

---

HYDERABAD – ccNSO Members Meeting - Day 1 (pt 1)  
Sunday, November 06, 2016 – 09:00 to 10:30 IST  
ICANN57 | Hyderabad, India

KATRINA SATAKI: Good morning, dear colleagues. Please find your seats. Take the best ones. And we are about to start.

Good morning, everyone. So now we start our ccNSO Member Days, day one. Today we start at 9:00. Please note that tomorrow we start at 8:30, but Alejandra will highlight the most important things we need to remember during these two days.

It's my pleasure to welcome you here. This is, again, the first meeting post Transition, and I'd like to congratulate you all with this achievement and thank you for your input and your contribution to the process.

As you see in folders in front of you, you have all the materials that you might need during these days and you'll also get these temperature cards. Actually, I must say that we almost lost them. They were on that container, the one which was on the burning ship, but thanks to our brave ccNSO Secretariat they managed to recover them and we will use these cards to measure temperature in the room.

---

*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.*

---

Next on our agenda is a welcome from our local host, but unfortunately Mr. Bansal could not join us today. He's too busy with his arrangements with the Ministers and other people who need introduction to this multistakeholder environment. But we have Mr. [Joly] here with us here and on behalf of NIXI, our local host, he will welcome attendees of this meeting.

NATHAN [JOLY]:

A very good morning to everybody. My name is Nathan [Joly] and I'm from the National Internet Exchange of India. Our CEO Mr. Rajiv Bansal could not attend the meeting because of some urgent work, so I really apologize for that. I would like to give a very warm welcome to everybody, to the ccNSO community and ICANN community, to this meeting. On behalf of .in registry, I would like to thank the Chair of ccNSO Katrina Sataki and the Chair of the ccNSO Meetings Program Working Committee Alejandra Reynoso.

We are aware of the immense contribution of the cc[TLD] in the strengthening of the multistakeholder corporation model in the Policy Development and process improvement. In 2005, we started .in registry in India, and since then the numbers were around 6,000. In almost 10 years we have seen a tremendous growth in ccTLDs for .in. We are at about 2.19 million in the current year.

---

The growth has been possible because of the dedicated team effort of NIXI and also support from the ccNSO community, and also the registrars whom we are working with.

India is witnessing an Internet revolution as never before. Today, we have more than 350 million Internet users with the help of Digital India and BharatNet program. We are hoping to cover 250 gram panchayats in India with optical fiber cables.

At NIXI, we are in the business of making available the country top level code domain .in and .bharat, which we recently launched two years back. Dot-bharat is the Internationalized Domain Name System – domain names, IDNs – what we call. And we have also seen a tremendous growth in terms of IDNs in India.

I would also like to thank you again for your participation, and I wish you all the best. You have already good and productive meetings going forward, and enjoy the beautiful city of Hyderabad with amazing food and the places you can visit here. Thank you so much.

KATRINA SATAKI:

Thank you very much, Mr. [Joly]. May I ask now Alejandra to highlight some of the most important and the most interesting things that we're going to experience during these days.

---

ALEJANDRA REYNOSO: Yes. Thank you very much. First of all, I would like to keep this slide a little bit there so you can know who are the members of the Meetings Program Working Group in order that if you have any comment, any feedback, any suggestion, please approach any of us and let us know what your thoughts are about meeting or what you would like to see in Copenhagen, what you would like changed, or what you do like about how the meeting has been scheduled.

Also, I would like to thank the ccNSO Secretariat [without] whom this meeting would not be possible. They do all the heavy lifting to make these meetings come a success. And thank you Kim, Bart, and Joke for all your support.

This is the first C Meeting format that we are having of the ICANN meeting. It's called the Annual General Meeting, and the objectives are to have a seven-day meeting. It is the longest meeting on the year. The focus is on showcasing ICANN's work to a broader global audience.

We will also have eight high interest topic sessions, as similar as we did in Helsinki that were the Cross Community sessions. Three of them started yesterday, and the rest will go on through the week. We had an official opening ceremony yesterday, and

---

we will have two public forums. Also there's the [silos] work, that's called Inter/Intra Community Work Sessions.

But for us, the ccNSO meetings comprise four days. Today is the third day. On Friday all the working groups had their own meetings, and yesterday we had the Tech Day. Today it's our first day of meetings and tomorrow our second day, so let's see what we have for today.

For today, we have the Members Meeting Day. This is a brief summary. Please note that we will have a joint meeting with the GAC at noon. This will be in Hall 4. Also, we will have two high interest topics. One will be exploring public interest within ICANN's remit that, unfortunately is at the same time as Q&A with the ccNSO Council and ICANN Board nominees. I recommend that you attend the ccNSO Council and ICANN Board nominees since they will be your representatives here.

In the end of the day, we will have the high interest topics of DNS and content regulation. This is a subject that is of interest of all of us. So please if you can make it, it's on Hall 3, all the high interest topics.

Today, we will be discussing the PDP and retirement of ccTLDs and Review Mechanism for the decisions on delegation, revocation, and retirement of ccTLDs with Becky and Bart. Also, we will have a panel on how does the IANA Stewardship

---

implementation affect ccTLDs and what are the implications for the future chaired by Lise.

We will have the working groups updates, the ccTLD news session chaired by Hiro and also, as I told you, the Q&A with ccNSO Council and ICANN Board nominees chaired by Allan.

And yes, we do have fun here also. We will have our ccNSO cocktail today. Please if you will, tweet any pictures or any comments. Use the hashtag ccNSO Cocktails to use our social media networks.

I would like to highlight the important contribution of our sponsors from .in, .ca, .nz, who especially provided the buses so we can go back to our hotels and enjoy the two full hours of our cocktail. Also from Nominet, SIDN, DNS Belgium, nic.br, Verisign, and UASG. Thank you very much to all of you. This would not be possible without you.

This cocktail will be at 6:30 p.m. and please do not forget your printed invitation that is within your set of documents that is on your table. At the end of the cocktail, shuttles will be leaving around 8:40 p.m.

For tomorrow, this is the summary. Please, please, please, be careful. Tomorrow we start earlier than today. At 8:30, we will have the joint meeting with the ICANN Board and the ccNSO in

---

Hall 3. So bear in mind that it's earlier than today and please be on time.

Then we will have the rest of the day with the Members Meeting Day. We also have a high interest topic [that is hosted] by us. This is the ICANN General Council on Legal Advice, questions and answers. This will be in Hall 3, so we will move at 3:15 to that location.

After that, it's the ccNSO Council Meeting here in this room, and also at the same time it will be another high interest topic if you're interested in that of Underserved Regions in ICANN. And an extraordinary high interest topic in the later hour will be the Internet Governance Public Session from 6:30 to 8:00.

Tomorrow, we will have the Legal session chaired by Peter and the update of next steps in ICANN Accountability by Jordan, he's chairing that session, and also the Regional Organizations Update chaired by Leonid and the Marketing session chaired by Vika.

As additional information, on Tuesday, it's the Annual General Meeting and the second part of the Public Forum and the community Recognition Program in Hall 3.

So welcome to the ccNSO, and I hope you enjoy it.

---

KATRINA SATAKI: Thank you very much, Alejandra. Are there any questions regarding our agenda or any other topics, especially high interest topics? If not, then let's move forward to updates from our working groups.

The first one, may I ask Annebeth to join us here for the update from the Cross Community Working Group on the use of country and territory names as Top Level Domains.

Next will be update from Giovanni.

ANNEBETH LANGE: Good morning, everybody. This is Annebeth Lange from Norway here representing ccNSO as co-Chair in the Cross Community Working Group for how we can use country and territory names as TLDs if we agree.

Next, please. I can do it myself? Okay.

Just to give you – those of you that have not been here for the longest time – how did it start? We are discussing TLDs at the first level, only the codes that's based in ISO 3166. What we were set out to do was to review the existing framework based on the AGB model that we arrived at in 2012 after a long battle or fight or what can we say? It took some time before we came there.



---

Could we really manage to develop a framework that all could agree on in a group consisting of representatives from all the stakeholder groups? We have had teleconferences – a lot of them, late at night – face-to-face meetings, and we have been going on since the study group delivered their study report in 2013. It’s not a PDP. It’s meant to be a working group and to deliver the results into a PDP later on.

The study group was created. They created this working group and we should try to find a harmonized framework if that was feasible. The other thing that the study group had as a recommendation was to write a letter to the ICANN Board to ask them to exclude country and territory names from the second and consecutive rounds until we could arrive at the harmonized framework if we could develop that together. That letter has not been sent – I will come back to that – because we tried now in the working group to see if we could arrive at that framework. So let’s see what happened.

In the working group, we have arrived at the interim conclusion of the two-letter strings. What we have concluded on so far – and I hope that will stand – is that the two-letter codes are reserved for country and territories, and not only those on the ISO list that’s there today – that’s self-evident – but also other two-string combinations for the future. Because it’s not up to us, not up to ICANN, not up to IANA, to decide what will be a country in

---

the future. And in this world it might be new countries, and it would be sad if they didn't have a two-letter code for them.

So we went on to the three-letter codes in the ISO list and, of course, that was much more difficult. We had discussions, we had surveys, and the disagreements showed to be not only between the ccns on the one side, the GAC had one view and cc one view, and the gs another view, but it is disagreement within the stakeholder groups as well.

So we did not go so far as discussing short and long form of country and territory names since we didn't agree on three-letter codes. We think that it is even more difficult to arrive at some agreement on the whole names. In that situation also the IDN will be much more stronger because then it's not only ASCII letters but the IDNs [will come in stronger].

As I said, it was divergent views, and we arrived at the conclusion that to arrive at a harmonized framework that we could all agree on – the framework that suits every stakeholder group – the mandate was much too strict, much too limited.

What we also have seen in the discussions the last two years is that it's other groups discussing geographical names, like we know that the working group in GAC, and they are discussing even those names outside what have been protected in the Applicant Guidebook. So it's a lot of confusion out there on the

---

geographical names. What should be protected? What should not be protected? Should it be protection at all?

What we see now for the future, we have to find a way forward. We had a working group yesterday, and even there we saw the different views coming very clearly. The GNSO thinks that this should be treated in the GNSO PDP already in established working group for the subsequent rounds. They are treating all geographical names there. Their view is that it should be treated there, and these working groups are open for us as well.

But it's evident to see that they are a majority there anyway and in the end, if it is a PDP in GNSO treating names of country and territory names, that's of big interest for us it will be the GNSO in the end – the GNSO Council – that will give a recommendation to the Board. So what we hope is that we can cooperate before that so we don't have the situation that we had the last time that a lot of discussion started after the first Applicant Guidebook was delivered.

It took seven editions before we ended up with the one we have today. Or should ccNSO have a PDP with this issue? Or should we have tried to find another way to work together, a cross community working group with extended mandate with a clear link to the PDP?

---

So the suggestions that was presented during the discussions in the working group – on the one side, status quo. That is no solution. Then we continue with what we have today. And that is actually what we in the letter I mentioned, if we send that letter, then it will be as it is today until we can arrive at a better solution.

Other people meant that we should allow everything with no restrictions, that three-letter codes and country and territory names could be used by everyone to anything.

Other suggestions again was that three-letter codes on ISO 3166 should be treated as a ccTLD, and these suggestions have mainly come by countries that have a two-letter code today but are not really satisfied about how it's run and they want an alternative.

