EN

HYDERABAD – High Interest Topic session: Underserved Regions in ICANN
Monday, November 07, 2016 – 17:00 to 18:30 IST
ICANN57 | Hyderabad, India

ALICE MUNYUA: Good afternoon, everybody. This is the Governmental Advisory Committee underserved regions working group high-interest topic convened session. We're going to be discussing issues pertaining to underserved regions in the ICANN community. My name is Alice Munyua, African Union Commission co-chair of the GAC underserved regions working group. And I'm going to let the panelists introduce themselves, the names and constituencies. Perhaps we can start with Abdalla.

ABDALLA OMARI: Thank you, Alice. My name is Abdalla Omari. I'm here on behalf of the ccNSO, the African region.

OLGA CAVALLI: My name is Olga Cavalli. I'm the GAC representative of Argentina, also the GAC vice chair. I'm here in this panel to tell you about the draft -- the group that drafted the charter for the auction proceeds future cross-community working group.

PUA HUNTER: My name is Pua Hunter, co-chair for the underserved region.

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.

SIRANUSH VARDANYAN: My name is Siranush Vardanyan, ICANN staff, development and public responsibility department, responsible for fellowship program.

ANDREW MACK: Andrew Mack with AMGlobal. I am the outreach chairman of the BC, amongst other things.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Tijani Ben Jemaa. I am the vice chair of ALAC.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Cheryl Langdon-Orr. I'm a member of APRALO, which is the Asia-Pacific Regional At-Large Organization. And I'm currently on this panel for two reasons. One is I am an active participate of a number, if not all the topics in Work Stream 2 including the diversity matter.   And, secondly, Alice knows I'm highly opinionated on many subjects including this one.

MICHELE NEYLON: Good afternoon. Michele Neylon. I don't have an opinion on anything. And I member of the Registrar Stakeholder Group, formerly the chair of that group, currently a GNSO Councillor but also on the board of the Internet Infrastructure Coalition.

I'm probably on this panel because I've done a little bit of work with ICANN in relation to some of the capacity-building, but I've also been quite a vocal critic of other aspects of the entire project. Thanks.

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: Good afternoon. I'm Rubens Kuhl. I'm a citizen of Brazil, one of the countries usually listed as being underserved. And also gTLD registry and ccTLD registry.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Hi, I'm Jonathan Zuck from ACT, The App Association. And I'm also the chair of the Affirmation of Commitments-mandated review on competition, consumer choice, and consumer trust and also evaluating the application and evaluation process with respect to underserved regions.

ALICE MUNYUA: Thank you very much. And welcome, everybody. I hope we're going to have very vibrant discussions on underserved regions.

And to start us off, I would like to give a very brief background on the underserved -- the GAC underserved regions working group. As you can see there, our terms of reference and focus is mainly on regions underserved by the DNS industry and on least

developed economies and small island nations. And that definition and focus is adopted the U.N. definition of underserved regions.

But we are looking for, you know, an alternative title to this working group because we'd like to -- because we believe that "the underserved" has a negative connotation. So we are looking for a more positive title for it. And some of the ideas that have come up are evolving nations, high-potential regions, outreach and inclusiveness and working for Internet in a sustainable development. So we're going to be requesting you all to help us come up with a new title for this working group.

Without further ado, I think I'm going to have -- because we have quite a large number of panelists, I'll have a fast presentation by Andrew Mack who is going to be looking at -- presenting on some research findings on underserved regions. Andrew, you have the mic.

ANDREW MACK: I think there is -- yes, a presentation that's coming up. My apologies. The original version of this has beautiful graphics in it, but it didn't translate.

My name is Andrew Mack. And as I said, I run a consulting firm called AMGlobal based in Washington. And amongst other

EN

things, we focus a lot on the global south, the evolution of the Internet in the global south and what is happening.

And we were asked by the CCTRT to take a look at the lack of demand for applicants in the global south in this most recent round of new gTLD applications.

And as you can imagine, it's a very difficult thing to do to look at something that didn't happen. You're kind of trying to prove a negative. And it's been -- it was a very challenging project to do as a result. It's also a difficult task because you're trying to reach out to people who don't almost by definition find this urgent because they are -- the round's already over.

And so we -- what we did -- and I'm going to move to the next slide, if I might, is what we did was we structured our research trying to understand since most applications in the last round were from the global north -- and, Alice, you were looking for another term "underserved regions" might not be. "Global south" is one that we've used to refer to what used to be called the third world or emerging markets.

Most of the -- almost all of the applications for the last round were from the Europe, United States, China. And so we looked at two questions. One was: What factors influence decisions of people in the global south that cause them not to apply? And the second thing is: Okay. Based on that, what might ICANN and

EN

the broader ICANN community consider doing to increase global south participation in future rounds? So think of it in these terms. What were your constraints? And then what advice do -- does the community have?

