

And, yes, working steadily on this topic of revocation. We think our first public consultation probably will occur -- I guess summer 2013 is a misnomer because it's summer for some and winter for others, but by Beijing, ICANN, we believe, will be in the process of consulting on this topic.

Next slide, please.

And the working group is meeting 1:00 p.m. to 4:00 p.m. on Thursday in Harbour C, and as I said revocation is the focus. And as always, observers are welcome, so if anyone in -- any of our GAC colleagues would like to come along, and I hope our GAC members of the working group will be in attendance and that you'll have your work completed by then. I know in the last couple of meetings it's been quite tight in terms of GAC communique time and our working group times, but I hope you can make it.

Next slide, please.

And there's a link to all our working group documents and the contacts for myself and Bernie Turcotte who is the ICANN support person for this working group.

With that, thank you.



HEATHER DRYDEN: Thank you very much for that thorough update on the work of the Framework of Interpretation Working Group, which relates to country codes and the various documents that exist in relation to delegation and redelegation matters for country codes.

So are there any questions for Keith about the working group?

I don't see any.

So we do have an invitation to join their meeting on Thursday to catch up with what's happening there. And also GAC members may wish to join in other ways or participate in other ways, and we are welcome to do that. We have assigned leads and others who have been trying to participate, but the door is open.

Okay. All right.

So I think we can move to the next item.

LESLEY COWLEY: Okay. Thank you.

So item 4. Only two more left. Don't worry.

Item 4 is the study group on the use of country names. We have a study group ongoing on that, and I'd like to call on Paul Szyndler to introduce that subject.

PAUL SZYNDLER: Thank you, Lesley.



Good afternoon. My name is Paul Szyndler, and I am chair of the Country and Territory Names Study Group. In my job I work for AuDA, the dot AU manager. And as ever, it's a pleasure to be back in this room again.

I've presented to the GAC on two separate occasions regarding our work, both in Costa Rica and Prague, so I'll refrain from going into a very detailed explanation about our scope and charter.

But for those that might have missed it, I will say that the study group was established by the ccNSO Council in late 2010, and as with any good study group, we draw our membership from across the ICANN community.

We're due to conclude our work in the first quarter of 2013, and that will be a report to the ccNSO Council, and, if appropriate, recommendations for further work.

In brief, we are looking at ICANN's policies and practices as they relate to country and territory names. Something that will be of great interest to GAC members.

Specifically, we're looking at the IDN landscape, ccTLDs, new gTLDs, and anywhere in the policies that the issue of country names comes up.

As everyone will appreciate, there isn't necessarily consistency across the different policies. And this of itself may not be a problem. But we're also gazing into the future as our market becomes more complex with IDNs and new gTLDs to see whether there is and will continue to be predictability and consistency in how country and territory names are



treated, or if there are any gaps, potential problems that might need to be addressed.

And I stress that it is not within the study group's charter to propose additional protection for country names, but we will, if necessary, flag areas where refinement may be required.

With that, I just wanted to highlight two particular issues to the GAC today. And the first is on the screen. That is a survey that was conducted or is being conducted by UNESCO on the study group's part.

It surveyed 39 member states of UNESCO, and I stress that these countries weren't selected by the study group. They were selected by UNESCO, given their expertise. And the brief was simply could you please ensure geographic diversity, linguistic diversity, diversity of script and, if possible, include countries that may have more than one official language.

It was a very simple survey. It's only ten questions. I've presented that here before, but it's basically in what ways do you represent your country? What is your two-letter ISO code? What is your three-letter code? What is your country's long- and short-form name? And what is your country's name in the six languages of the U.N.? Et cetera, et cetera.

To date, the survey response hasn't been overwhelming. We understand that these things take time, and hopefully we've left ourselves and administrations enough time to do this.

The ones that are in bold and underlined up there are the ones who have provided responses to date, and the data that we're getting from them is very good.

I'll give you an example of New Zealand, Frank, where of course the responses came back both in English and the Maori language. And it's very interesting to look at how Azerbaijan or Armenia or Greece is referred to in the Maori language. It may not be consistent with anywhere else. So this is really a data-gathering exercise.

