

---

BUENOS AIRES – Continued Operations for New gTLDs (SLA Monitoring / EBERO)

Thursday, November 21, 2013 – 11:00 to 12:30

ICANN – Buenos Aires, Argentina

CHRISTINE WILLETT: ...the new gTLD continuing operations session. I'm Christine Willett, vice president GTLD operations. I'd like to introduce to you my team today. Here at the panel, we have Francisco Arias, director technical services for ICANN. Hi Francisco. We have Mike Guider from JS Global Advisors. He is the EBERO program manager. Bill Yang, also on the panel from JS Global Advisors. He's the senior technical advisor to the EBERO program.

I also like to introduce some of our esteemed guest and providers here today for the EBERO program. [Verna Staub] from CORE association. Would you like to say something?

[VERNA STAUB]: Yes, I'm taking, just saying this in a couple of words, because I'm just one of the members of the oversight committee that we instituted at CORE, together with [?] here. The team that's handling EBERO is in Germany is in Dortmund, Germany, led by Omar [?], and he unfortunately couldn't come, he usually comes to ICANN meetings but he couldn't come this time.

CHRISTINE WILLETT: Thank you. And from Scenic, our second EBERO provider, Mr. Wong. Thank you very much.

---

*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.*

WONG:

Hello. I'm [?] Wong from [?] information center of Chinese [government census] and also [Scenic]. It's also my great pleasure to participate in this session, and also to introduce our collaborative work with ICANN on the EBERO project. I would like to introduce my team, these two gentlemen, please stand up.

They're young and [?]. We have [?], he's the EBERO program manager. And we have Doctor [?], he's the EBERO coordinator. We also have a team composed with more than 30 dedicated [staff], supporting the EBERO functionally. And they are fully prepared and deeply committed to fulfill these important responsibility.

During the past years, we have been actively exploring means to make the Internet more secure and reliable. We know that ICANN also has the same goal of promoting consumer trust, and helps the development operation of Internet. With respect to our common pursuit, we have been continuously collaborating with ICANN as strategy partner for many years.

We also see EBERO project as a catalyst to further enhance our relationship, and realize our common goal according to our understanding for public interests. Above all, we are fully committed to use our infrastructure and technological capacity to support ICANN's objective as safeguarding the rights and interests of registrars and the broader Internet community. Thank you.

---

CHRISTINE WILLETT: Thank you very much. Thank you. So I'm going to turn the presentation over to Francisco for the panel presentation and then we'll take questions and answers at the end.

FRANCISCO ARIAS: Thank you Christine. So today, we are [?] decision at three topics, service, low level [?] system, there is real important interface in the EBERO program. Service level, SOA monitoring system, as well call it, they already know having this system has to do with core value of ICANN serving them, and allowing the security of the Internet.

And what we are doing is [?] the five critical functions as defined in the [?] and four all new TLDs. And we have the [?] in the interim to restore the critical functions in case of an emergency. One of these critical functions, as defined in the registry, they are DNS and DNSSEC, RDDS, this is WHOIS and web WHOIS, [?] which is the protocol that is used to interact between [?] ...to create and manage the domain names.

And the five critical functions is that escrow which is the process by which the registries and deposit copy of their registration database with active party, and their escrow agent. So all of this functions are being monitored in the case of the services, DNS, DNSSEC, and EPP, and WHOIS, and web WHOIS, the check is to make sure that they are working as they are supposed to be working.

There is also check on the response time on these services. And finally, there is a requirement in terms of how long it has to pass between an update, a domain name for example, and the time this is propagated into DNS and the WHOIS or the web WHOIS. This is in the new TLD [?]

agreement. You can see there the specific numbers, I'm not going to go through them.

If you have an interest in looking into detail, you can find the registration agreement in the new TLD Microsoft – of ICANN. The [registration] also contains all the emergency thresholds. These are defined, thresholds after which for failure in one of these critical functions, the operation of – of a TLD will pass to the interim. So there is the link between the SLA monitoring system and the SLA monitoring system provides the information that is needed for the EBERO to know something is maybe wrong, and they need to take over the operation of a TLD.