 Next slide, please.

 So briefly we looked at a cross-section of different potential interviewees. We wanted to get into a real conversation to the greatest extent we could with people in -- decision makers who were leaders in the global south to get their thoughts on this and to bring to the front of their mind.

 We had on the -- your -- over my shoulder on the left side, you will see a wide-sector distribution looking at different kinds of organizations who might have applied. But we made a very significant decision to group the best bulk of our interviews in the Latin America region. And that was mostly because we wanted to make sure that we could get enough comparable data.

 And the interviews were anywhere in length between 30 minutes and a hour and a half. So we got some really interesting conversations, some really, really good depth.

 Next slide, please.

So what came out of this was if you will an ABC of major constraints. Number one was awareness. Too few people knew that this program was going on. Not enough of them felt that they had the time for decision-making. The information was incomplete. It was in really dense expert language. And there was too much -- too limited knowledge at what we call the edges, which is to say on the one hand, busy policymakers, the CIO, the CTO, the kind of people who in an organization or an association would need to green light the project, would need to say yes to it, on the one hand, and too little knowledge at the general public level. And at the general public level, it was very important because if you were trying to make the argument that this is something that our company or our organization or our association wants to go for, the fact that no one in the general public knows that it exists is a constraint. So awareness, number one.

Number two, business model. There really was no clear sense of what success looked like. A number of the interviewees with whom we spoke said, Okay, great. Show me one that works. Show me what this is supposed to look like, especially in a global south context. There were some concerns about consumer -- customer confusion, search engine optimization, things like that. There was a lot of confusion and very little knowledge about what a generic TLD might mean. So as you

know, many of the TLDs that were applied for were TLDs that were categories. And in the global south, this was much less common. And people in the global south said I didn't really understand to get a .BANK or a .FRUIT, something that could be sold more broadly.

And then the C: Cost, complexity, and channel. $185,000 is perceived as real money and even -- it was interesting. We had a wonderful conversation with a Kenyan investor who said it's not that we can't afford it, but it's can we justify making that investment as opposed to something else because $185,000 in our part of the world is important.

So cost is one. The complexity of the program is another. Even people who are relatively comfortable with the ICANN process who had more knowledge still felt that they did not have enough information.

And then last channel, they weren't sure that they could get into and sell through the global sales channels. So all three of those, the ABCs, led us to the sense of a lack of urgency around making the decision.

Next slide, please.

So tangibly, what might we do as a community? Well, very obvious first piece of advice, outreach tools, outreach tools for

non-expert audiences, answering key questions about cost, process, timing and ICANN itself. An awful lot of people who need to know about this kind of program don't know enough about ICANN. So we got to get those tools out there to people.

Second thing is to explain different uses for new gTLDs. The vast majority of interviewees with whom we spoke just assumed that the name that they might apply for was their name. And, in fact, there are many other uses.

Third thing, a strong, strong piece of advice that the interviewees gave us was build a long-term program of consistent outreach and build that program not starting when the clock starts but before the program begins because things take longer to percolate through and into different parts of the emerging markets world in different parts of the global south. Make those a combination of in-person and general public-facing efforts and working in partnership with the ICANN community to help promote and repromote and be consistent about messages so that people can get the chance not just to hear it once but to really absorb this and to get feedback.

And then, lastly, evaluate other possible assistance. We mentioned that there's the possibility of price support, consultant registries. A huge number of the people who applied for new gTLDs worked with consultants. People in the global

south said they didn't know where they could find consultants in their parts of the world. Things like that, getting out sales channel information.

So I think last slide.

So last slide is around the big questions. This is all fine and good but it makes an assumption. And the assumption is that this is, in fact, something that we as a community are committed to doing. And I know, Alice, that this is a big piece of what the GAC is looking at.

So are we committed to promoting new gTLDs in the global south? If so, how committed are we? Importantly, what would success look like for an effort of this sort? And I think it's important for us to think about why is this important for ICANN and the ICANN community? It's not just enough to be rhetorical. If we're going to be committed to it, we have to be committed to it because it is something where we have real strong goals in mind. Thank you.

ALICE MUNYUA: Thank you very much, Andrew, for that concise presentation.

Are there any questions for Andrew, even from the panelists here or from the audience? Olga.

OLGA CAVALLI: Andrew, thank you. After explaining the new gTLDs concept in Latin America about, like, 200 times to 300 different people -- and you know we have very few applications from Latin America. Having gone through this reality that several names that are interesting for the general market are taken from the region, what would you -- would you say what would success look like for this effort? What's your opinion about that?

I mean, when you talk to people, they tell you, Why would I need that? What is the purpose? And when we started to think about in Argentina and perhaps asking TLDs from different regions, then we realized we should ask one per region, which is a big effort and a big amount of money.