So the purpose of my request today is basically if there are any GAC members here or following remotely or see the briefing afterwards whose countries are up there and you think that you may be in a position to assist us with really making sure that the survey has come across the right person's desk, perhaps you may know someone in your administration, perhaps it may be you that may be able to assist with the survey, I stress this is obviously a very unofficial approach, made on a one-by-one basis and that UNESCO is continuing to try to solicit more input through posts. Hopefully there may be some members here who could assist us, and if association have a word with either myself or Bart Boswinkel from ICANN staff because that would be of great assistance.

The final point I want to make is this survey will soon be circulated to the rest of the ICANN community. So we will send that letter formally to the S.O. and AC chairs, including Heather -- now you know. And that letter will, again, simply be a request to help with the survey and to help gather data for this process. It will not be something that requires GAC plenary consideration or consensus. But if members could assist, again, on an individual basis, that would really be greatly appreciated.



Because again, the more data we get back, the better our recommendations will be, and the better final outcome. So thank you very much.

HEATHER DRYDEN: Thank you for that, Paul.

I see Greece and I see U.K.

GREECE: Thank you, Madam Chair, and thank you for this presentation. I have two questions, actually.

Why some countries are underlined in bold and some other not? And the second question is that I'm not aware of this questionnaire, so I will be very happy to help, and if there is the possibility to have this questionnaire, it will be very helpful.

Thank you

PAUL SZYNDLER: Yes. Thank you, again. Firstly, the ones that are bolded and underlined have responded and have provided information back. When we aggregate this data and begin to analyze it, obviously that which has been received through UNESCO official channels will be granted a particular status in comparison to the broader data gathering we get within the ICANN community. But this is precisely why I brought the issue up here, because there are people within the GNSO -- ccNSO, I'm sure there's people -- ccNSO who are close to government and know



who the right people are who they should speak to and I was hoping this may be the same case here. So, again, any assistance you can offer will be greatly appreciated.

HEATHER DRYDEN: Thank you.

A quick reply, Bart?

BART BOSWINKEL: Yes, just in addition. What you should remember with the UNESCO survey, this goes through UNESCO channels. And that's probably one of the reasons why you haven't seen it service. I don't know how your UNESCO channels go, but this is specifically done through the UNESCO channels.

HEATHER DRYDEN: Thank you.

U.K., please.

UNITED KINGDOM: Thank you very much. It's very interesting. I just wanted to intervene to correct a name on that list, actually. Maybe a typo.

Number 7 under Latin American/Caribbean should be St. Lucia, L-U-C-I-A.



When I went there, I don't remember encountering anybody who spoke French.

I hope that's helpful.

HEATHER DRYDEN: Okay. Instant feedback from the GAC.

All right.

India, please.

INDIA: Thank you, Chair. We are not knowing they received this kind of (indiscernible) from UNESCO. If we ignore, we'll get it here? Or what channel it is coming up? We are not aware.

So although we support this study, and we would like to be participating in that.

HEATHER DRYDEN: Thank you, India.

So I will look for the invitation to arrive in my inbox and will forward that to the GAC list so you are able to reply based on your interest.

And thank you for bringing this update to us today.

Okay. So I think we have one more item, Lesley.

LESLEY COWLEY: We do, indeed, and this is the opportunity to get a number of acronyms into one sentence.

So this is an update on the ccNSO IDN ccPDP from our secretariat, Bart.

BART BOSWINKEL: To make it more complicated, this was from Working Group 1, and we have a Working Group 2, as well.

Okay. This is about probably -- this is on the -- the update on the draft policy for the selection of IDN ccTLDs. So to put it in perspective, in time, it is -- it should replace the current fast-track methodology, which is not a policy. So in that sense, it's very -- yeah. We've been working on it for quite some time.

Again, for general context, it builds on the current fast-track methodology. It takes into account, say, three years of experience with the fast-track methodology, two reviews, and the input received both from the GAC ccTLD communities and others.

The major changes, if you compare the methodology and the overall policy, are in the areas of confusingly similarity. There is a placeholder for IDN variant management. Waiting -- We're waiting for the outcome of the variant issue program of ICANN, and that might take some time. But in time, that needs -- so the policy needs to be revisited to take that into consideration, but we didn't want to wait for it.