The SLA monitoring system is comprised of several [?] that are distributed around the Internet, and in order for something to be considered a problem in a specific service, several nodes must agree, let's say, that something is wrong with the specific service. You know, it's not enough with having one group node saying that the DNS for a certain TLD is not working, you have to have a certain number of [?] nodes in a different, [?] for us to consider that a problem.

So we are sending continuously inquiries in DNS, EPP comment, and WHOIS queries to see what the status of the services in the new TLDs. Currently we have 40 [?] nodes around the world, and we have two central processing services that are accommodating, aggregating the information and [?] node, the services that are regarding alerts in case any of the thresholds are reached.

This is a graphic representation, you will see it. So what do we place then, the nodes, the [?] nodes. We have two types of services, DNS and

---

WHOIS are public services that are provided for anyone in the Internet to use. So they have to be as near as possible to the networks with the most users across the Internet, and the different geographic locations.

And on the other hand, EPP is a service that is provided by the registry to the registrars, and there we try to be as close as possible to what the registrars will access the registries systems. This is a picture showing the actual location of the [?] notes. There you can see, we try to distribute the notes based on the Internet population and the different parts of the world.

And also to cover all of the five year applications that ICANN then divides the work. In terms of the interactions – the SLA monitoring system with the other components in the new GTLD program, so the SLA monitoring system will produce – if something is seen as potentially failing, an incident will be raised and will be sent to the [nook], the ICANN [nook].

The ICANN [nook] will evaluate the incident, and if the incident is confirmed, then it will be – a notification will be sent to the emergency context of the registries so they can act before we, for example, reach the emergency thresholds. The [?] as soon as we see something that looks like it's a problem in the registry [?] notified so they can start mitigating the issue.

We don't wait until this are really – until we reach the emergency threshold, for example, the results, of course, are generated to compliance so they can do their function within ICANN. And the results are there united for the EBERO team, so they can also act upon those

---

alerts. This is the workflow for the processing of the incidents. I don't think we really need to go into detail into this.

This is what I was talking about the different thresholds. We have to find several thresholds in the system, so we don't wait until the emergency resources are reached. We are particularly looking to make sure that the TLDs are working, so we don't have to use extreme measures such as the [?]. Again, more diagrams, I don't think we need to go into this level of detail.

Operational milestones in terms of the [?] monitoring system. We have... We're still working on the [?] monitoring system. We have, at this point, since October, released the monitoring of the DNS and [?], that's what we are testing now. And in December, we are going to have the full functionality of the [?] monitoring system, meaning we will have EPP, that's the part that is missing.

We're also modifying the way we are doing the monitoring in the case of DNS, with the conversations in name collision, we have to modify the way we monitor the DNS for example. We were planning to do the monitoring [?] that will be updated. Since that is not possible because of the name collision restrictions, we modified the monitoring to be, for example, checking for the SOA record over the TLD in terms of DNS.

And the other thing that we are planning to have ready by December is the ICANN [nook]. We are outsourcing this function. We are finalizing the process with the provider, and we intend to have the ICANN [nook] fully operational in the next month. Now I'm going to talk about the registry reporting interface.

---

This is the interface that is used for registries and their escrow agents to report to ICANN and used for two different purposes. Their escrow notifications and the multi reports sent by the registry operators. And this system interacts internally with other systems and teams inside ICANN, for example to indicate some [?] since that [?] is one of the critical functions.

If, again, certain thresholds are reached, then the EBERO team is also notified so they can do their part, and something with compliance. In the case of the [motor] reports, one of the reports that is required for the registries is their transactions reports. The domains of where register, renew, and so on. And this is data that is used by finance in ICANN to invoice the registries and registers, at least the part that is related to transactions.