So there are a lot of things that come -- questions that come -- right after you think it's a good idea, then it's also more complicated. Thank you.

ANDREW MACK: Great question, Olga. A couple of things. And my apologies all for speaking so quickly. I just know we are time constrained.

A couple of things came in from our discussions in Latin America. One is that an idea like this takes time to percolate. It takes time to develop. And so what we heard from a lot of our

interviewees was it may take six to nine months before I am able to take the idea, socialize it within my company or with my government agency or whatever so that it can go and be vetted and people can get their head around the idea and understand why it might make sense for them. So that was number one.

Number two is, is that people said we're interested in this idea in theory but we can't -- we don't have the talking points to explain it to people outside of our narrow -- of our narrow band. And as I was saying, the two edges in the technical community, the CTO, CIO world, they get this, okay? But trying to explain it to the CEO or to the head of an association who may have very little interest in and very little knowledge of the technical side, it takes a different skill set. It takes a different set of talking points almost.

And then, again, with the general public, if they don't perceive that there's a lot of knowledge in the general public, then they're going to say that's great. Why are we going to do this now as opposed to waiting until the general public is on board?

I will say that I think it is a -- we have an opportunity to distill from what's happened so far. And I think we have an obligation to do it -- to try to understand, okay, what are the potential models. And in a situation where there may be some potential models, how can we adjust those models to make them feel and

be a little bit easier for the global south to pick up because there's no question, there's a fair amount of translation that needs to go on both linguistically and in terms of market.

People -- I remember interviewing an executive in Peru. And he said, This is really a new idea for our market. And I don't want to be too far out in front of our customers, but I want to be ready when they're ready.

And so part of this is when will they be ready? And part of this is, can we make the value proposition as simple as possible?

I just wanted to acknowledge Vanda Scartezini who is also sitting in the front row who was deeply involved in this project and wonderful to work with.

And thank you very much, Vanda.

ALICE MUNYUA: Thank you.

Jonathan, please.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Yeah. Thanks. I guess one of the things that -- this is Jonathan Zuck, for the record -- that I find interesting about this conundrum, if you will, is that right now registrant numbers are quite low in Latin America and other parts of the global south as

well, and so if I was a rational actor in the global south looking at taking on the notion, as you say, that it's not an insignificant investment to produce a product that the marketplace hasn't demonstrated it's that interested in to begin with -- and there's a number of explanations for that; apps or whatever else -- it makes me wonder if it's putting the cart before the horse to be thinking aggressively about marketing a program of new gTLDs and new strings, and maybe we need to be strategizing more about helping people understand why participation in the DNS in the first place is of interest, and thinking about what developing that market looks like because then there's then more of a natural attraction.

And so I guess part and parcel to that is sometimes when we talk about the global south, we talk about folks finding opportunities within their own markets, and in some ways there's a replacement for the global north marketing into those markets, I guess, and avoiding some sort of, you know, DNS colonialism or something like that, but the -- one of the things that's interesting in the app market, which is where my day job exists, is that, for example, one of the most popular disaster relief management apps -- right? -- that's used after a big flood or something like that came out of Nairobi, right?

And I mean, you know, when Katrina hit in New Orleans, it was actually an African, you know, app that was used to manage

volunteers and things like that, and it's because it was kind of a frictionless environment for them not to just find customers in that market but to access a global market.

And so the other thing that might be worth trying to understand better is, barring trying to build up a registrant marketplace in the global south as a first step, is there a way to target our outreach about this TLD to create a more frictionless opportunity to market a generic string out to the global north -- right? -- and why -- you know, why isn't it possible for the head of the -- I always forget his name -- the head of the telecoms in Mexico to have been the one to have done .PHOTOGRAPHY or something like that? Why does it have to be about a local market just to get a local -- a global -- an investor in the global south to participate in a global market?

ANDREW MACK: I think that that makes good sense, Jonathan. There are -- there's no question that we don't want to be limited either way, right? I don't think we want to be limited thinking about the global south as being the target and a hermetically sealed system. Part of our goal should be to capture demand in and out, as well as within. We were just in the -- in the -- the Africa strategy session and we were talking about the ccTLDs, and the point -- the point came up and I said, "Look, what we want is a

balanced diet. We want to have the ability to take from all of these different boxes and to create whatever opportunities make the most sense" and something like Ushahidi, if it grows up organically, that's great.

I was very struck, though, by a number of people who mentioned -- in the interviews who said "We're not tied in enough to be able necessarily to believe that we can sell a generic out into the -- the broader community, the global north community," and so maybe that's something we can dive into more deeply and understand that and improve those linkages.

ALICE MUNYUA: Yes, please. Go ahead with your question.