Or should three-letter codes on ISO 3166 be allowed as gTLDs but with some restrictions – for example, the way it is today for capitals and cities in the Applicant Guidebook of 2012.

So what we have to do now is to decide how the discussion should go forward. What we have decided at the working group meeting yesterday is that we should continue out this year, we will send out the options for recommendations for the three-letter codes that we are still not agreed on to the working group to agree on which version we should send back again to the

---

chartering group, and then we will finish our interim report and the interim report will go out for public comment.

So we have to decide, should the Council now send the letter to the ICANN Board from the ccNSO Council just to have a fall back so we don't do something stupid before we know that all can agree on it? And the next thing is where should the discussion take place.

We must remember that, especially in connection with the IDN, it is a huge overlap. We have talked about that before that as long as it is a non-ASCII letter somewhere, then it's an IDN. We could end up with a situation that one country name is a ccTLD through the IDN process and then another version of a country name could be a gTLD, and that's not very good either. It's still a lot of confusion out there.

The meaningful representation that we had will cause difficulties and a lot of overlap. So this is of main interest to the ccns as well, and it has been difficult to get the GNSO to understand our real interest. It's not only a gTLD for us. We have feeling of identification, so we'll see how this works out in the end.

Questions?

---

KATRINA SATAKI: If you have any questions, you have a microphone here. If somebody from the back of the room would like to ask a question, we have Bart with a mic. Yes, please Steven.

STEPHEN DEERHAKE: Stephen Deerhake, .as, American Samoa. First, I want to thank you for your incredible amount of hard work on this topic. With regards to the idea of having Council send a letter, what do you think the reaction from the GNSO would be if we tried to lock things down that way?

ANNEBETH LANGE: I think we don't lock it down, but I think it's important that we don't decide anything before we know how all the stakeholder groups feel. Our fear is that if it's only decided in the GNSO, we don't want to have the situation again that we have to fight afterwards, and we know the government would probably stop it anyway

I don't think they will agree on anything less than at least have a support or non-objection since that's the system for the lesser. I will say that country and territory names are much higher in the hierarchy than a capital and a city – and since we have the system of support or non-objection for those categories. It has also been mentioned a lot that we should go back to the thought

---

of categories. Should we have different rules from different categories? So that thought has also come up.

STEPHEN DEERHAKE: Thanks.

KATRINA SATAKI: Thank you and we have another question. Please, Andreas.

ANDREAS MUSIELAK: Good morning. Andreas from DENIC. I follow this topic for quite a while and thank you, Annebeth, for your efforts. My point is I think we should send a strong signal towards the Board or at least start a working group. I think, and I agree with you, [leaving] the topic with the GNSO is the wrong signal from our side. That's my view on this point.

ANNEBETH LANGE: Thanks.

KATRINA SATAKI: Thank you very much. Any other comments or questions? Timo?

---

**TIMO VOHMAR:** Hello. I'm Timo from Estonia, local ccTLD. This is not actually a question to Annebeth but a proposition for this whole group. We are a country code and name support organization, and this question is about country codes. I think we should actually restart the discussion about this case to have an opinion and not to let the GNSO decide this topic for us. Just as a disclaimer, I have been a part of this Cross Community Working Group for a short while, and Estonia has a strong interest in start using .est, our three-letter country code.

**KATRINA SATAKI:** Thank you. If there are no more questions I would like – yes, Peter.

**PETER VERGOTE:** Good morning. Peter Vergote, .be. Annebeth, I know that within the GNSO we have been discussing this, but it might be good to have your vision, your opinion, for the whole ccNSO. We know that there is some traction within the GNSO to come to a kind of a compromise to allow three-letter codes but with the restriction that you have a right of objection from both the country and the local ccTLD. In your opinion, is this idea getting any traction within the GNSO? From your perspective, would it be feasible that this actually leads up towards a compromise for the three-letter codes? Thanks.



---

ANNEBETH LANGE:

I know that some within the GNSO – and that’s important to say, that GNSO is not one body. It’s different organizations within the GNSO as well.

I had a talk yesterday with Alexander Schubert which has quite interesting ideas about that, as you say. He is for a compromise. He is trying to find a pragmatic solution to be able to open it up. And as you say, his solution is both support or non-objection from both the government and the cc.

That seems very tempting, and for us of course that would be a good idea. But I fear that a lot of governments in the world would oppose that. But if we could manage that, of course for us that would be good.

I have asked Alexander. He was at the working group yesterday, but he didn’t raise that subject and that was [kind of pity], but he said that he should try to talk to others in the GNSO. And I feel that we have to talk with them. We shouldn’t work in different silos here.

This is important for us. It’s important for the governments. And it’s important from the gs. It’s too bad that we couldn’t get anywhere in that Cross Community Working Group we had, but perhaps the mandate was too restrictive. Perhaps it should be

---

reformulated. Perhaps it should be another working group. I don't know, and that's what's up to the Council to decide in the end.

JÖRG SCHWEIGER: Jörg Schweiger from .de. Actually, I've been talking to Alexander Schubert as well. The suggestion I made to him and I would love to see that included in any kind of compromise, be it supported by the GNSO or by us, should from my point of view include not only those two conditions we've just been mentioning but that if three-letter codes would be allowed, then there would not only be a need for the government and the current incumbent to support that string but additionally that the operator of the current cc would have a right to grandfather that three-letter code or string. So if .ger for example or .deu would be at stake, then I would love to ask to be the first to decide whether we Germany, we .de, would be in a position and wanting to operate that string.

KATRINA SATAKI: Thank you. Eduardo?

---

EDUARDO SANTOYO: Thank you very much. Eduardo Santoyo from .co but now I'm going to speak on behalf of LACTLD because it's the LACTLD feelings that I want to express.

We have been following a lot about the discussions within the working group have been had, and we appreciate a lot the work that you have been done on there because it is really a huge concern for many ccTLDs of the region. How could be allowed or not allowed, how can be used the three characters string because it could be a lot of confusion because it could be a lot of competition for many ccTLDs on their own on their countries.

And for that, we are also not much more in favor to allow to continue discussions just as a PDP within the GNSO because we agree that we will be there just [almost] forgot [probably have] a huge minority where our voice are not going to be heard. So for that reason, we encourage to continue looking to have a new [spaces] of discussions where the voices of our ccTLD, so all the cc voices will be heard in a very good way.

The other thing that we as many of our ccTLDs has been in contact with the local governments also trying advise them to be aware of what is happening, what is the course of the discussions right now. And probably one of the things that we did in the past when there was the period of comments from the use of two characters for the second level at the actual round,

---

we made the suggestion that Jörg just mentioned it for these specific [three one] does the answer or the proposal to avoid confusion with the users [shall] not be just presented to the government but also to the current operator of the ccTLD or [for both]. Both voices has to be heard.

But in this case, we really encourage to continue the conversations and to try and to avoid to let this just on the field of the GNSO. We also appreciate a lot that you have been working on behalf of our community there, Annebeth. Thank you.

KATRINA SATAKI: And the last question from the floor.

DEMI GETSCHKO: I also want to thank Annebeth for all the work. Just a very short comment, one in the line of what Jörg said and other more or less like what Eduardo said also. First of all, I think the three letters that are related to the two letters code is in some way [sign on] names of the same code of the country. We are not the country, but we have the country codes. Then I think in this case at least the operator of the two letters code now has to have the first refusal rights. If they want to operate the [sign on] name of

---

these two letters, I suppose it has to be offered first to the operator of the two-letters as an option to refuse or not.

My second point is that a GNSO PDP is related to generic Top Level Domains, and we are discussing here what is [or will be] the criterion to define what will be or not generic in three letters and country code names. This is not subject to a PDP in GNSO because they are not generic already. They are in judgement. I don't understand how we can make a PDP over something that is not under your umbrella now.

KATRINA SATAKI: Thank you very much. Now we have a discussion. Okay, I see Roelof wanted to raise another issue. Okay, let's discuss. I think it's why we're here.

ROELOF MEIJER: Roelof Meijer from .nl. If you prefer to ask a question, I can formulate it as a question.

KATRINA SATAKI: You can have a statement.

ROELOF MEIJER: I have a reaction on what Jörg and Demi are suggesting. Although I understand the sentiment, I think that we should not

---

forget that one of the objections of new gTLDs is competition, and the condition of new three-letter TLDs being run by the incumbent cc registry is not really helping competition. I also think that that in most countries there will be national laws against that kind of protection.

KATRINA SATAKI: Thank you. Jörg?

JORG SCHWEIGER: I'd like to ask a question and refer to what Roelof just is saying. My interest would be, what do you feel, Annebeth, is the position of the GAC? That is related to what Roelof said in a way that he mentioned competition, law, choice, and all that but then we are also talking about confusion and strings that are confusing.

I would as a customer – and that is the perspective the GAC should have and the ICANN Board should have as well – I would be completely confused if I would be confronted with a .de in Germany's case which is operating under Policy A, and we would have a .deu that is clearly operated under a policy that follows [g] rules. So we have all different kinds of differences in [there] like WHOIS data validation and all that kind of stuff.

So we have completely different feeling and look and feel of two strings that would clearly represent one country. I think that is

---

really a lot confusing, and I wonder what the position of the GAC and the Board might be on that one.

KATRINA SATAKI: Thank you very much. We have this question added to our agendas for discussion with the GAC and the Board. So Annebeth will give them overview, and we'll have a chance to learn what they think.

But since we're so happily reunited with our colored cards, I would like to ask Annebeth if you can think of a question to ask the room to feel the temperature and general feeling in our community.

ANNEBETH LANGE: Well, I didn't have time to think about that, but I think the main thing we have to decide is should we leave this to the GNSO in the PDP or should we try to find a way to do it ourselves? So should we leave it to the GNSO alone?

Obviously not.

KATRINA SATAKI: This is no. Anyone thinks yes?

---

ANNABETH LANGE: Is it a green card here? Are you a gTLD?

I have one more question. If we're continuing with this, if we manage to create another Cross Community Working Group, are more people interested in really contributing to the work? I need support.

Good. Thank you very much.

KATRINA SATAKI: Thank you so much. Really, thank you, Annebeth, for your contribution to the work of this working group. It has been really great. Thank you very much.

Next on our agenda, we have an update from SOP Working Group. It's Giovanni, and after that we have an update on EPSRP. Giovanni, please be ready for that, too.

GIOVANNI SEPPIA: Thank you, Katrina. Good morning, everybody. This is Giovanni Seppia from EURid, .eu registry manager. The first update is about the work we have been doing with the ccNSO Strategic Operating Plan Working Group. It was not much work from the last time we saw and we provided you an update as there were no Strategy or Operating Plan published by ICANN for the working group to comment on. But we had at the beginning of



---

this ICANN57 meeting a very interesting session of the ccNSO SOP Working Group with a quite useful ICANN presentation. The first one made by Xavier, CFO of ICANN, touched base on three key points.

The first one is an update on the Fiscal Year 2018 Operating Plan and Budget, which ICANN staff is currently working on and which is going to be published for public comment in March next year.

The second point is the efforts that have been made at the level of cost optimization. The first point Xavier brought up to our attention is the refinement of the RFP process they have at ICANN and also how they make selection of third parties when it comes to contracting third parties for certain services. Also at the level of personnel, he clarified a bit about the performance review process at ICANN staff level and the compensation policy.