As I mentioned before, there are several uses of this interface. We receive daily notifications from their escrow agents by the deposits that are being made by the registries, or the lack of those. The reports from the registry operators also about the process that they are doing, and the [multi] reports.

So when the escrow agent needs to send ICANN a [?] notification, when they receive reports, be it invalid, valid, or if it's missing, since the reports are required on a daily basis. Part of the deposits, the escrow deposits are required on a daily basis, so if the deposit is not done, a notification is generated to ICANN.

This system also provides, oops. I should really only use one instead of using my laptop. In terms of the [monthly] reports, what the interface does is it validates the [monthly] reports as provided the registry

---

operator. This is a function that was known for existing gTLDs in email. The registries would send an email to an [?] in ICANN will receive [?]... will receive the reports, and load those reports to a database, now with this interface that would substitute that part of the work that I used to do.

And will automate it and validate that everything is according to the specification in the registry agreement. And again, if exceptions are generated, the alerts will be sent to the appropriate parties. This is a graphical representation of the process. I don't think this is really necessary.

And finally, the specification of the registry interface can be found in the interim draft that is shown there. I believe that if you are a new TLDs registry or applicant, you probably know about this one. The interface, the [?] interface has been available to the escrow agents, and [?] operators since August. The [?] environment is available already. And we have the first two multi reports for [?] as of yesterday, and I think that's it. Mike?

MIKE GUIDER:

Thank you Francisco. We're here today to share some information about the EBERO program. I believe that over the last two years, while the EBERO program has been under development, I don't know that we actually have had a presentation on EBERO that really describes the features.

So, what we've done for today, is we've identified these topics. I would like to begin with the mission. What are we really trying to do? How do



---

we launch the EBERO services? Inspecting for readiness. Readiness is absolutely critical in these types of services. And then we would like to share a little bit about, what is it like to have a TLD in EBERO?

It is a little different than the situation for a regular TLD. We're going to just touch on what the master service agreement is, what the commitments are. And then we're going to talk a little bit about how the common transition process that all EBEROs will be using: works, and some of the key service levels and commitments that are part of that common transition process.

And then, a few words about customer service. As I'm sure you know, we don't expect very many EBERO events, but when an event occurs, we do think all eyes are going to be on what's happening and then the immediate aftermath thereafter. So we would like to share a couple of thoughts about customer service.

The mission is simple, protect the registrants. While one of the ways of doing that is to rapidly transition those five critical functions that Francisco discussed earlier, another registry environment, that are into our EBERO providers, our mission remains to protect our registrants. And to that end, we really do that in two ways. The first way, is we try to keep them out of EBERO.

And that's one of our missions, that's one of the missions of the ICANN EBERO program, is to do whatever we can to assist in keeping TLDs out of EBERO. And we'll share a little bit about how we do that, how we assess risk, going forward. But, of course, the second mission that we discussed earlier with Francisco is, the rapid movement of the five functions into a new environment.

---

So those are our two missions. So, a quick update on status. I've mentioned that we've been working on this for a couple of years. We had originally 14 respondents to the RFI back in September 2011, and today, and you've been introduced to our first two EBERO partners, we have Scenic and CORE. And I'm pleased to also announce that, we underlined the word now because we are, in standby, in service today.

If an event occurred this minute, the response teams are on standby and ready to go. We're also working with contracting on both New Star and [?], it hasn't been completed yet, but we're working on that. So let's talk a little bit about launching the service. This is an unusual type of service in that we never want to use this service.

We never want to use it. And so, because that, we're not doing it over and over, it's obviously similar to a traditional computer disaster recovery or business continuity program. So readiness is important. And our critical step before asking a partner to go into service is to ask them to, with us, demonstrate their readiness.

Once they're up and running and in service, we didn't have another element of the concept of readiness and that is practice. Because we're not going to get five of these a week, and do it over, over, and over again to get better, we literally need to practice. And we're going to.