BARTLETT MORGAN: My name is Bartlett Morgan. I am from the Caribbean. And regardless of the definition of "underserved region" that you use, the Caribbean falls squarely in there.

So I guess my question is -- just kind of lifting up the hood a bit, is: How much input did you get from the Caribbean region, specifically, in producing this?

ANDREW MACK: Funny you should ask.

Out of the 37 full hour interviews that we had, we had two from the Caribbean. We interviewed a major media house and we interviewed a person who was a senior technical person at CARICOM, so we got both a regional perspective as well as a private sector perspective. Interesting interviews because these are -- you know -- these are very, very small diverse markets -- right? -- but with a need to work together to form a kind of coherent whole. And in each instance, they had a fair amount of knowledge about the program, but in both instances decided not to go forward, partly because they couldn't quite get the business model right.

On the CARICOM side, one of the things that they were urging us to do was to look in more depth and despite what might appear might make some good sense as we think about the small island states in the Pacific as well, whether there's not potentially a model that could be built that would specifically speak to the needs of, you know, these kind of diverse small market states, groups of states. I know that the -- that the -- that there are two or three markets around the world, at least, that have those same dynamics.

BARTLETT MORGAN: Thank you.

ANDREW MACK: Uh-huh.

ALICE MUNYUA: Thank you. I'm afraid -- yeah, we have to move on because of time constraints so I would like to call Tijani.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Thank you very much. Tijani speaking.

So I don't have a pretty presentation. I will only speak to you.

First of all, I don't like the title, "underserved region," first because the term "region" can be confused with the five official regions of ICANN; and second, because I will not speak about region, I will speak about parties, underserved parties and those parties include countries, group of countries, territories, or communities.

But I will keep speaking about region to comply with the title.

So what are those regions? Those are, first of all, regions where ICANN never go and organize a meeting.

You know that every time ICANN go to an area and organize a meeting, there is a lot of benefit for the community there.

One of my colleagues in ALAC told me that in his country, several professors of I.T. in the university don't know about

ICANN, and every time ICANN go to an area, everyone hear about ICANN and everyone -- not everyone, but a lot of people come to the meetings of ICANN, so this is a big advantage to hold a meeting in an area.

I am not speaking about the economic advantage; I am speaking about the knowledge, the participation.

The underserved regions are also the regions that are not considered by ICANN or less considered than other regions.

If you read the bylaws and the articles of incorporation of ICANN, you will find that ICANN must act for the public -- for the global public interest, and for me, one aspect of the public interest is to make the necessary effort so that all parties benefit equally from the services provided by ICANN, including the underserved region.

As you know, people from the underserved regions don't come to the meetings of ICANN because of obvious reasons. They are not supported. And I know that ICANN make a lot of effort through the fellowship program, et cetera, but as you know, it cannot be enough, so those -- those regions are really underserved in this meeting.

Underserved regions should be considered when ICANN develops policies. And here I will take an example which will be the -- my explanation of what I want to say.

For the new gTLDs, when the program was developed, it was decided that the fees should be $185,000 for one application, and as you know, it is an amount that people from underserved regions cannot afford and cannot pay. There was a lot of complaint from the community, and we -- at the end, we managed to have the board make the famous Resolution 20 in Nairobi to form a group, a working group, to see how we can -- how ICANN can help the applicants that need assistance in applying for and operating a new gTLD.

The group was formed. Its name was the JAS working group. Very famous. And this group didn't attract only people who are lobbying for making effort to make those people apply, it was also -- it was open for everyone, and some people who are against this approach came in it and worked with us. And during all time we worked in this group, every time we make a proposal, they say, "Oh, it will be gamed," so we make more and more barriers.

At the end, we ended up with a very tough criteria. They are so tough that even if we got funding from ICANN to help and to support 14 applicants, we got only three applicants.

In the meantime, ICANN inside the program, the new gTLD program, made outreach for the new gTLDs, and they did it in North America, in Europe, and then they said, "It is not effective, we will make it on line." When they can -- when they arrived to underserved region, they did it on line. And my reaction was, the underserved regions are the less connected people, so you are -- you are making outreach for people who will not see it.

And there is a big difference between going to people, talking to them, explaining to them, and making outreach on line.

So this is another way of underserving those communities.

So three applicants -- three applications. Only one was accepted because of the very tough criteria. And even this one was dropped by the panel of community, the community panel. So the result is zero.

I cannot explain more. I cannot say more to tell you how those regions who are not served -- well served are really disadvantaged, and I think that the most important thing for us is to make ICANN consider those regions for -- in everything ICANN do, especially when they develop their policy. Thank you.