The last point Xavier touched base is risk management, which is an area where they keep continuing to work. This is quite a sensitive point in that the ccNSO SOP Working Group highlighted during the various comments we submitted to the Strategy and Operating Plan. Xavier also underlined that this is also an area where ICANN would like to have more engagement from the community, including our ccTLD community.

The second presentation we had was from Sally Costerton and Patrick of ICANN, and they followed up on the very first meeting.

---

It was a sort of a cross community meeting we had during the ICANN Helsinki, which responded to a request from the ccNSO SOP Working Group that is to hear also from the different ICANN IANA department that were subject of some of the comments made by this working group. And so they wanted to provide us more information and clarification in certain areas they're working on. And so this is really a follow-up on what they started telling us during the ICANN meeting in Helsinki.

The first point they clarified is a quite interesting update on the way they measure, or at least they try to measure, their engagement activities. As they rightly pointed out, at present there are no real best practices or standards for measuring the quality aspect of any engagement activity. So they are working on it to introduce some KPIs and measurements for making sure that whatever they do from an engagement perspective is qualitatively measured and reported back to the community in this Dashboard that ICANN has made available some time ago.

Also, they added that one aspect of their current work is to make the different offices [and ops] which ICANN populated the world with operational because apparently there were some [ops and] offices that were not fully operational yet. So Sally's working on making those [ops and] offices fully operational from an administrative perspective.

---

Also, the last point is a point that was raised by the working group and to which the ICANN staff present at that working group meeting a couple of days ago committed to answer. The point is to have an overview of the impact of previous activities that were developed by ICANN, including certain activities like NETmundial. What we understood is that the new CEO has invited all ICANN staff to make sure that whatever is done by ICANN is very much in line with the new Bylaws so that it's also easier to report the impact of these activities to the community.

In the future, what we are going to do is to prepare ourselves for commenting on the Fiscal Year 2018 Operating Plan and Budget. There is also a session which is a session that is in preparation of the Fiscal Year 2018 Operating Plan and Budget that is going to be in two days' time, if I'm correct, and it's a session that ICANN has been having for a while and inviting the community members to participate to have a first presentation of the draft Fiscal Year 2018 Operating Plan and Budget and on which community members are invited to express their first view opinion on how ICANN can refine or start making sure that the draft turns into a more consolidated plan.

That is for the ccNSO Strategic Operating Plan Working Group update. I'm happy to answer any question now.

---

KATRINA SATAKI: Thank you, Giovanni. Are there any questions?

I do not see any. Thank you very much, Giovanni.

And next on our agenda we have an update from EPSRP by Giovanni, and after that, TLD-OPS and Jacques, please join us here.

GIOVANNI SEPPIA: Okay, this is the second working group update and it's about EPSRP. Everything goes back to an ICANN Board resolution of 2013. The ICANN resolution of 2013, for those of you who are not familiar with the IDN fast track process, was introducing an appeal mechanism for strings that had been deemed confusingly similar to [ISO codes] by the so-called DNS Security and Stability panel that is the panel that evaluates the confusing similarity within the IDN fast track process.

As the community, we thought and we submitted to ICANN some input saying that we do believe that this DNS Security and Stability panel at some point lacks some sort of scientific background to determine and assess the confusing similarity of a string. There was an ICANN opening to introduce a second layer of assessment, and the second layer should be made by a linguist panel – those who are really expert in assessing confusing similarity. And so at that point there was this

---

evaluation panel made of linguist expert that was created and which started to reassess upon request three strings that were deemed confusingly similar with [ISO codes].

That went really smooth and well until the panel had an issue because of the guidelines. For its work the panel is following some guidelines that were produced again with the community input, and the guidelines do not foresee any guidance in case after a very scientific assessment a string is deemed confusingly similar with another string in the lower case or with another string in the upper case. And so in case of this split result, there is nothing in the guidelines that say what the panel should decide.

So what happens is that in June 2015, this issue was brought to the attention of the ICANN Board. The ICANN Board resolved that the ccNSO, in consultation and in conjunction with two other groups which are the GAC and the SSAC, were expected to provide faster guidance to this panel and review the guidelines to make sure that this element was somehow addressed in the guidelines and so the panel could have guidance how to decide in case of a split assessment.

So there was a working group which was formed in 2015 and which I've been a Chair with three great members from this community – Vaggelis from the .gr registry, Hiro from .jp, and

---

Wafa from the Tunisia registry. We had the ICANN staff support, Bart and Kim, and two GAC observer – Manal from the Egyptian government and Panagiotis from the Greek Government., and we had also an ICANN expert Sarmad.

The working group worked quite hard. We, first of all, produced a Charter which was published in September before the working group started to work. The Charter was approved by the working group by the way, and we also drafted a working plan for the working group to deliver what we were expected to deliver according to the Board resolution. We had many calls and one face-to-face meeting in March this year. But as I said, most of the work was done by e-mail exchanges.

Then the outcome of the working group, which we submitted to the attention of the ccNSO Council, is that there was a lot of discussion in the working group about different elements included in the EPSRP guidelines. We decided that it was more appropriate to move a certain kind of recommendation outside the proposed changes to the EPSRP guidelines and include them in a recommendation paper to be submitted not only to the attention of the ccNSO Council but also eventually to the attention of the ICANN Board.

Concerning the EPSRP guidelines, the main point that was raised and proposed by this working group is that in case of split

---

recommendation and in the event that there are those that split recommendation, the confusing similarity assessment against the lower case shall prevail. And that is in respect with and in line and consistently with the fact that ccTLD policies must be decided by ccTLDs at the local level, but in case there should be mitigation policies to reduce confusing similarity risk, those should be enforced at the registry level.

But the main point was this recommendation that was made by the working group which is an invitation to ICANN at [all] level to make sure that the confusing similarity principles are the same no matter if in the gTLD or ccTLD space or IDN ccTLD space. They should be the same across all TLDs because at the end we are talking about end users, and an end user of a TLD is an end user of a [g], IDN, or cc and it doesn't matter which space but what it matter is that there is a consistency, and at present there is no consistency.

So at some point we feel that this community is quite discriminated against. There are quite liberal policies that are currently applied in the gTLD space. So as I said, we put forward this recommendation to the ccNSO Council together with the revised EPSRP guidelines, which were revised in a very limited way to address mainly the issue of split outcome in case of the panel evaluation.

---

The next steps will be for the ccNSO Council to decide if to approve the revised guidelines and also to follow up on the recommendation paper by ICANN staff.

I must say for completeness of information, that there was a public comment period. During the public comment period, we received the support of the ALAC constituency and also we received a paper from the GAC that is supporting the decision of the EPSRP Working Group and also a sort of endorsement by Verisign that is rightly pointing out that they agree that these IDN policies and especially confusing similarity matters there should be applied consistently throughout the TLD space.

Also, we received this comment – well, we didn't receive a comment. That the SSAC produced an advice to the ICANN Board to reject this working group outcome and also the recommendation. There have been some misunderstanding at SSAC level as the SSAC advice is based on factual and content related mistakes. So we have been having during this meeting here in Hyderabad some meetings with SSAC – one was yesterday – to try to clarify that it was never the intention of this working group to break the security and stability of the Internet. That was not we were for. We were not a terrorist band. We are just a working group trying to sort out something on the basis of a Council resolution. Again, no backside plan, just an open working group which on numerous occasions reiterated its wish



---

to have the SSAC participate proactively during the working group but they decided not to.

Yes, and I have to shut up because the Chair is saying to me to shut up. So this is the status of the working group. Thank you.

KATRINA SATAKI: Thank you very much, Giovanni. Are there any questions from the audience?

If not, then thank you very much. And we'll move to our next update. It's TLD-OPS. Jacques and Christian.

JACQUES LATOUR: We only have 10 minutes so the only logical way is for me and – so now we have five? So for the next five minutes, both Chris and I are going to talk at the same time, deliver the content.

CHRISTIAN HESSELMAN: Alright, thank you. An update of the TLD-OPS Standing Committee on the TLD-OPS Incident Response facilities.

How do we go to the next slide? Okay. Oh, that's too fast.

TLD-OPS is the Technical Incident Response community for and by ccTLDs, in case you haven't heard of us yet. The members of the community are the people responsible for the security and

---

stability of their ccTLD, and our goal is to further increase the security and stability of ccTLD services and the Internet at large.

Our approach is to increase the reachability of ccTLDs, which is something that we accomplish through a mailing list, and to increase the level of shared knowledge on security alerts, which is what we use that same mailing list for.

The community is open to every ccTLD irrespective of ccNSO membership, and the whole lot's being guided by the TLD-OPS Standing Committee, which consists of representatives of ccTLDs, including folks from SSAC, IANA, and ICANN Security Team.

Next slide, please.

So as I said, the TLD-OPS community revolves around a contact repository. That's basically a standard mailing list that we have augmented with a script that generates an e-mail message every month. In that message, there's the Incident Response contact information of every ccTLD, including phone numbers, e-mail addresses, and so forth. By using e-mail, the contact information is readily available through your inbox if you're a member. Subscription is through your IANA administrative contact, which as what we call a trust anchor, and we're using the mailing list for exchanging various kinds of security alerts, [full] alerts such as on DDoS attacks, phishing, and malware distribution. We

---

have a leaflet available on our site that contains more information.

This is the current status of the membership. We have 186 members. There was another one that joined recently – 186, which is 65% of all ccTLDs, and as you can see from the amber circles over there we’re still missing quite a few ccTLDs from the African region, Asia Pacific, and in particular from the LAC region. So that’s something we’ll be working on. I’ll talk about that in a minute.

Progress since ICANN56 – the list has been used on three different occasions – actually four. One is still missing here – to alert ccTLDs on security incidents. So we managed to help one ccTLD who had problems with their DNS Anycast service. There was a security warning from a ccTLD that had been compromised, and actually there were two security warnings on DDoS attacks and one involved the attack on the root of June 25, 2016. So we added about eight or nine new members in this period from ICANN56, and we also sent out a TLD-OPS newsletter back in September.

So the objectives that we had set for ICANN57, we wanted to go up to 187 in terms of membership. We reached 186 so, unfortunately, we didn’t manage to increase by 5% but still 186 is quite okay. We also wanted to get the list to be used more

---

often in collaboration with ICANN’s Security Team. It turned out that we didn’t need that collaboration anymore. It worked by itself. The community basically provided the security alerts themselves, so that’s actually even better than getting the information from ICANN. And we also drafted the TLD-OPS Terms of Use, which are now on the website.

Our goals for ICANN58 – that’s going to be in Copenhagen – is to further increase the membership of the initiative to 194, and we’re also going to be organizing webinars for the underserved regions, if you will, in terms of TLD-OPS presence – LAC, Africa, and also Asia Pacific. And we’re planning to organize a workshop at ICANN58, which Jacques will talk about.

JACQUES LATOUR:

Okay, so for ICANN58, we’re looking at holding a two- or three-hour session for TLD-OPS. The intent is, what we notice on the list is that we don’t have the right procedure to handle a DDoS. So in light of the event that happened a couple of weeks ago, it’s clear we need to write procedures on how to do incident detection, incident mitigation, crisis management so if one ccTLD is under attack from a DDoS that we have a procedure that it can follow to leverage TLD-OPS, to reach out, to get help, to mitigate the event, and then get back online. So we need to develop procedures. So the session is going to have very clear

---

focus on what the outcome of the session is. It's not a [sales] show of technology what people can do but we need to have procedures to respond and to mitigate DDoS events, so that's what the focus is going to be. And we're five minutes exactly.