And so with our first two partners in the first quarter of next year, we are going to practice an event. A little bit about what's in an inspection. This is an onsite inspection, we have 47 different questions or inspection probes that we review. It covers staffing, and readiness, in terms of on call. It covers technical elements of movement of zones and escrow files and so forth.

---

And in fact, the three tasks that are specifically conducted or listed there, these are timed tests that are required to be done within the service level time. And you can see what those are. The event exercise is a little different, in that we're actually doing two things in our event exercise. Of course, we're going to practice with full timing, the complete movement, or complete transfer in, of a TLD into the new EBERO environment.

But we're also going to practice something called event level alerts. And the event level alerts I'm going to comment on in a few moments, is our framework for monitoring and accessing risks that any specific TLD at any specific time would actually go into, need an EBERO transfer in. The folks participating are the EBERO, the escrow agent, and of course ICANN.

ICANN has a key part of the actual execution of an event, but we are going to stop short of actually trying to move something into the live root. So our root zone partners, we're not going to ask them to do their last step of actually doing a transition.

Of course, we'll have a script and the script will be, what we believe will be one of the early types of events, and we will be using simulated data so it's certainly not an exercise of capacity or volume. It's not that type of exercise. It will be just be our first time with everybody responding, as a team, and trying to execute this transfer in the shortest amount of time to the standards required.

That's what we're going to practice. Well, I'd like to call on my colleague Bill and ask him to share with you a little bit about what it's like to be in a TLD in EBERO, compared to a regular registry. Bill?

BILL:

Thank you Mike. On the screen behind me, you can see we've put side by side, a comparison of the critical functions and user experience of registrants and experience that registrars might have while a TLD is located in a standard registry versus in an EBERO. And the first thing we want to stress is that the EBERO is held to the same standards of specification operation as a regular registry operator.

All five critical functions meet the spec five standard, or spec 10 standard, I'm sorry. One of the big differences though, is that the EBERO – what a registry will do, adds and removes, they'll expire, they'll renew, they'll transfer domains back and forth. The EBERO does not. And this is a... There are some reasons for that, largely having to do with keeping the EBERO out of the financial transactions associated with registry operations.

The EBERO is frozen, a registry that moves in EBERO is frozen, it is not working, no new names, no transfers, no expires, no revenue. The registry might have gone through the R step process, or negotiated into the RA additional services that aren't part of the standard set of services that within a registry would offer, in the base RA, and the EBERO doesn't do that. If there are special security services, or widgets, or whatever the registry may offer, that's not part of what the EBERO does.

The EBERO takes the five functions and the five functions only. Those functions remain the responsibility of the registry operator. Next slide. Again, normal registries have all of this billable stuff. They do all kinds

---

of transactions, and the registry manages that under the terms of their RIA. But the EBERO doesn't.

The EBERO doesn't have those billable events. There are no monetary transactions occurring between the registrar and the EBERO. The registry pays fees to ICANN on a per diem management basis, but the EBERO doesn't. The revenue is not there. Next slide. But, spec 10, is the same spec 10. We require our DNS, our DNSSEC, our registration directory service, and our [?] registration system to work the same way, the same performance requirements.

Data escrow is governed the same way. The EBERO begins making data escrow deposits as soon as the transition is complete. Next slide.

MIKE GUIDER:

Thank you Bill. Let's transition to the commitments that we've asked our EBERO partners to make, through the master service agreement. Our expectation is that all of the contractual commitments are the same for all of the EBEROs. This is a service that we need to now be concerned about which EBERO is selected to have an event, and that their terms and conditions and SLAs are different, or they are going to execute it differently.

So, for the general standard terms and conditions, we expect to have very, very few, maybe some minor, jurisdictional differences, but we would expect those to be nearly the same. But for the common transition model, and this is the set of steps that we all go through, and the service level commitments, and how we communicate, and when

---

we do it, all of that, plus the fees are identical for all EBEROs. So, there is no different financial model for each of our EBERO partners.