ALICE MUNYUA: Thank you very much, Tijani, for sharing some of those challenges that we can perhaps address later, but for now, I

think I'd like us to have a presentation to understand where -- the work that ICANN is currently doing with the cross-community working groups, and we'll start off with Olga with auction proceeds and then with Cheryl. She's on several working groups and then the CCWG.

Olga, please.

OLGA CAVALLI: Thank you, Alice.

I will briefly present you the status of the -- the cross-community working group that will be appointed or formed in the near future about auction proceeds.

For the moment, there has been a drafting team that several of us participated in it and we have developed a draft charter that is for consideration by the community.

I would like to give the credits of this presentation to Marika Konings. She presented it. It was much larger and I just took some part of it to present it to you, so I -- in the sake of saving time and effort, I will use her presentation. Of course with her agreement.

And I would like to mention that the work -- the drafting team was chaired by Jonathan Robinson from the GNSO, and the co-

chair was Alan Greenberg from the ALAC, and we had members from the ASO, three members of the board, I was participating from the GAC side, GNSO and SSAC and RSSAC. And GNSO I already mentioned.

And the group had several meetings and we -- we received several comments from the -- from the public comment period and also we had a session in Helsinki.

If we can go to the next one. Thank you.

This is very briefly the time line of the working group. I would --

Please go to the next one so we don't invest much time.

So the charter -- what is the charter about, where we are now?

The -- there were several discussions. As I mentioned, we received comments from the community. We also had very frequent conference calls. And with this input, we have been developing this charter. It's the result of all these discussions. And now the status is that the different supporting organizations and advisory committees are invited to agree in this charter or perhaps send comments, but mainly if they -- if they are agreeing with it.

And if there are no special inconvenience or main concerns, it should be adopted, and some of the supporting organizations

and advisory committees have indicated already that they are considering and some of them are said -- have said that they are agreeing with it.

Can we go to the next one, please.

And please, if there are other members of the drafting team in the room who want to add any comment to my presentation, please do so.

So the charter has some sections. I will briefly mention them to you.

First, it addressed the problem, which are the goals and objectives -- objectives and scope of the working -- cross-community working group; how is the membership defined and the staffing and how the work will be organized within the cross-community working group; what is expected as a deliverable, as an outcome and reports that will be produced by the working group; and the rules of engagement.

Can we go to the next one.

Okay. So this is important because there is some misinterpretation sometimes about the role of this cross-community working group. It's tasked with developing proposals for consideration by chartering organizations on mechanisms to be developed in order to allocate the new gTLD

auction proceeds, which are funds that ICANN has from -- its origin is in the auctions of new gTLDs.

So the cross-community working group will not be assigning these funds. They will develop a mechanism to allocate these funds.

It's a very important difference to understand.

It's expected also to consider the scope of fund allocation, conditions to preserve ICANN's tax status, and how to deal with potential or actual conflicts of interest. This is important for those who will be members of the cross-community working group that will have some skills in order to understand these funds allocations and tax implications to ICANN.

And it will not make recommendations with regard to specific funding. So it will develop the mechanisms.

Can we go to the next one.

Some more details.

It should be transparent, openness, ensure accountability, processes and procedures should be lean, effective. These are important concepts that are written. They seem obvious but it's good that they are established in the charter. Take appropriate measures to deal with conflicts of interest, which include

enhanced disclosure as part of the cross-community working group process as well as avoiding conflicts at subsequent stages. Deal with diversity issues by striving for a fair, just, and unbiased distribution of the auction proceeds not inconsistent with ICANN's mission and seek to ensure diversity of members/participants/observers of the cross-community working group itself, which is somehow what we have been discussing a few moments ago.

Can we go to the next one.

Legal and fiduciary -- oh, that's difficult -- fiduciary? Is that okay? Fiduciary?

(Off microphone.)

OLGA CAVALLI: Okay. Thank you.

-- constraints. I should have spoken in Spanish.

Allocation will need to factor that auction funds to be utilized in a manner not inconsistent with ICANN's mission. That's very important. Expected to make recommendations how to assess the extent to which use of proceeds is aligned with ICANN's mission.

Maintain ultimate responsibility for the confirmation of all disbursements.

Must not endanger ICANN's tax-exempt status.

Specifically, high standards when dealing with conflict of interest.

Administration of disbursement proceeds -- process as well as necessary oversight will be funded from auction proceeds.

Next one, please.

So questions to be answered. This is something that everyone is thinking about.

What framework should be designed and implemented to allow for the disbursement of new gTLD auction proceeds? This is the work that the working group -- cross-community working group will have to focus on.

What will be the limitations of fund allocation, factoring in that the funds need to be used in line with ICANN's mission while at the same time recognizing the diversity of communities that ICANN serves? It won't be easy.

Safeguards to be put in place to ensure that the creation of the framework, as well as its execution and operation, respects relevant legal and fiduciary -- again?

(Off microphone.)