CHRISTIAN HESSELMAN: Thank you, Jacques. If there are any questions, then we'll be glad to take them.

KATRINA SATAKI: Thank you very much. If you have any questions please feel free to talk to...

[EDUARDO SANTOYO]: Thank you very much for your report and for your work. In order to get more people from LACTLD region, I encourage you to invite LACTLD to participate in the process. We for sure can do a lot in order to increase the participation of LAC members on the process. You can write an e-mail [or] now we're going to take [inaudible] but we're going to help on this.

CHRISTIAN HESSELMAN: Okay, great. Thank you very much. We also plan to ask LACTLD or perhaps ICANN to do the webinar in Spanish because perhaps that might increase the reach a little bit.

---

[EDUARDO SANTOYO]: For sure we can do it together by LACTLD, [but] we can do something in order to help to increase the numbers.

KATRINA SATAKI: They know Spanish, I'm sure [inaudible].

Thank you very much. Short announcement – we have a pack of freshly printed latest versions of our agendas here. Susie got them, so if you want please pick up your copy. However, I have to tell you that it's already obsolete because, unfortunately, due to very interesting discussion on country and territory names, I'll have to switch some presentations, and now we'll have an update from Elise from PTI, and then we'll have a discussion on the PDP and I already expect it to go into the coffee break. So please feel free to grab your coffee and come back. We will be discussing things.

So please, Elise.

ELISE GERICH: Good morning. It's very nice of you all to invite me to speak to you and to talk about PTI, which is now the organization I'm representing when I come to see the ccNSO. I'm Elise Gerich and I'm President of PTI. I'll try and explain how the organizational

---

structure has been evolved past the Transition of the Stewardship.

PTI stands for Public Technical Identifiers. People have asked me why did you choose PTI as a name for the new affiliate, and it was very simple. During the Transition discussions and all the proposal writing and everything else, everybody kept talking about this new organization as PTI and we came up with some other ideas for names. Most people didn't like any of those names, and so we said, "Okay, let's just try to find words that'll fit the acronym and stick with PTI." It was as simple as that. So Public Technical Identifiers = PTI, and so the new affiliate of ICANN which is performing the IANA services is PTI.

There were a whole lot of things that had to happen in order for PTI to come into existence. There were a lot of legal activities. PTI had to be incorporated so that it could be a formal legal corporation. It has to have an organization with a budget, and so we started working on a budget, which I'll talk about later in the presentation. It has to have operations and operational support and resources to provide the services that PTI is supposed to provide. So we had to work with, obviously, the current staff as well as what shared resources we would need from ICANN in order to continue to operate.

---

A corporation needs to have a board, so there was a five-member board defined in the proposal writing and in the Bylaws. Then each corporation needs to have officers. When you incorporate within the state of California in the United States, you need to have a President, a Treasurer, and a Secretary. So I was appointed President, Becky Nash is our Treasurer for PTI, and Samantha Eisner is the Secretary for PTI.

Then of course, we need people to actually do the day-to-day services that they do so well and to deliver those services to the community. And so the PTI staff are the same people you've been working with in the past, however they're now working with you from the organization PTI.

So who are the five Directors on the PTI Board? Lise Fuhr is one of them. She's seated in here. Jonathan Robinson is another. And those are the two community-selected Directors, and they were selected as an interim process to seat the board until the Nominating Committee can formally make nominations to provide candidates for those two positions. From the ICANN-nominated Board Directors, there's David Conrad who's the CTO of ICANN, Akram Atallah who's the President and CEO of the GDD division, and myself, President of PTI.

So what's the relationship of PTI with the TLD community? And you notice there's a little extra box up there. We have the big



---

ICANN box and then we've got the CSC box, that new box – the Customer Standing Committee – and PTI. Basically, ICANN has created a contract between PTI and itself to perform the naming functions, the naming services. The same things that we delivered as the ICANN department – the IANA department within ICANN – are now being delivered within PTI, but we needed a contract for PTI to be able to formally know what those services should be.

The CSC – the Customer Standing Committee – provides the oversight for the delivery of those services. So as you all know, the CWG had a Design Team A, and the Design Team A came up with a list of service level expectations. Those service level expectations led to service level agreement, and so it's the CSC that oversees that the service level agreement is being met by PTI.

So who is on the CSC – I guess who are because there's more than one. You have four members and six liaisons. The members that have been nominated by the ccNSO and the GNSO – and that's the Registry Stakeholder Group of the GNSO – are Jay Daley, Kal Feher, Byron Holland, and Elaine Pruis. I won't read the liaisons, but you all are perfectly capable of reading them.

---

The CSC has a meeting planned this week here at the ICANN57, and so these folks will be meeting, and I believe Byron's been selected as the chairperson of the CSC.

So what are the deliverables to the community from PTI? What are our outputs? One of the deliverables is a service level expectation Dashboard, which is live. It's something that is based all upon the Design Team A's definitions for service level expectations. We do the qualification of changes to the root zone database and have them implemented in the root zone and update the WHOIS database. That's a very common function. We've been doing it for quite a long time. We're just now doing it under the umbrella of PTI. And we post monthly reports.

So this is one activity that is a difference. In the past, when the IANA services were part of ICANN, the budget was created as part of ICANN's overall budget along ICANN's timeline. One of the outcomes from the CWG proposal and the final proposal that the ICG put together was that PTI's budget should be created nine months in advance of ICANN's budget and that we should have community input well in advance before the PTI budget was submitted to ICANN for approval also.

I should make it clear that PTI is a cost center. That means that we have no revenue. Basically we're totally funded by ICANN. People were concerned that if the PTI budget weren't

---

committed in advance of the ICANN preparation of their budget that PTI might be underfunded. So we have already started this activity. We've submitted the proposed draft budget to the PTI Board. They've looked at it, and we have published it for public comment, I think it was October 17<sup>th</sup>. It's open for public comment right now. We certainly would appreciate the input of the community.

Down at the bottom of this slide, it kind of summarizes some differences from what the IANA department's budget was within the ICANN budget now that it's PTI. There's \$10 million in funding planned. I'm just giving you real high-level sound bites. It's about a \$700,000 growth overall, and this includes extra staffing because I put in a couple new head count for FY18. This is an FY18 budget that begins in July of 2017.

We've also got oversight activities. We have more committees that we're working with, and we have a board to support. And we also have the Root Zone Maintainer contract, which is included in the overall budget. In the past that's the Root Zone Maintainer function [which] is done by Verisign, is still done by Verisign, but they were under a cooperative agreement with NTIA. They're now under contract with ICANN to perform this function, and the budget that we have for paying them to provide that function is included within the IANA services budget.

---

People have asked, “So you’re PTI. How do I contact you? What do I do?” We’re an entity that’s performing the services on the behalf of ICANN under contract. It’s embedded. The IANA services are the only function for PTI. Basically, you can contact us the same way you did before. Even though we’re called PTI, PTI.org, PTI.net, and PTI.com were already taken by other organizations. They weren’t available to us, and so we made the practical decision to continue to just use IANA.org as our domain name. So you can still send questions to IANA@IANA.org. Our e-mail addresses, we all have alias now for ICANN.org. Our primary e-mail address is IANA.org.

PTI does have a website however. It’s PTI.ICANN.org, and that website is primarily for the administrative activities. We’ve posted I think there’s six contracts that PTI is involved with. Those are posted on the PTI.ICANN.org website. However, everything operational – the services we provide for the TLD community – are posted on the IANA.org website.

Enough about PTI and our organization. Now you know who we are and who supports us and what our board structure is and the oversight committee. We’ve actually been pretty busy since ICANN56. We developed and launched the service level expectations Dashboard. We did the development and testing and the cutover to eliminate the NTIA module in the root zone management system that’s been live since October 1. We’ve

---

launched the customer service satisfaction survey and actually have just finished it.

Marilia Hirano who launches and captures this information and provides the report asked me to tell the cc community that we get almost no responses from you all. We don't know if we're not asking the right questions or if we're not sending it to the right people, but we certainly would like to figure out how to get more input on our customer service surveys from the cc community.

Let's see, we've done an enhancement to the user credentials for RZMS. People had concerns about how long it took to receive credentials or to refresh credentials, and we've made enhancements to the program to do that. We've done a number of key management facility upgrades. The key management facility is the facility that houses the Key Signing Key – the KSK – for DNSSEC. We have two secure facilities, and we've done some major security upgrades over the last nine months actually to both of those facilities to make the facilities even more robust.

Kim Davies is co-author on an RFC about label generation rule sets. I've put the RFC number up here. He has been very instrumental in that area and posting those rule sets on the IANA.org website. We've implemented the RSSAC 003 Recommendation. This was a development activity between Verisign and ICANN where we increased the signature validity

---

periods for both the KSK and the ZSK – the two Key Signing Keys needed for DNSSEC.

Finally, we've been very engaged in the KSK key rollover planning. It's an eight-phase plan. It's published on our website. I think there've been communications and blogs that have been published about this. Just last week I think it was – I've lost track of time – but within the last week or two, we took the first step in that phased plan for the KSK key rollover. That was to generation the next KSK so that it was prepopulated but it's not active yet and it won't be active until we get to the end of the phase about a year from now.

So we've been pretty busy, but we managed to also create a new organization and we're up and running and hopefully you have not seen any degradation in service while all of this was going on.

The next thing I'd like to mention is the service level expectation Dashboard. I will be giving a live demo in just a minute, but I wanted to leave this slide up for a minute so that you have the URL and to let you know this is an implementation of the Design Team A's proposal and their final document within the CWG proposal, and I've put the URLs in case you wanted to look at it.

This is our team – the PTI team. I hope most of these faces should be familiar, and if not I'm sure they'd be happy to have

---

you stop by and visit us in Los Angeles. But we are PTI, and we're here to serve.

Now if I could ask Kimberly to help me with the live demo. And if you're all trying to click on it at the same time I am it may look a little slow. The demo has to populate it and so if you're just starting out and haven't opened it previously, it may take you a little time.

This is the Overview page of the demo and it has three major components. There's the Service Availability, then the Request Volumes, and if you could scroll the screen up so you can see down below Request Volumes. I can't control this part, I don't think. And then you have Request Durations.

This is a summary and an overview. Now if you'll scroll down so we can see the Overview tab, Kimberly, and click on the Overview tab please. This is kind of like teaching a kid how to drive. You don't have your hands on the wheel, but you don't want to mess up.

So if you'll click on that one, that's the Request Volumes and it'll take a few minutes. It refreshes about every 15 minutes.

So this is the request Volume, and it's by month. Kimberly if you'll take your cursor and just go over some of the bars in the

---

graph you'll see that you'll get more detailed information about those individual bars.

And now if you could scroll to the bottom of the page please. Then you have more detailed information so you don't have to try and figure out in the graph, "Oh, let me see. Where does that fit on the bar?"

Let's go to another page, Kimberly. That's the Time Per Actor. One of the big things that people were interested in – I'm talking so you don't notice how long it takes to load – is that people wanted to see how much time it took us, the PTI staff, to do the job and how much time it took the requestor if we had to request more information, how much time it takes the root zone maintainer, how much other third parties if there were other things that had to be requested.