Fees sometimes get a few questions. The fees that we are asking, or that we are paying the EBEROs, are aligned with something called supplemental note 1.9 of the applicant guidebook. Now, for you applicants, you'll know that well because that's the table that you've looked up something called a COI value, that's the continuing operating instrument, financial instrument. And that is the amount that you had to commit through an escrow agreement, or a letter of credit, to have available in case it was needed to pay for EBERO service.

And then all of the agreements are five years. Because EBERO is new, and not something that the community has watched in terms of how ICANN addresses the leadership and governance of the program, I thought I would show a slide that shows two important roles. And the first, is what we call the EBERO executive committee. You can see who is on it. Christine, here, is vice president of operations, is on that committee. And the EBERO program is under her direction.

But the president of the global domains division and the ICANN general counsel are on that committee. That committee has basically has three rows in the ongoing administration in oversight, or governance of the EBERO program. One is general oversight of the program. Are we doing the functions that need to be done in a broad sense?

But more specifically, when it comes to considering that we might execute an event, then the executive committee is a key component of the review and analysis as we get closer to an event. And I'm going to show you a little bit about how that works. So, they can – they do...

---

Another function is that they can stop the event, and that you'll see that's a function that maybe needed, and it may be needed at the very, very, very last moment, just before the step that transitions that TLD to the root.

The event directors, the reason that you see three descriptions there is that we need three event directors ready at all times. It is not possible to make the statement I made at the beginning that says, we are ready to take an event now, today, without having at least three individuals that can lead an event, and that's what an event director does.

They are the leader of the event. They actually issue the event order, that causes the EBERO partner to spring to life, and be ready to execute the transfer. You can see, the expected event director is the EBERO program director, his first backup is sitting over here in the corner right now. John Crane, who is the chief security and stability and resiliency officer.

And if we get to one more, if John's not available and, in this case, I'm not available, the next person up is Bill sitting right next to me. Over time, these individuals, by name, will certainly evolve, as the program moves forward, but there will always be three. I'd like to share a few moments about the alert level model.

And this is a framework that allows ICANN to monitor, and assess, the risk of an EBERO event occurring. And it's designed to have different actions take place if our assessment is the risk of it occurring is nearer to now. So of course, if an event, there is a sudden failure of one or more of the functions, there is no note as per se. Actually there is notice

because the monitoring system actually gives us alerts before we would even consider executing EBERO events.

You saw that table from Francisco earlier. But not too much time. This primarily is designed if that there is information that ICANN receives in addition to the monitoring, which feeds into this, that we can consider what could we do to help prevent an event. That's what this is all about. We want to take as many actions as we can to help avert having to move a TLD into an EBERO environment.

So that's our model. There is a lot more detail about it, but I think for today, what I wanted to do was just introduce the principles of that model. So what are the service levels for actually moving a TLD? Well, here there are, and these are the service levels that are contractually committed by the EBERO partners.

If you were to add up the total hours for these service levels to transition all five functions to completely operational state, they total to about 150, or they do total to 150 hours. However, we don't expect to just perform to service level. Our goal isn't to take 150 hours, our goal is to do this as fast as we can, all right, to minimize the impact on the registrants.

So here's another way of looking at those service levels if you talk about zero hour. So it's zero hour, the event director issues this order, and away we go. So DNS and DNSSEC in about eight hours or less. We then are in a state of waiting for the escrow from the escrow provider of the registry, then we'll work on SRS, followed by RDDS and escrow.



---

The service levels were set with an understanding that there would be unexpected events, complications, discrepancies, stuff doesn't work when you don't do it on a frequent basis. And we try to take all of those things into account when we set these initial service levels that total to 150 hours. But we've been working actively with our partners to bring those numbers down when we actually come into execution.

Today, we don't what the exact number would be, we'll get a little better sense after we practiced in January, but we believe that the kind of goals we should have are that the DNS is up in a few hours, way less than eight, and that all of the functions are operational in about a day. So, I think it's important for all of us to realize that if we're committed to the mission of protect the registrant, then we have to be committed to keep working to do this as fast and as crisply as possible, if we're called on.