OLGA CAVALLI: -- fiduciary constraints, thank you.

Aspects should be considered to define a time frame for the funds allocation. This will be -- this will take some time, which is the time frame to operate, as well as the disbursement of funds.

Conflict of interest provisions.

Priority or preference be given.

So these are several questions that are in the scope of the work of the future cross-community working group that will take some time to define.

Can we go to the next one? I think it's the last one.

Should ICANN oversee -- oops, no, one -- yeah. Thank you.

-- oversee the solicitation and evaluation of proposals or work with another entity? A foundation, for example, created specifically for this purpose. This is something that the cross-community working group will have to decide, if it's a foundation or it's ICANN itself.

What aspects should be considered to determine an appropriate level of overhead that supports the principles outlined in this charter?

What is the governance framework that should be followed to guide the distribution of the proceeds?

To what extent could ICANN, the organization or a constituent part thereof, be the beneficiary of some of the auction funds?

And should a review mechanism be put in place to address possible later adjustments to the framework following the competition [sic] of the cross-community working group?

So can we go to the next one?

No. There is one -- there. Thank you.

So this is some of the questions that the cross-community working group will have to work with. There are extensive links and information you can find at the end of this presentation. Of course, you can review the full charter. And the status now is, as I said, the SOs and ACs are considering the charter for adoption. There should be a call for volunteers launched quite soon. It is expected that supporting organizations appoint in between three or five members to be part of the working group. It should be around 20-something, 21, 20-something members. And the

first meeting, it doesn't have a date today. But it should be some day in the first quarter perhaps of 2017. Thank you.

And, of course, if there are other members of the drafting team, please, you can -- if you want to add any comment, that would be fine.

ALICE MUNYUA: Thank you, Olga. This is a very important, you know, working group that I think as we discussed -- we've discussed at the GAC and in other various SOs and ACs. It's extremely important to have as many people from the under -- developing regions and underserved regions as possible joining this cross-community working group.

But also taking into consideration the challenges that those SOs and ACs have already in terms of diversity, the lack of diversity in the current existing SOs is something that I think we may want to address both in the selection of committee members who join this cross-community working group and in the work of this -- of the cross-community working group itself. So I would like to invite Cheryl Langdon-Orr who is actually taking part in one of the most important working groups that's looking specifically at diversity issues. Cheryl, please.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Thank you very much. And, yes, I am particularly keen to give credit to the fantastic work done out of Work Stream 1 and the recognition on all of the importance of all of the topics, be it our own accountability for the supporting organization and advisory committees, our intention to look at transparency in a proper and effective way, and most particularly -- and I'm not not paying attention to the others. I am, in fact, an active member in all of them, but this one has my heart and soul.

Diversity matters. Diversity matters was the title of the lightning talk I gave in Work Stream 1 because -- and I'll say it again -- diversity matters.

Our particular Work Stream 2 diversity work group is in the early stages. And there is opportunity for all of you in the room to be an observer or an active participant in that process.

We are only, if memory serves, four meetings into our process and we are at first reading of straw-man proposals. So the time is right now. If you believe diversity matters and you would like to make sure the voices that you're hearing in your local communities and the best interests of the people that you care passionately about come into that conversation, there is a pathway. Please join.

That said, this is an indicater of how seriously ICANN is taking the topic of diversity. One of the other things that I am -- for the

last few years had the honor and the privilege to be involved with is something that's turned into a cross-community working group on accessibility. And to see the serious uptake and interest on those topics that we've had over those last few years from across the board, relevant senior ICANN staff does my soul good and I'm sure would do yours if you looked at it.

I would like to think that a product of this diversity working group is going to get thoughts about diversity in everything we do in ICANN just seen as part of the DNA of what we do. We should not have to be discussing how much gender, how much language, how much -- notice I haven't been using those terms. Diversity across the board matters.

If we improve by capacity-building or by outreach programs or by education or by whatever improving the market and understanding, the awareness, the ABC from Andrew's excellent review and survey that he presented earlier on, that's all going to allow more opportunity for more diverse voice coming in to what ICANN does and most importantly what the awareness is about opportunities in the domain name space across what -- I also have a problem saying "underserved regions." They are opportunities, and they're the opportunities where the next billion and the billion after that are residing.

I wanted to just have a couple of additional points. And I've just written down a couple of words as I was listening. Tijani -- Tijani made a point about the cost of the exercise. And that was a point, of course, that you also picked up on, Andrew. But you picked up on it rather differently.

Tijani recognized that entry to the new gTLD program cost was an impost. But you pointed out that it was an impossibility. If however that level of money was to be spent is at cost of something else. And that something else in these regions is often vital and, in fact, is often life and death vital. So to ask that amount of financial contribution or to have the simplicity of untested business model, we could probably ensure more ongoing funding once the business model was tested. But in a risk situation, obviously people are going to be more averse.