And finally, there is an update and clarification of the processes involved in -- in the selection of an IDN ccTLD according to the methodology.



So there is clearer separation between criteria and processes. The fast-track process itself and the implementation plan, it's a mix of procedures, processes, and criteria, all along each other. So that's the way it's been drafted.

I think the major issue over the last year, and not just, I think, in the GAC but also in the ccTLD community, has been the issue of confusingly similarity.

In San Francisco, there was a small working group who started to focus on confusingly similarity with more input from the technical community. That, again, didn't move fast forward, so at the end it was brought back to the working group itself. And based on the final discussions we had at the Prague meeting and afterwards, we came up with the draft overall policy, which is now published.

So I'll go just briefly through the major changes regarding confusingly similarity.

The first and I think important one that we learned is that the standard for confusingly similarity has been adjusted. The standard is now more focused and more limited. So you don't have -- it sudden focus on, say, generally used fonts, and it is more on the perceived confusingly similar -- the perception of strings instead of what a reasonable Internet user might expect.

So based on that overall standard, it became clear that future work, either -- yeah, probably part of the implementation plan is to underpin this new standard with methods and criteria to do the confusingly review itself.



And again, one of the recommendations in the overall policy is in the end, the implementation plan needs to be adopted and monitored by the ccNSO itself so you don't end up with an implementation plan that goes off on its own. So there is constantly feedback between the ccNSO and the implementation team.

Excuse me. My fingers are too big.

Finally, and this is also regarding the method and criteria for doing the confusingly similarity, there is direction in the overall policy what should be included in the method.

To date, it's mostly a linguistic and technical component, and I'm talking just confusingly similarity.

As a result of the experience, say, with the fast-track process, it's clearly what was -- It became very clear there was one major lacking component that has to do -- and I'm getting very much into the details, but it's very important to understand -- its own cognitive psychology. This is on how people perceive written language and how people perceive language on screens. And that's because in order to make a real understanding whether something is confusingly similarity -- confusingly similar, you also need to know how this is perceived. And if you just have a linguistic and technical component, it doesn't work.

You're lacking some of the parts. And thanks again, that's what we learned through the fast-track process.

Finally, and this is more a procedural side of it, it is -- the proposal is to make it a two-stage review. The role and responsibilities of each of the



two panels needs to be specified again (indiscernible), so there is a primary review and then there will be a final and second review of the confusingly similarity. So we -- so, again, a two-stage process.

And again, learning from the fast-track process, in the procedural part of the policy, there is an explicit description of the communications that need to take place between, say, the panel, staff, and the requester of the IDN ccTLD string that's an in-depth communication. At a minimum, the names of the panelists should be recorded, the rationale for the decisions, and some other stuff.

But these are the definite minimum standards for the communication. And again, that's what we learned.

And finally, in the transitional arrangement for the -- between the fast-track process and the overall policy, there is -- it is, say, what is recommended is that IDN ccTLD strings who did not pass through the fast-track process because they failed on the current IDNs or the confusingly similarity test should be enabled to go through the second review again.

So they get back or they halted or they're still in the process, it depends on the status, but at least that's a -- the current decisions of -- of -- depending on if they want to, but the current review can go through the second stage.

Just a bit on the timeline. I won't -- Keep this short.



Finalization of the draft is between now and, say, at the end of this meeting the comment period on the draft policy recommendations will close.

Based on, say, then the draft needs to be finalized, that will be submitted to the issue manager of the whole policy process that will result in an interim report that combines the two elements of the policy development process. That will be published as a final report or interim report, then a final report will be submitted to the ccNSO Council by -- before the Beijing meeting, so that can be discussed by the community and by the council at the Beijing meeting.

And at that time, the GAC -- again, this is formal, a formal part of the PDP, the GAC will receive a request for advice and all comments from the Chair of the ccNSO.

And then it goes into ccNSO members felt, and that's the end of the PDP, I hope.

That was all.

HEATHER DRYDEN:

Many thanks for that, Bart.

So questions.

Greece, please.

GREECE: Thank you, Madam Chair, and thank you, Bart, for this presentation of your proposal which consists of things that we have already mentioned during the second annual review process.