Okay. A quick comment about customer service roles. If an event occurs, there will be a lot of people that are going to want to contact somebody, to talk about something. And of course, the critically involved partners are the registrars, the EBERO partner, and of course ICANN. And I think you can see registrars are responsible for the registrants. The EBERO service to be responsive to the registrars for those things that are appropriate while it's in EBERO, and ICANN is involved, if necessary, to deal with discrepancies in data, and if there is anything odd like a court order or something that would be unexpected.

And that's it. Thank you very much.

---

CHRISTINE WILLETT: Great. Thank you all for your presentations. We'll now go to question and answer portion of the session. If you would like to form a queue at the front.

BRIAN SWINSON: Thank you very much. It's good to see that we are planning around this. Brian Swinson. I wanted to ask a bit more about the EBERO program. First off, I'll start with a comment. To fail from working to your backup is very important to test, it's equally important to test from the fail to the backup, back to working.

Understand what those diagrams look like and what disruptions can happen. On your program, I want to understand, is there any scale that you're considering? Like if a registrar with say 300 TLDs were to fail, can you support that? Or, someone with a very large number of domains such as maybe like dot com, could you support that?

MIKE GUIDER: So let me address the second question first. You mentioned dot com, and there is the other, I call them the original 22, but they're not original, but the registries that are in operation before the gTLDs are coming up. Those are not in scope of this EBERO design program, and there is work going on to address that. It is a little different everywhere from what the agreement is, all the way down to some of the factors of scale, and when you mention dot com, that's a factor. Bill, would you comment on the capacity?

---

**BILL:** Well, I do want to stress that we are talking about registry emergency transition, not registrar emergency transition. So we are not an emergency registrar. We are really only dealing with registry failure. And from a scaling standpoint, we've planned for over three years approximately 150 events covering three million domains under management. That's the capacity we've contracted for.

**BRIAN SWINSON:** And how many have simultaneous events?

**BILL:** We've planned for three – well, two right now, we have two EBEROs, so each team is single threaded right now, but we actually have a contingency plan for the catastrophic failure you're describing. So yes, we have thought about that problem. The catastrophic failure, we would not have service levels on, but we would restore services in an orderly manner based on the criticality of the service.

**BRIAN SWINSON:** Thank you.

**CHRISTINE WILLETT:** Thank you very much.

**WENDY PROPHET:** Wendy Prophet on behalf of remote participant Alex [?]. Sorry if I said the name wrong. Do registry operators get access to an example web interface where they can see the current status of their registry as

---

monitored by ICANN? And if yes, will there be an option for machine readable information that can be integrated into the registry operator's own monitoring system?

FRANCISCO ARIAS:

Thank you Wendy. We plan to have an interface for registries. That would be the interface after the IANA support to EPP. I don't think we have considered yet to do a [?] interface. I think it's a fair request, I will take that into consideration. Thank you.

MIKE:

Mike [?]. During the presentation, the one table said there would be no billable events during the EBERO. Is that just registry to registrar billable, or would that also impact registrar billing at ICANN? Could you elaborate on the non-billable part one? Part two, what happens when a registry exits, hopefully exits the EBERO?

Will that registry be able to recover? Because if they missed annual registrations during that period of time, once they come back online, those names, I assume, would continue to resolve. Will that registry operator be able to recoup?

So, if you could perhaps... I haven't gone through that aspect, I've been focusing on helping get registries up, not necessarily when they fail, but obviously this is an important point. And if you could perhaps share your thinking on this, it would be helpful.

MIKE GUIDER:

Circle back to JJ in legal.

UNIDENTIFIED:

Maybe, but I'll try. The contractual relationships between the registrars and the registry that is in EBERO, remains in place. That doesn't go away, it's not changed. So what is changed, is that the registrars that would normally pay the registry, that just stays in place, okay? ICANN is paying the EBERO to do what most registries are doing anyway, which is paying a RSP back in to do the function.