Oh, my. A little slow. It's not always so slow. Did someone else click on this in the room? I hate it when demos are slow.

Here we go. Again, so if you could scroll up slightly so they can see there. And then take your cursor across the various bars. Again, you can see the big tall point in some months happens to be the blue line which is the requestor. The purple line can be pretty tall sometimes, too. The root zone maintainer is pretty consistent.



---

And then again, if you'd scroll up you'd have more detailed information in the table below.

If we could go to the next tab, Kimberly, I think it's overview of how long it takes for requests.

I think you get the idea. We could walk through many other tabs if you wanted, but now you have the URL. We'll be meeting with the CSC, and I know that they'll have feedback on the Dashboard and hopefully this will be a good indication so everyone in real time can watch and see what the overall performance of the PTI delivery of the IANA functions is.

That's the end of my presentation, and I want to thank the staff for running the demo for me. Thank you all very much.

Do I have any questions?

KATRINA SATAKI: Thank you. Are there any questions?

PETER VAN ROSTE: Good morning. Good morning, Elise. My name is Peter van Roste from CENTR. I noted that you were struggling to get responses in your annual customer satisfaction survey. I can suggest you work with regional organizations. We typically have a quite

---

good, I would say about 50% response rate to our surveys. So that could be helpful.

ELISE GERICH: Thank you very much because, as I said, it looked like we hadn't gotten hardly any from the ccs. I know that we work with you all a lot, and we don't know if we're sending them to the wrong people or what, but that's a good idea. We'll reach out to the regional organizations to see if perhaps we can do a better job next year on how we distribute the survey.

KATRINA SATAKI: Thank you. [Yaramin]?

[YARAMIN TOLAR]: Hello. [Yaramin Tolar] .tz. During last technical [center] technical working group 14 days ago, we had interesting discussion about how we as a community can influence to [request] some features, in particular in RZM system because in the past we had some issues with the passing technical checks and recently we have a problem to roll the key to new [algorithm ECDS] because the rZM doesn't allow us to do that. And we discussed whether we should request this update to CSC or RZERC or what is the body that we can ask to do that or directly to you as PTI? I don't know if this is a question for you or maybe for the community,

---

but this is an issue for us. So I would like to know what is your opinion about that and if we will manage to [fill] somewhere to request this feature, what will be for example the timeline to implement this new feature?

ELISE GERICH:

Yes, I think you're talking about the new cryptographic algorithm for signing your TLD and you want it to show up as a DS record and be in the root. I would think that that would first come to PTI as a request that we would expand our technical checks to include such an algorithm. We might then – we being PTI – consult and see whether or not with experts such as the TLD operators, DNS-OARC, RZERC, or RSSAC, or SSAC, whether or not they felt that there was any danger to adding this to the root zone, and I don't believe there is. But I'm just saying that might be the process we would follow, at which point we would then have to collaborate with Verisign because both of us run technical checks before we add anything to the root zone. And so our technical check suite would have to be expanded to accommodate this.

I know there's a lot of potential cryptographic algorithms out there. So the other thing is, how to balance one request for one specific algorithm and the development work necessary with potential other requests and also with our other development

---

plan. So I would think the first place is to come to PTI and have a formal request, which I know you've had some talks with Kim Davies, and then we need to confirm with other parts of the organization and the community that they think that this is okay and then we can expand our technical check. It's mostly an operational issue and then it's also a resourcing issue.

As I tried to show all the development activities we've had going on over the last nine months, we have to then prioritize what things and we would have to work with the community and perhaps at that time say this is when we would target making that change. I hope I answered your question. If not, please restate and I'll try again.

Thank you.

KATRINA SATAKI: Thank you very much. Does that answer your question? Okay, you're happy. At this point, at least.

ELISE GERICH: I think maybe he's only sort of happy but not really happy.

KATRINA SATAKI: He'll be happy when it's all implemented.

---

Thank you very much. Thank you, Elise. Looking forward to seeing how it all evolves. Thank you.

ELISE GERICH: And thank you all very much.

KATRINA SATAKI: Yes. So as I already mentioned, we swapped sessions. We do expect the next one is of high interest to our community. Therefore, we'll do it that way. Now Bart will give an overview and if we feel that we need some additional time to discuss this, to ask questions, and get some answers, more understanding on the process, then we find other time for example today after our Q&A with our ccNSO Council and Board nominees. So we just in parallel with a high interest topic in Hall 3, we will stay here and discuss PDP. So, Bart.

BART BOSWINKEL: Yes. First of all, Becky was supposed to be here as well, but she had other commitments. You could see her running out a little bit earlier. Let me go straight through what I intended to cover during this presentation, and I'll limit to a few highlights that are important for progress because this will come back at the GAC ccNSO meeting.

---

What I intended to do is present the issues that I have identified as preliminary as issue manager and have a discussion with you to fill this in and to expand it to start creating charters, but I'll get back to that one later on. There will be a quick overview.

So what are the requirements – that's the starting point for today – the requirements of an issues report? That's the description of an issue. What needs to be done is a General Council opinion, so that's ICANN's General Council needs to be included. That will be included, but that will be at the end. It is a formality in the Bylaws.

The question the Council asked to be respond on is one or two PDPs (I'll touch upon that briefly), recommendation of task force or working group (I'll touch upon that briefly as well but a little bit longer because especially the working group and the working group Charters is a relevant, tentative timeline), and view anticipated Board views of the end result, but you don't know so that's fairly easy.

So where am I as an issue manager? Identification of high level issues: that's done. One or two PDPs: I can say a preliminary, tentative recommendation. Task force or working group: I think that's the easiest one as a no-brainer. That's the working group, as you will see.

---

And then what will happen at the end of this meeting, and that's what I need to discuss with you, is the request to Council to include the community – so that's you or the volunteers – in the drafting of working group charters. What that entails, I'll touch upon at the end of my presentation. So that's the real purpose so if you're comfortable with me moving that forward.

Let's get started. This is for a more in-depth discussions, experiences that say PDPs and other high level, important activities, that principles help to guide the development of policies and policy related matters but also later on – and that's far more important – once they as a means for interpretation of implementation and once the policy gets effected.

In this case, as you can see, the subsidiarity principle that is very paramount for ccTLDs should be one of those principles as well as principles relating to local law, etc. That's a [long text] and that's an adjustment. What is currently in the FOI Working Group or in the FOI itself and then no retroactive application of policies, etc. and a transitional arrangement. so pending cases need to be judged not with [an] impending cases or delegations, Review Mechanisms should not be applied for that one.

These are high level principles. They can be extended, changed, but this is just to give you an indication how relevant they could be and what you need to think about because especially

---

something like the subsidiarity principle is not documented anywhere.

So the Review Mechanism – what is, I think, and I’ll touch upon it very briefly what I’ve done. I went back to RFC 1591 Section 3.4 because that’s where a kind of Review Panel is mentioned [and its] scope. If you will read it and go through it, you will see that’s probably something that a ccTLD manager does not feel very comfortable with if you look at the text.

And you’ve got the FOI Working Group or the FOI itself has some language around Review Mechanism, and in the current ICANN Bylaws there is something around the IRP that it doesn’t apply. This is the context of Review Mechanisms.

I’ll just run through this very quickly. High level issues with regard to the Review Mechanism. So the main one is effectively the scope of the Review Mechanism, to what do you want to apply it and whose decisions, what decisions, applicable/open to all ccTLDs? So that’s a discussion whether it’s applicable to all ccNSO members and non-members, applied or say before RFC 1591. So that’s a vast lake of issues. What will be the result of such a Review Mechanism? Will it be binding, non-binding? These are all issues that need to be addressed in a policy regarding the Review Mechanism.



---

Other ones who are standing, only ccTLDs, significantly interested parties, others, and what are the grounds? So how could you apply? Again, this is for – if you're interested we can have a more in-depth discussion about it and it would be helpful if Becky would be around as well.

Finally, the rules and structures. If the community agrees to have such a Review Mechanism, rules and structure of a Review Mechanism. Again, there is a whole host of issues that need to be addressed but first identified.

So that's with regard to the Review Mechanism. Now with regard to [respect] the other main area of the PDP is the retirement of ccTLDs. Again, as said, the context of it there is no policy in place at all. That's the conclusion of the DRD Working Group report 2011

There is just a limited number of cases, so in this presentation I've listed three, probably the most well-known. One is the .um case, the other one is the Netherlands Antilles case, and the third one I've listed is the .yu case. What is already interesting what you will see if you look at the last two lines of each of these cases, for example in the .um case, you'll see that in the IANA root zone database it's mentioned as not assigned. If you look at the ISO 3166 list it has the qualifier it's an assigned code. So that's a bit confusing in my view.

---

If you look at the .an case – the Netherlands Antilles one – in the current status in the IANA root zone database it says retired. Nobody knows what it means. It's not defined. In the current ISO 3166 list it is transitionally reserved. So from assigned it went to transitionally reserved.

If you look at the .yu case, that's an interesting [as well], there is no mention at all in the IANA root zone database. So it's not included. It is in the current ISO 3166. It is listed as transitionally reserved. So these are just what you see in looking at the core databases relating for ccTLDs.

Again, what are high level topics? What are the conditions for retirement? Consistency of terminology. What triggers a retirement? So is this the change in an ISO 3166 list? Does it need to be a substantial change in the name? This is relevant for IDN ccTLDs. What happens is, names of countries do change. Sometimes it doesn't result in a change of the two-letter code, but it could impact the meaningful representation of the name of the country. What do you do in such a case? Should the current IDN ccTLD be retired, yes or no? That's one of the issues.

Underlying is, who triggers a retirement process? Because that's still a little bit unclear. Currently, it could be the IANA function operator. It could be ICANN, the ccTLD manager, or government. Again, the ccTLD manager government, for example, is the case

---

in the .um or is what happened in the .um case, or other significantly interested parties or parties of the significantly interested group.

Other issues, as I said, consistency of terminology. What are the conditions for retirement? Should it be conditional to a delegation, which is the case for example in the .yu and .an case when it was part, if you go back to the IANA report, it's part of the delegation process, or .rs and .cw. The reason is, it is the same manager as far as I can see. And compliance with conditions: if you set conditions, should we comply, should they be complied with, and what are the consequences, if any?

These are all kinds of preliminary issues that I've identified as issue manager.

Moving forward, what does it mean? I think where we end up, and you could sense this already with say when we discussed this at the Marrakech meeting and again in Helsinki, is the preference of the community is to have a single PDP and two working groups. Working group one, development of recommendations around the Review Mechanism (so this is the old slide), and working group two, around the retirements.

One of the advantages of doing this, or the reason why, say tentatively the issue manager will recommend this, is you will

---

have a ccTLD manager, you will vote at the end on the total package so you have a full understanding of what happens.

Secondly, and it's related, the Review Mechanism can only be completed once you know how the retirement mechanism will look like, or how the policy on retirement, because decisions on retirement may or may not be subject to reviews as well. So it needs to be [updated]. When you start with Review Mechanisms you need to adjust it.

The other reason and the third main reason for having one single PDP, it allows for flexibility both at the end of say the timing schedule, etc., and matching the issues as for the community itself and finding and staying involved in the process. So it is at this stage, and this is the starting point for next steps.

Going back to this whole list of issues – and I went through it at a very, very, high pace – it's very clear these issues need to be refined and descriptions need to be added to it. Once you start doing this, you're almost in the process of resolving those issues, finding solutions.