And now, we're waiting to see how this proposal will finalize and how it will be implemented by ICANN.

Just a question for clarification. During the transition process, applications that have refused due to confusability should be reapplied or -- I mean, for our case, we say all the time that our case is still open, so --

BART BOSWINKEL: They can use -- Maybe I wasn't clear enough.

Because they're part of the confusingly similarity review, they are stuck at the confusingly similarity review unless it's terminated. Then they're out.

But if they're still in the process, then they can go into the second review panel and -- according to the rules of the overall policy. That's, at least, the proposal as it is in the policy.

GREECE: Automatically. So that means I don't have to reapply again.

BART BOSWINKEL: You don't have to reapply but you have to indicate that you want this.



GREECE: Good. Okay. Thanks.

HEATHER DRYDEN: Thank you, Greece.

I have Germany and EU Commission.

GERMANY: Thank you for this presentation, because I think it's a very important issue because it's related to a question of national sovereignty and languages. And I think we here in the GAC have discussed it in the past quite often. And in the fast track, we noticed that there were some problems in respect of this, and I would really encourage you to find some kind of method that is really objective in this respect and establish some criteria that everybody could understand afterwards of the decision.

What I also would like add comments is that is a second examination possible? Because as we heard in the current round, they are now stuck, those applications. And as I said before, this caused quite a lot of discussions also in the GAC.

Thank you.

HEATHER DRYDEN: Thank you, Germany.

EU Commission, please.

EUROPEAN COMMISSION: Thank you very much.

Adding on to what Greece and Germany already said, we would wish to underline quite forcefully that we think that this should be solved as a matter of urgency. And these issues were highlighted already in the Prague communique so Beijing is still quite far away, so we should not in any way have any delays resulting, we think, from the reconsideration of the IDN ccTLDs applied during the fast-track process.

So thank you for your attention.

BART BOSWINKEL: Just for clarification, this is about the overall policy, and it will replace in due time. But unfortunately, we have to follow a certain process.

So, say, maybe at some stage it is possible to find a solution, but this policy has to follow its due course, unfortunately.

HEATHER DRYDEN: Thank you.

Are there any other comments? Yes, U.K., please.

UNITED KINGDOM: Yes, thank you. Just a quick question.

At what stage of the policy development process will you be seeking GAC advice? I am asking this question in the context of ATRT recommendations, that we engage in policy development a lot earlier than has been the case in the past.

So just a clarification. Thanks.

BART BOSWINKEL:

Yes. There is -- In fact, a -- According to the current policy development process, but this policy has been taking quite some time because we wanted to learn from the fast track. The policy process itself has been initiated at the same time or even before the fast track was developed.

As a result, say, some of your colleagues are observer on, say, on the working groups.

According to the bylaws, the -- and the GAC has been forewarned at that time. And now we're talking about 2008, I believe, is that this is running. And that's why we kept you updated.

According to the bylaws, the moment you need to be informed and are requested, formally requested of -- for advice is at the moment that the chair of the ccNSO receives the final report. And that is just before Beijing, because we have to go through another step of consultations.

LESLEY COWLEY:

But I think the key thing here is that doesn't come as a complete surprise to GAC colleagues, which is why we try to have the ongoing dialogue with you all.



HEATHER DRYDEN: Thank you.

Okay.

So thank you very much to the ccNSO -- Oh, India. Sorry. Please, if you have a comment.

INDIA: Thanks, Chair. One question regarding this fast-track process. It's still on or is it going to be over by some period when the other generic process is going to be?

BART BOSWINKEL: The fast track -- And again, that's probably the recommendation. The fast-track process is still there until this process -- say, the overall policy -- is implemented and takes over from the fast-track process.

INDIA: (off microphone).

BART BOSWINKEL: No. Unfortunately for you, no.

HEATHER DRYDEN: So thank you very much to the ccNSO. We covered a lot of issues today and really received some great presentations.



Thank you to all those that presented to us.

And I guess we'll meet again. There's more to discuss. So thank you.

LESLEY COWLEY: Thank you, Heather.

HEATHER DRYDEN: For the GAC, we have a 30-minute break.

4:00, please.

(Break)