I also wanted to suggest to you that this is not just one little work group's activity and we all go tick the box, we've got diversity sorted. Diversity needs to be looked at sustainably. We have to make ongoing and enduring commitments. And until, in my very biased view, we do make serious, effective ongoing commitments to make sure that diversity aspirations are met -- and that will mean some facilitation to get there -- we are going to have a situation where we have people who are making decisions about groups that are not represented in that

decision-making process. And that's just about idea. Thank you.

ALICE MUNYUA: Thank you very much, Cheryl.

Jonathan Zuck on the CCT review. Thank you.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Thanks, Alice. Again, Jonathan Zuck for the record.

As we are looking at competition, consumer choice, and consumer trust, we're called the CCT review. But there's the often-forgotten aspect of our review which is to look at the, quote-unquote, effectiveness of the application and evaluation process. And there's a lot of components to that. And a lot of them are being taken up by the PDP on subsequent procedures that have to do with sort of increasing efficiencies within that process, et cetera, that would have downstream benefits, I think, to any type of applicant including those potentially in the global south.

But we chose as a review team to focus on the notion what you might call unintentional discrimination in that process and how -- and how the process, you know, in particular might have disadvantaged the global south. And that's everything from the

languages that things were available in, how information was presented, you know, and how the outreach program worked, how the applicant support program worked, et cetera.

And I guess there's sort of three data points that I think are -- that are interesting. One of them is looking at the structure of the registry system itself, it's sort of in three tiers, right? There's this notion of a backend provider, a registry service provider, a registry, and then there's the sort of distribution channel in the form of the registrars. And when we look at that from an economic perspective, it lowers the barrier to entry if you only need to perform one of those things rather than having to kind of build all of that at once, putting together the backend service, putting together the distribution channel in addition to trying to come up with a business model around a new string is unduly prohibitive.

And so we often look at this notion of, you know, minimum viable scale for a business like this. And we don't yet know what those numbers are and everybody is sort of waiting with bated breath to see whether some of these low registration registries are able to survive. In some ways I think that, again, rational actors in the global south were smart not to be the guinea pigs of this system because it's not as though anybody in the global north really knew what the business model was going to be. And we're going to get an opportunity to see sort of what has worked

EN

and not worked, et cetera, rather than just sort of spit balling some business models and trying to sell people on starting a business that didn't have the capacity to sustain itself.

So luckily there's something inherent in the overall structure of that marketplace that makes it possible for a smaller player to succeed. The minimum viable scale is lower than what it might otherwise be.

One of the things, though, that we found is that the structure of the application evaluation process in some ways ignores that structure. And so the applicant needed to take a lot of responsibility for the registry service provider for the backend. And that's complicated in terms of producing letters of credit, et cetera, going through certification processes.

And so part of the reason why it was so much money is that every registry service provider needed to be tested again for each application, right? So even if you were hiring VeriSign to be your backend service provider, you had to pay to have them tested one more time to see if they would be able to handle your string as well.

And so it created a situation of sort of unnecessary overhead in what would otherwise be a sort of a segmented market. So that's why some of the discussions around RSP certification and things like that are interesting, I think, in particular for players in

the global south because if we can treat the application process with more specificity, I think those costs can come down and make the whole thing feel less daunting in the global south.

So, I mean, I think we also commissioned the survey that AMGlobal executed. And we're very excited about, you know, those results and trying to incorporate them. And I think that there's still going to be two aspects to our analysis, though.

One is: What are the points of friction that might have particularly affected the global south that we might remove from the system? So as I said, sort of removing any unintentional discriminatory aspects of the application evaluation process.

And then the other, which is a bigger question, I think, for the community and that Andrew raised in his presentation is: What should be we be doing to actively promote applications, you know, in subsequent procedures from the global south? Is it something that we ought to have an objective to having more next time or something like that? And I think that that might be outside our purview as a review team. I think that has got to be a decision of the community as a whole to make that an objective.

And I think that that's an open question. You know, in other words, from a straight economic value standpoint, if, you know,

there's 20 applicants from the global south instead of the five, you know, has that created an economic benefit there? Whereas, you know, is it more about understanding better how the DNS works and working on registrants rather than applicants?

As Andrew mentions, you kind of want to do a little bit of everything, a balanced diet as he says. I get that in theory. But at the same time, you know, when you try to spread yourself too thin and your resources too thin, then there's some question about the efficacy of that.

So I think our team is certainly going to be making some recommendations for streamlining the process, removing some of the barriers to entry. A lot of the issues that we discussed have to do with an innate nature of a round. Like, there was this limited application window that, as Andrew said, made it difficult for those that needed to sort of gin up more support to participate.