It would be, first of all, a waste of time if, again, if only the issue manager would do this, and it's probably far better if this would be a community effort. The way to do this is that the community defines the charter of both working groups, and in this charter you define, refine, the descriptions of the issues and the scope of

---

the working methods. That's one, and secondly there will be additional usual language around working groups.

So the community defines it. Once these charters are done – so we're effectively creating two drafting teams or a drafting team for both charters – then these completed charters will be included in the issue report as Annex A and B, and the issues as defined in these charters will be part of the issue report as well. Say these are the issues that need to be and will be addressed in the PDP.

Once this is done, then there will be a general council opinion, and again as I said, that's a formal step and once that package is complete then the PDP could be initiated

If you'll look at the timeline, what does it mean? How much time would we lose? It's assuming that say you are in support and the Council is willing to decide this at its upcoming meeting – so that's tomorrow afternoon. The call for volunteers for the Drafting Team will be launched, could be launched on the 14 November until 2 December. Council could appoint the Drafting Teams at its next meeting on 15 December.

In the meantime, the issue manager could start preparing a strawman for the charter that's including the high level topics and some additional language on the working methods, etc. Then once this drafting team has been set up, the first meeting

---

will be early January on the base of every two weeks and updating it and then submit charters to the issue manager by the end of February because in principle it should not take too much time. So by the March in Copenhagen, the Council can initiate the PDP.

I've included in the whole slide deck, which will be available anyway, the references I've used to distill the issues, etc. And that's all.

KATRINA SATAKI:

Thank you very much, Bart. Our next session starts at 11:00, and we will start it at 11:00.

So the question to you – would you like to use 10 minutes for discussion or 10 minutes for coffee? [Throw] your cards. Who would like to have a coffee – green card, please. Okay, yes, I see.

We'll break for 10 minutes coffee break, and we will talk. We will have an opportunity to discuss this PDP. So now just digest what you've just heard, and we will talk about PDP in more detail after Q&A with our nominees. At least we'll try to start this discussion.

BART BOSWINKEL:

At least you have an idea of the direction of travel. That was the purpose of rushing through it. One of the reasons is this will

---

come up in a more condensed format at the meeting with the GAC because they need to know where we are as well. So hopefully this afternoon we'll have very extensive discussions on the issues, and Becky will be around hopefully as well to run really into the issues because that's probably the core of the discussion. Thank you.

KATRINA SATAKI: Thank you. Enjoy your coffee and tea.

[Break in audio]

HIROFUMI HOTA: So the next session will start in two minutes. Could all the presenters in the next session come up here? We should have Byron, Ning, Russell, and Pablo. Could you come here?

[Off mic crosstalk]

Okay, let's start our ccTLD news session from 11:00 to 12:00. After this session, we'll meet with GAC in GAC room Hall 4 starting from noon. So I want to make this session ending five minutes to noon. So please each speaker limit your presentation in 10 minutes or 12 minutes. On my list first is Byron, second is Ning, and Russell, and the last one is from Pablo. Can we start from Byron?

---

BYRON HOLLAND: Thank you, Hiro. I see that I'm competing with the coffee break. But we'll get going so as to get us back on time.

Good morning, everybody. What I'd like to – pardon me? What I'd like to talk a bit about today is what we're doing at CIRA in terms of a new strategic direction and how in essence we're reinvigorating the organization as a result of taking a step towards offering new products and services within our market.

As many ccs, this is a pretty fundamentally different direction given that from almost all of our history we have been an operator that provides one thing: .ca domain names and the underlying DNS.

As we all know as we've talked about over the last number of meetings and certainly at regional organizations, it's quite a different landscape that we live in today versus the landscape that we've lived in for most of the lives of our ccTLDs.

For one thing, now ccTLDs are in the minority of the market in terms of number of TLDs out there. We have 1,000+ for-profit new generic TLDs out there, many of them very well-funded. Some of them not. And that presents its own distinct challenges or set of challenges. We've seen many different business models and pricing models evolving out of the new GTLD landscape.



---

I know we've all been watching the number grow in terms of the new gTLDs that are out there. In terms of domain names, most recently there are about 23 million new gTLD domain names out there. It's certainly slower than I think many expected; however, it's still very significant. So it's not the explosive growth that many predicted, but it's strong and meaningful growth and we're starting to see that hockey stick ramp happen. And I think there's only more to come there.

Just recently we saw .web – or for .web. Apparently it was Verisign, although there seems some question about that. The .web extension went for \$135 million at auction, so very significant money being invested in the new TLD space. And all that being said, the two biggest players, Google and Amazon, haven't really even come to market with their new TLDs in a meaningful way, so we're still all waiting for that to happen. That's a pretty dramatically different landscape than all of us have been operating in for most of the history of our organizations.

At CIRA last year we continued to grow at 4%, but that's significantly lower than the growth rates that we've had for most of our existence. And that's true across a lot of ccTLDs and certainly a lot of the larger ones who are experiencing zero growth or in some cases even slightly negative growth. That's a very different place for us to operate in.

---

So what's a ccTLD to do? What are we doing in particular? How do we retool ourselves for this dramatically different environment? And while we do that as organizations – while CIRA does that as an organization – how do we also continue to nurture a dynamic digital environment within our own respective jurisdictions?

And we do this – and certainly I'm doing it in Canada – in an environment where my costs aren't declining in any way. There's the notion of Moore's Law where processing power is declining pretty dramatically, but the fact of the matter is, most of my expenses are around human capital, around people, around operations, and those costs only continue to increase.

Not to mention we are facing significantly increased threats from a cyber security perspective, new vectors. I remember fondly the old days when we used to just see spikes in activity when we knew we were under attack. Now there are no more spikes unless there are multiple vectors simultaneously because we're always under attack. The only time we see a spike is when its numerous attacks concurrently.

As I just mentioned, the war for top talent is I would say very real, and we're certainly experiencing it in CIRA. It's hard to get good talent. We have to fight against for-profit actors for the best talent. The competition within our channel is also a

---

significant challenge. Most of our registrar partners are fairly distracted with implementing new gTLDs. And the new gTLDs are competing heavily against each other, so getting shelf space within a registrar's web presence is getting increasingly difficult from an attention point of view but also more expensive. To be presented at the top of the list or to have a material presence on registrar websites is starting to cost more and more money or certainly time and resources.

So all of these things are making it a very, very different landscape than what we've lived with for most of the history of our organization. And how are we going to respond to that? I think as ccTLDs we shouldn't shy away from being innovative. We shouldn't shy away from doing new and different things to ensure the ongoing viability of our organizations and also to provide a benefit to the public and our respective jurisdictions, not to mention just as businesses we want to make sure we're viable into the future.

So it's in that context that CIRA really reviewed and redid our strategic plan and took some material steps into our future. Just in the past year, CIRA's Board approved a new four-year strategic plan. Strategic plans are always a bit of a challenge to articulate in a very short time and with only one slide, but I've done my best here to simplify it and highlight the focus of CIRA's

---

strategy really comes down to three core elements. One is innovate, one is operate, and one is donate.

In the early days of CIRA, we were really focused just about operations, providing the DNS and registry services. But going forward, we're going to be much more focused on innovation and contributing back to the community through donation. And as well, we have some cross-cutting underlying planks around talent in particular and partnerships and otherwise, but the key thing here is innovate, operate, and donate has become the new strategic direction of CIRA. And I highlight this because innovation starts to be a key factor in what we're doing going forward.

Innovation happens in the way that many of us traditionally think about it. For example, we've created a CIRA Labs. Jacques Latour who spoke earlier has been moved to head up our CIRA Labs as CTO. And they're doing things that are more technology-centric.

But innovation happens everywhere. It can be happening in marketing, it can be happening in how we deal with our channel partners, and we're seeing that happening with how we deal with channel partners in terms of being much more aggressive and demanding of them. There was a time where there was an equality of outcome was the mantra across all our registrars.

---

Now its equality of opportunity. Now they are measured and judged on the performance of the programs and activities that they do with us.

I can tell you that's led to some challenging discussions, but at the end of the day with somewhat restricted resources, things that we do with them have to pay back to us not just provide more margin for registrars. So that's been evolving, too, and we're engaged in some pretty innovative programs with them.

So not only do we have to implement the strategic plan, but we have to ensure the longer term viability of the organization. To that end – and going back to the innovation component of our strategy – we've really focused on several core areas – two in particular here. As we looked at what can we do to solidify the future of CIRA, how can we take advantage of the expertise that we have – our domain expertise as it were – we focused on two key areas.

One was around the DNS in specific, and we've developed an Anycast service. Like many of you, we were buyers of those services. We consumed those services ourselves, and we believe that we should have three discrete Anycast providers for redundancy and security and performance. But all we got out of them was a service. There's very little in terms of information, in terms of data, in terms of understanding. Yes, they provided a

---

service. We used ISC, PCH, and Newstar, but we weren't getting what we needed to truly understand what was happening.

So that was the genesis of innovating a new service for an Anycast provider and customer number one, of course, was us. We started that because we wanted more. And when we looked around the Canadian landscape, the DNS infrastructure of many organizations was not what we would consider up to scratch.

So we started providing it through our registrars. They didn't really take it up. We had to do a bit of a pivot and innovate in terms of how we were going to distribute it. We started selling direct, and now we have 130 enterprise customers. Large-scale customers like hospitals, universities, the Bank of Canada, and others are our customers.

Interestingly, once we were in that market, other people started approaching us who we hadn't actually figured when we started this service. As many of you know, in Helsinki we announced that we were providing a white label service to our friends at .se. So we essentially offered our entire Anycast cloud and infrastructure to .se so they could resell it to their registrars and organizations in Sweden.

If we hadn't innovated, if we hadn't deployed that new service, we never would have been in a position to have that kind of a discussion. So innovation is key, and you never know where it's

---

going to lead you. Dot-dk has also taken up our Anycast service, so now we have an international footprint as well as the originally intended national footprint.

In addition to the Anycast in terms of innovation, we knew that CIRA needed our own next generation registry. So as we thought about building the third registry in our existence, we thought about how can we leverage it for CIRA's benefit but also to the benefit of others? So when we started developing it right from the base we created it as a multi-tenant environment, that it could run numerous TLDs, and both gs and ccs with equal ease. And we have built that product out knowing that it will be the future of CIRA, but we have now also enabled it to be able to provision other TLDs and some of you may know that we just announced our first generic TLD: .kiwi is actually our first tenant in our new registry, and we anticipate .ca will be moving on to it in about 12 to 18 months.

We had always thought CIRA would be tenant number one, and of course metaphorically we will be, but chronologically, .kiwi has been our first tenant on the new platform and that's actually gone very well and we've become ICANN accredited during the process.

So in thinking about our future and innovating around the platform we developed, we put ourselves in a position to

---

generate new and different kinds of revenues than we would have thought of originally.

But it's not all about revenue and business. There's also still the public benefit side of our organization where we continue to innovate there as well. And we've developed an Internet performance test that we've made available to the general public, and in a sense, crowdsourced performance tests.

So we released the CIRA Internet Performance Test, which is a true end-to-end performance test. It's not like your typical Telco or ISP one where they measure just their connection and miraculously you always get the speed and performance that you're paying for. Ours actually looks at the end-to-end test in conjunction with the Google M-Labs environment.