That is very similar to what EBERO is. So from a fees viewpoint, it's the responsibility of whatever that contract is on that side. That's my understanding.

CHRISTINE WILLETT:

So, Mike, the other billable events that were referred to, there are no new registrations to be taken during an EBERO operation. There are no expiration events. So for the registrants also as well, there were be no billable events. So, it will require, and one of the reasons we talked about customer service at the end, is that we acknowledge that the registrars who support and work with that registry operator, need to be closely coordinated with to manage this transition to an EBERO status, for the registrants.

UNIDENTIFIED:

And just to provide a little context to this, is over the 15 years that I've been participating, there have been events where larger scale registrars have failed, and during that registrar failure, the registries have continued to renew names and when ICANN transitions, that those

---

registrations to another registrar, sometimes the registries have not been compensated during that transition.

So again, I'm asking this from a historical perspective where ICANN somehow always manages to get paid, but those providing services sometimes do not.

CHRISTINE WILLETT:

So as I said, looking at it from the other registrant's perspective, if there are no rules, there are no new registrations, no one would be collecting fees in that situation. I will take it back, you also asked a question about the exit and the transition from the EBERO. So I'll take that back as well. Thank you.

JORDAN BUCHANNAN:

Hello. Jordan Buchannan. Just to clarify on there being no renewals or expiration events, so just to be clear, that means that regardless of the length of registration term at the time of the transition, all registrations will be maintained throughout the EBERO management of the TLD?

MIKE GUIDER:

Yes.

JORDAN BUCHANNAN:

Okay. Thank you.

---

UNIDENTIFIED: [?]. Do you have a metrics of specialization for EBERO provides, like EBEROs that support IDNs, and EBEROs that doesn't support IDNs? Because we know at least one issue where not all the EBEROs would be able to provide, which is support for domain attributes, starting name service, domain attributes instead of actual object. At least one of them doesn't support domain attributes.

So do have a making of features that EBERO support and some not?

MIKE GUIDER: So all of our EBEROs support IDNs, as a requirement. So there is parody within that space. I would have to look very specifically at domain name attributes as to, I mean, everyone supports the draft standards for the escrow format. How they internally represent that data, is a different questions [CROSSTALK]...

UNIDENTIFIED: ...representation matters? As the register interface is expecting to use that metaphor, not on others. So registers are expecting to register that TLD, and update records, because they are allowed to update records with EBERO using domain attributes for that TLD, not using a[?].

So EBERO needs to support that option.

FRANCISCO ARIAS: [?]. I get what you're saying. The way I see it, I think it's an interesting question and the way I see it, the registry escrows the data either as a host, sorry as an object or as an attribute. And then there is a different issue which is how the EBERO is going to import that data to their

---

database, which I believe is completely independent, they can take something that is, I will think, they can take something that is an attribute and convert it to an object because it's there, [?] representation doesn't matter.

I think the [?] is the interface between, with the registrar. It's a good point, maybe there is – they are suspecting to have that TLD handled in a certain way. However, take into account that the relation between the registrars with the other registry is not the same as the relation with the EBERO. That's a different relation, and the – perhaps the assumption that they were having before doesn't apply.

UNIDENTIFIED:

That would make it such a transition likely fail, because suddenly the mechanism changes. So I think you should probably take that into consideration. Thank you.

CHRISTINE WILLETT:

Thank you. We have a remote question.

WENDY PROPHET:

Remote participant, Andy G. Has ICANN considered the anti-trust implications of allowing CNN and BBC to registrar their brands dot [?]? But specifically blocking Al Jazeera from doing so?

CHRISTINE WILLETT:

I don't think that that question is appropriate for this forum. But, thank you for the question. If we don't have any other questions, we'll wrap



up this session. Thank you all for your participation, and we'll continue to keep you informed as these operational continuity support mechanisms continue to evolve and enhance. Thank you. Have a great afternoon.

[END OF TRANSCRIPT]