Now we're up to about a quarter million tests from across Canada, and we're starting to get a pretty good insight into what the true Canadian Internet performance looks like because then we've also layered on our own additional components where we now heat-map performance – and this is just a map of Toronto, Canada's largest city – and looking at the performance literally neighborhood by neighborhood, postal walk by postal walk, and right down to the ISP. Not only does it look at performance, we also look at quality. So we can see ping and jitter and DNSSEC and IPv6 and 100 other data points.



---

So this provides a really unique dataset that is valuable to us as CIRA but also to policy makers, to academics, and provides us the opportunity to monetize the value of this by selling it back to industry. So what started out as a pure public good can also have some potential financial benefit to the organization. We can do both. And that's what we've been very focused on and that's what our strategy is about.

Innovate, operate, donate – and I think in particular this provides a nice example of how those things can all live together and provide a solid future for organizations like CIRA. Thanks.

HIROFUMI HOTA: Thank you, Byron. We can take just one quick question here. No? Yes, [Jay].

[JAY DALEY]: Thank you, Byron. Can we all steal your Internet performance tool please?

BYRON HOLLAND: I'd be happy to talk about that.

[JAY DALEY]: Thank you.

---

HIROFUMI HOTA: Thank you. Very quick.

Okay, let's move to the second presenter who is Ning. So Ning, please.

NING KONG: Morning, everyone. I'm very glad to have this opportunity to share some experience from CNNIC. In this presentation, I will separate my presentation into three parts. In the first part, I will share some current [status] of .cn and .xinhua .

In this slide, you can see in this year .cn get big increase and from last year and we become the number one ccTLD and in this year, and we think that we will be very soon to get to the 20 million point. So I think that may be in the end of this month. It's our first time to get such high [point]. And for the IDN, we got the .xinhua, .china in simplified version and traditional version. Also in this year, we got increase from the .xinhua. The number is about 500,000.

We have a lot of domestic registrars in China and now the number is about more than 80, and we have about 2,000 resellers in China. And also we know that .cn is allowed to registered around the world, so we have about 40 overseas

---

registrars in the world and we also have more than 1,000 resellers in the world.

And now you can see that from my last presentation in the previous ICANN meeting, CNNIC is still seeking [the director] overseas registrars in South America and Africa. Unfortunately, we didn't make it, so we are still seeking overseas partners in such kind of areas. So if anyone would like recommend some overseas partners, I will be happy and will be very appreciative for your recommendation.

For my second part I will share some innovation of application in the ccTLD .cn and .xinhua. We try to cooperate with our registrars to not only increase the .cn and .xinhua but also improve the application of .cn and .xinhua. In this slide, you can see that we cooperate with registrar in Xiamen City in China.

[Now] in China almost every company have a credit code and it's a long code. The length is about 20 numbers/characters, so for the registration side of this kind of domains doesn't make any sense. But we want to make some application cooperation that if people register such kind of long domains, for example the credit code plus .cn, and if the end user to access such kind of domain [inaudible] and it's easily redirect this domain name to a [query] web page and this web page will show the relative company's credit information. And such kind of information,

---

most of them [are] get from the authorities. We think that such kind of application can improve such kind of long, not really fancy domain names to get more applications.

Another thing that we try to cooperate with another registrars which provide a free website building service. We cooperate with such kind of registrars that if end users want to use such kind of website building service and they can get .cn domain names and there's a special regional second level .cn, now we have some special original second level .cn, for example we have .tj. Tj.cn is belongs to the Tianjin City.

In this slide, you can see we cooperate with another registrars in Nanyang City. We want to improve such kind of application because most of the Chinese vehicle users they want to make sure that if they got any kind of violation information, but not everyone can remember the website which can query such kind of information. So we cooperate with such kind of registrars and if people can just type the license plate number plus .cn and in the browsers, and people can easily be redirected to the query authority, [query] information and easily to get the vehicle violation information.

The last application cooperation is about EAI. And you know CNNIC think the EAI is a very important application, and we believe even in more than 80 years ago we think that maybe the

---

e-mail application EAI – E-mail Address Internationalization – we think that maybe such kind of application could be a [pillar] application for the IDN. Maybe we are wrong, but we think it's a good application we need to try.

We contribute on the standardization of the EAI [in] IETF, and after that we try to promote the implementation of EAIs and we cooperated with Coremail. Maybe not everyone knows such kind of brand. It's the biggest Chinese brand who provides the e-mail software solution and e-mail service in China. So we cooperated with Coremail that and every end users from Coremail and if they use Coremail's e-mail service and they can get a .cn for the e-mail service.

We know that most people, especially the young people, do not know what is EAI and even IDN, so we [use] some kind of our efforts to try to training the young people in China and we visit several Chinese universities to train them that what is IDN and what is EAI.

After our training, and most of the young people think that they do not know it before but they think it's an interesting service, it's an interesting concept, and most of the young people want to try it. And so we cooperated with some Chinese universities and we provided some demo service to the young people and the university teachers, and [enlightened] the people can try the

---

e-mail address and they can use the EAI address at their account to use the e-mail service.

That's my second part. And in the last part I want to share some other things. Most of us, we are ccTLDs and the domain name registration business is our major point, but we also want to share some experience that for ccTLDs most of us have the experience and abilities to provide the DNS service and other related service.

And you know CNNIC got authorization from the ICANN for EBERO, DEA, RDE, and TMCH such kind of relative DNS service. We also provide the technical hosting and data escrow for the DNS related companies in China, and we also provide the domain name verification service. Now we cooperate with Verisign, Afiliast, and .TOP new gTLDs. And now we verified about 10 million domain names in China. So we think that maybe we, on one hand we improve our domain name registration service, on the other hand we can think about try to share our DNS abilities to the market.

That's all. Any questions? Thank you.

HIROFUMI HOTA:

Thank you, Ning Kong. Questions, comments? Yes, Peter.

---

**PETER VERGOTE:** Good morning. Peter Vergote, .be. As a European based ccTLD and being confronted with declining growth, I'm very jealous if I look at your growth figures for both .cn and the IDN version. I just had a question. According to your view, the strong performance of .cn in terms of growth, is it linked with the economic performance of the Chinese economy or is it perhaps more that you see a massive pick-up and interest in IDN registrations or is it due to better enhancements of Internet connections and Internet literacy in your country? Do you have any kind of idea what might be the trigger for this phenomenal growth?

**NING KONG:** Thanks for your question. We do know that China have a very big Internet users market, so that's the reason why we think that we could be the number one ccTLD. We think that it's a big trigger about why we get the increase of .cn and .idn. One of the major [point is] the economic factors. We do notice that a lot of the investors, Chinese [inaudible] invested .cn for the domain name registration, and we still think it's a very major factors for our increase.

But you can see in my second part of my presentation, we tried to improve not only the domain registration numbers, we want to try to improve the application of .cn. We do not like our .cn

---

just to be invested by the [inaudible]. We also would like to see that more people can use the domain names for the [real requirements].

PETER VERGOTE: May I do one follow-up question? Have you changed anything in terms of pricing for registrations the last couple of years, or has it just been stable?

NING KONG: The price is stable. Yes.

PETER VERGOTE: Okay, thank you.

NING KONG: Thank you.

HIROFUMI HOTA: So the last question from Roelof.

ROELOF MEIJER: Can I ask two? Okay, we'll see. Roelof Meijer from .nl. Very interesting. Thank you. It's related to Peter's question. Do you



---

know the percentage of domain names under .cn that actually have contents that lead to a website?

NING KONG: Pardon. I'm sorry?

ROELOF MEIJER: Do you know the percentage of your total zone that of those domains that actually lead to a website or have content?

NING KONG: I have to check the number. My colleague, do you know the number of what kind of percent of our domain names?

My colleague is in charge of the domestic domain name registration, and I think he's...

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: Based on our report, we have more than 3 million websites in China now but some of our applications not [included].

[HIROFUMI HOTA]: Could you get that answer, Roelof?

---

ROELOF MEIJER: Yes, I think he said 3 million, right? Three million websites. Can I do the follow-up question, Mr. Chairman? It's a short one, too.

I'm very interested in the two examples you gave of where the zone is used for checking certain information, so you have the pilot on the license plates and you had the pilot on complete credit number. Who is the registrant of those domains? Is it the company that has the company credit number and is it the person owning the car with the license plate or how does it work?

NING KONG: [Now] we [cooperate] with one of our registrars, and the registrars register the long domain names under .cn.

ROELOF MEIJER: Thank you.

NING KONG: Thank you.

HIROFUMI HOTA: Thank you. Thank you for the Q&A. Let's move to the third presenter who is Russell from Nominet.

---

RUSSELL HAWORTH: While it loads, let me start by saying good morning. Today, we want to talk from a Nominet perspective about how we're building on the foundations of Nominet to expand into new markets. Expansion and diversification is, if you like, a preemptive strategy to ensure Nominet remains as relevant in 10 years' time as we are today to the Internet space.

To be clear, a vibrant, safe, and trusted U.K. name space is fundamental to our business. It remains the focus for Nominet for the foreseeable future. So whilst we talk about diversification, there's no suggestion from our side that we are in any way doing anything other than continuing to invest and try to innovate in the core. But to defend and grow, innovation is needed both in the core domain business and in also new products and services. So I'd like to go through that briefly today.

I won't dwell on this slide because many in the room are very aware of the dynamics that the ccs face as a group of organizations. But there's a couple of points I'd like to make on this slide in particular, one of which is we obviously no longer have a captive market and we have to do more to actively sell and market our domains.

As a response to this, Nominet have run a range of promotions that we've never done before. Over the last 12 months, we've

---

run more promotions than we ever have in our lifetime as an organization. We're looking at bundling. There's pricing promotional discounts we're doing. But in order to facilitate this, we increased the price of the domains last year.

The other point I'd make on this slide is there are patterns of demand which are shifting. So domestic markets like the U.K. are now very mature, and there's more segmentation of the markets that we need to do. We need to get smarter about how we segment the markets, so we are doing a lot with data now to try and understand the segments of the markets.

We're working with the channel to understand when we think about SMEs and the under-penetration of opportunities in SMEs, what does that mean? So looking at the size of the construction market, looking at the size of the IT market, looking at the size of the travel market, and trying to really get to the dynamics of what's driving growth and potential areas of under-penetration.

So those are just some of the things we're doing, and obviously in the context of the overall market, we are facing a change in landscape and this picture you may have seen. It's on our website if you want to go and look at it in more detail. Clearly, it's not good viewership from a distance. But really what it's saying is that the country codes have shifted – .tk, .cn – as we've just heard about have experienced substantial growth.

---

But therein lies not the problem. The problem is obviously new domains, new gTLDs, .com is a global brand which is able to penetrate into markets that some of the ccns have challenges to do. And there are also innovation and disruptive forces at play. Last week, we heard of Google's Nomulus. That could have impact on the registry market. It may have implications for us as ccns as we start to look to diversify our businesses.

Given I am talking about U.K., no U.K. presentation is complete these days without mentioning Brexit. So I'll just throw it in there. But there are systemic challenges for the innovation for ccns as well, in our case particularly Brexit.

As I said earlier on, this is not about stepping away from our focus of running .uk. Running .uk is absolutely key for us. We feel as though we've got a great technical and service track record. We've got what I think is an attractive proposition and a very well-known brand and something that we've got to continue to remind ourselves that we are a very strong brand from a domain perspective in the U.K. And we also take a responsible approach, so we have saved around 165 million pounds in court fees with our award-winning Dispute Resolution service.

And as I mentioned, we are innovating in our core business. Domains are an area where we want to continue to innovate, and we're using data and segmentation to do that.

---

This slide is a little hard to read. It's got some gremlins in the PowerPoint, but effectively what this lays out is our strategy. And our strategy is really based on four concentric rings. The core obviously is not to scale. This diagram, I should have a little footnote in the bottom. The core is the majority of our business. It drives about 90% of our revenue. But the core business is something which we've added to over the years. We've run .cymru, .wales, as part of the gTLDs. But beyond the core, what we're really doing is three things – registry services, network analytics, and applied innovation. And I'll come onto each of those three briefly now.

The second concentric ring there, which is really hard to see from the actual diagram, but effectively the second ring there is around our registry service provision. And over the last year or so, we have expanded this quite significantly. We have recently been backend service provider for .blog, and there's been over 1,000 registrations in founders phase for .blog. Land rush phase is now open. There's about 300 domains registered in the first week. But the registry service market and provision for registry services is very much the focus of our second concentric ring.

Likewise, many of you would have heard that we are now the backend service provider for MMX. We have 24 gTLDs which have now been successfully transitioned, and there'll be two other gTLDs which will be transitioned on the 8<sup>th</sup> of November. The

---

point I'd like to make here is that ccs I think have a strong role to play in the backend service provision. The mystique about transferring domains I think is being dispelled. And we are successfully transitioning a number of gTLDs to the point where now Nominet is one of the top ten registry service providers.

Our third concentric strategic ring is around network analytics, and particularly DNS network analytics. Over the years, we've developed through our innovation program a product called Turing. Turing is effectively a DNS analytical tool. It's enterprise platform that we work primarily to shed light on nature and source of DNS based attacks. It identifies botnets and malware, and it identifies misconfiguration on networks. So it's very applicable to ISPs, and that has primarily been the focus of how we sell the Turing enterprise platform.

The other vector for growth for Nominet and for Turing has been working with governments, and so last week we signed an agreement and announced to the market that we're working with the U.K.'s National Cybersecurity Centre. That's a new area of growth for us and one where we feel there's good opportunities to play our role in making the U.K. network safe and secure.

We developed Turing, but we also developed a member version of Turing called Turing Essentials, and I think it's important for

---

us to ensure that what we're doing as a membership organization is identifying opportunities where we can develop products that we can sell to large organizations but equally look to provide elements of that capability back to our members. So that's what we've done. And I will just add that we have a booth just outside, so if any of you are interested in learning more about Turing, we'd be delighted to run you through the Turing platform.

The fourth concentric strategic ring is around innovation and applied innovation. And so we're exploring two things here, one of which is the Internet of Things. And so the kind of random collection of photographs there are really to illustrate that we are working with IoT in a number of different areas.

So right the way through from smart parking into flood networks – we've got a flood network capability where we're integrating devices out in the field to monitor flood network across the Oxford area and integrating that with data and maps to better provide information around flooding risk which is a big problem in the U.K. But we're also working with the London Zoological society to look at how we can integrate IoT in the wildlife, and so that's an exciting project which we are developing. So what effectively we're doing is taking a very hands-on approach to how we develop IoT and really look to be a platform provider for IoT.



---

Within that category, we are also working on dynamic spectrum management, particularly TV White Space. We're the first [Off-com] qualified operator for the TV White Space database. That's interesting because actually the two are very complementary. IoT and TV White Space work well together actually because in many remote locations, you can use the dynamic spectrum management with the IoT device.

Those are very complementary projects. We are also working on a number of different initiatives with partners. I won't go on to it in a moment, but there will be a release that we'll be able to talk about soon. But partnerships form a very significant component of how we work in IoT and TV White Space.

The gremlin has also attacked this slide, but effectively the point I wanted to make here was a point that Byron mentioned earlier as well which is Nominet's a public benefit organization. What we say is what we do commercially is inextricably linked to what we can do to give back to the community.

Our products and services I've just mentioned, all of those four concentrics help us be commercially successful over the long term. That means we can invest in initiatives that support a whole range of public benefit activities, and we've got three pillars of our public benefit. One is to deliver social technology, the second is to focus on safe and secure Internet, and the third

---

one is really looking at what we can do more to develop a more connected Internet infrastructure in future.

With that in mind, what we've done is we've invested over 2016 20 pence in every pound in terms of public benefit contribution, either directly or through Nominet Trust. Nominet Trust, we've invested substantial amounts over the years, but effectively what we're doing now is more direct public benefit projects. We have digital Propella, effectively working with young people to bring them into use their digital skills to marry those with SMEs and so we can identify areas where we can get that symmetry between SMEs that need digital skills and young people trying to find work.

We're working with the Prince's Trust on developing more digital projects to support digital engagement, and we're working on the Micro:bit which as many of you may or may not know the Micro:bit is a project which helps young people in schools identify opportunities and really encourages the next wave of future coders, and IoT is certainly a component of that future coding platform.

I'll move quickly to the final slide, which is effectively where we are now is we are continuing to innovate and continue to execute on each of those four concentrics to really help us get more people connected in more ways more of the time.

---

Thank you.

HIROFUMI HOTA: Thank you, Russell. Unfortunately, we don't have time so could we move to the fourth presenter, Pablo.

PABLO RODRIGUEZ: Esteemed colleagues and friends, it is a pleasure and a privilege to be here this morning to present to you what we have done during this past year in Puerto Rico. It is very likely that you've heard many things about Puerto Rico in the news, but the one thing that must be said is that we have a NIC that is invigorated, that is full of energy in terms of what it's doing with capital resources, especially with our children and with our youth. So that in common we have with .uk, with China, and I'm delighted to hear that all of these innovations and all of these initiatives are taking place and we are not the exception, so are we involved in that.

That said, what are we to do in light of the avalanche of domain names with which we are faced in our various countries? Well, Puerto Rico is not the exception, again. And we have been competing with .com and with so many other new gTLDs as we go by, but what we have found is that in this small island which is barely 100 miles long by 50-something kilometers wide, what

---

do we do to remain relevant in the Internet world? And that is what we are about to talk now.

We have the sky is no longer the limit. We need to start thinking beyond the sky into the stars and away from our galaxies. What are we doing with that? We have been getting involved in cooperation with NASA. We have been helping our students, and we are helping also our teachers, to use Internet technologies to take charge of our future, to take charge also of our realities and so that we can incorporate Internet technologies to promote education in all of its facets – education in the form of languages, technology, engineering, math, science.

Here we are, here we have some examples, such as Dr. Lester Morales who is a scientist and a NASA specialist, education specialist, who has been working with us. This is our President and CEO at the company, a very young man, who has a very interesting approach in terms of working with our youth.

And so here you can see how we have been working with so many different children bringing to them how the Internet technologies are incorporated and integrated into their daily lives. And this is how we make our ccTLD relevant to everyone and each of them, both professors, teachers, at very low levels, such as high schools, middle schools, and universities as well.

---

Here we are, we have some more of that. We have been working with various initiatives such as Virtual Educa which is an initiative by the Organization of American States which promotes education as one of the Human Rights that must be kept and protected.

So where are we? We are everywhere. We're involved in promoting science, technology, engineering, and math. We are promoting the arts. We are promoting technologies. We are promoting social activities. We are promoting social causes. Because the ccTLD, and especially in Puerto Rico, we strongly believe that the ccTLD is an integral part of every activity related to the government, to the community, to individuals, to the citizenships, to the students, to the older people, to the younger people. We should be involved everywhere, and that's precisely what we do. So we're going forward. We're in the Internet.

Here we're presenting some of the groups of students who have been involved and that we have been promoting in activities such as submarine robotic competitions. Our groups became national champions in the United States in both categories, obstacle course categories, and they have been integrating engineering, mathematics, science, and without a doubt, the Internet.

---

Also, we have been involved in promoting engineering, in robotics, integrating all types of education, because there is nothing more integrative than hands-on experience where you literally apply the theories and the theoretical concepts into a real product, a physical product.

And so here you look at this robot here and you see these extensions – est.pr – the Spanish version of student which is Estudiante – est.pr, and prof.pr for professors, for teachers and also ac.pr for academic. All of these extensions are free, and we're giving them away to every single professor, student, it doesn't matter who they are. In most cases we are also giving away the web hosting services. We strongly believe that if we don't do that, we won't be able to help them out and they won't be able to apply the use of those technologies if we don't promote this.

So this is how we continue to become relevant. This is a very interesting project here. What we are doing is, since the Photonics, which is the use of laser works and other similar technologies, have matured so much we are also taking people with a very low level of, example, algebra and we can teach these people how to use these technologies through the Photonics Institute which is associated with the UMET University in Puerto Rico, and they have this amazing program in which they help people to develop jobs, to learn new skills, and to

---

move these high level technical skills, such as the use of lasers to measure devices – very important devices such as our pacemakers for the heart, for quality control, for quality service – all of these applications are being used in Puerto Rico Top Level Domains through NIC.pr’s promoting this type of education.

We’re also providing them with domain names, and we’re providing them with domain names and registrations so that they can have, once they graduate, they can have a presence in the Internet. At the end of the day, all that matters is how will you have a presence in the Internet? And that presence in the Internet requires a domain name and web hosting services, and that’s what we are.

So here again you have different teams of students who have achieved high level grades, such as this group right here. They earned mathematics Olympics in Latin America where we [chose] our teams earned first, second, and third prize and the other team that also became the national champions in submarine robotics at the U.S. levels.

Here we are working with some of our government agencies. I’d like to acknowledge the President of our Regulatory Board of Telecommunications, Mr. Javier Rua, who has been a staunch supporter of .pr and without him he’s been instrumental in the

---

success of many of these projects as well as the secretary of Education, Mr. Román, who has been so gracious at helping us with providing many of these services to the students. Moreover, I'd like to show you what we have been doing with our new generations.

Hiro, if you allow me one more minute, I would like to share this – bear with me just a moment.

This is a dictionary for the Spanish language, for those of you that speak Spanish you know that we have different flavors of Spanish. Well, Puerto Ricans, we have our flavors of Spanish in digital as well, and I'd like to share this very quick video with you and here you will see – where is my sound? Do I not get to sound? No.

You will see here some of the events in which we have been engaged in promoting the use of these technologies. I am sorry that we don't have a sound bite, but here you will see real life information. We have been involved in all sorts of different types of events from social causes to business causes. We have been developing playgrounds for foster children, we have been involved in developing education programs, academic programs, and we have been involved with so many other activities which at the end of the day, all it means is we strongly believe that capital resource must be developed and our future



---

is in the new generations. And that's what we are investing and that's where our energy is focused.

With that said, I thank you all for giving me this opportunity. I thank you all for your patience. And thank you very much for this opportunity. I hope that I can see you in Puerto Rico in 2018. So we bid for your support, and let everyone know that you want to be in Puerto Rico in 2018. Thank you very much.

HIROFUMI HOTA:

Thank you, Pablo. Sorry we could not have time for Q&A. Please contact the presenters directly.

The joint meeting between GAC and the ccNSO starts at 12:00. ccNSO is famous for its being punctual. So please rush to Hall 4 next door. And after the lunch, 13:45, we will reconvene our discussion here. Please come back at 13:45.

**[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]**