But if in the future there aren't rounds or they're sort of regularly scheduled rounds, some sort of a hybrid model with greater predictability, then there will be less of that notion of running out of time to apply. You could take your time to do it.

So those are some of the things that we will be trying to recommend. As I said, I think we feel very strongly about

removing friction from the system. I think it's going to be a bigger decision about whether or not this particular program is one that we should be trying to set objectives for in the global south. And I don't know the answer to that at this point.

ALICE MUNYUA: Thank you very much, Jonathan. And I agree with you. One of the things I think we agreed yesterday and within the GAC is the importance of having, you know, data, especially that actually supports some of the -- you know, the assumptions that we have.

And so, you know, we are really looking forward to those recommendations. And, also, from when I look, for example, at the Africa region and many developing regions, I think just promoting the DNS industry is not really enough. And I don't think ICANN can go about it alone. And I think it's extremely important to think a bit more broadly in terms of what more we could do because sometimes it's actually about access and access more broadly, not about the DNS. So working with other organizations and partnering to ensure that happens first before we begin to, you know, advocate for promoting the DNS industry is extremely important.

But I'll open up. So, yes, Andrew Mack.

ANDREW MACK: Just one comment based on what Jonathan was saying, is that I think that there's no question we don't want to promote something that shouldn't be promoted or doesn't have economic viability. What I would like to encourage us as a community to do is to suck as much data as possible out of what we've just learned, to really work with it and really aim our analysis at the global south so that we can take the maximum amount of value so that we are removing all the obstacles and anything we decide to do is efficient and targeted in the next round. Because, frankly, more talk about the next billion users doesn't solve anybody's problems. We want to actually make something, you know -- make it happen, leverage the community's time well.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Andrew, sorry, I don't mean to cut in. Again, there is all this talk about the next billion users, right? And so I wonder if we should be focused on that and not the next five potential applicants, right? And so that's -- I'm not sure that I can very easily draw a bright line between having more applications coming from the global south and having more users on the Internet or more registrants within the global south community. I'm not sure that

one leads to the other. And so it's sort of making those associations.

Again, is the purpose of a string to develop something that's happening in the local community and there's something innovative happening there that's specific to that community that might be better served with a custom string or something like that? And certainly we're seeing that in the case of IDNs. I think that's where there's one exception that something very powerful that's happening in the new gTLD program is in the form of these IDNs because a lot of theories around both registrations and Internet usage actually come back to content. In other words, is there enough locally relevant content on the Internet to justify me paying an ISP for access to the Internet even, right?

And so looking at it from a content perspective, the fact that I have to go through some gymnastics to get to it via Roman characters in an otherwise non-Roman alphabet region, I think there's a lot of potential there for bringing on players that weren't there otherwise.

But I think we need to do a lot more thinking about participation from the global south in the Internet itself. And I don't know the degree to which that's ICANN's remit or what our narrow sliver of that or our vector into that problem is. I'm just

not entirely convinced that our vector into that is getting people to apply for new strings.

ALICE MUNYUA: Thank you very much.

We are woefully out of time. I'm going to Siranush. And all the other presenters, I think five minutes each. So Siranush, please.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: I had a question.

SIRANUSH VARDANYAN: Thank you, Alice. Just because of lack of too much time, I will be really very brief and will be introducing you the programs which ICANN is doing to involve more people and bring new people into this ICANN community. And I will be speaking about three projects on the development and public responsibility department at ICANN. And these are fellowship, next gen, and newcomers.

I will tell you about the main differences of fellowship. It's a global capacity-building program to support ICANN's multistakeholder community. We have online application. The round is three times for each ICANN meeting.

Next gen is regionally based program to create awareness and promote the future discussions within universities and other regional forums.

Again, three times a year around an ICANN meeting.

And the newcomer, those just entering the ICANN community, can self-educate using the newcomers Web page and participate in person or remotely in ICANN meetings.

So the unique qualities of each is that fellowship gives the opportunity to interact with each -- with each ICANN community leader in private settings by saying that the women -- that leaders are coming to the fellowship session and fellows can have the opportunity to meet them in person and ask their questions, and they can also later support their ICANN journey.

And as for next-gen, it is interaction with community and staff to encourage future engagement. They should prepare a 10 minutes presentation before and share it while they are at the meeting, those at the meeting.

And for newcomers, it's a structured learning experience while participating in the meeting or remotely designed to help newcomers feel welcomed and ready to participate in ICANN activities.

So there are funds supporting those programs for fellowship travel and accommodation, and stipend is being provided for next-gen travel and accommodation, and stipend for newcomers, there is no funding provided, but there is support coming through ICANN Learn and through engagement -- through engagement activities.

The main -- the programming for fellowship and next-gen programs are to support new participants and the support can be provided by fellowship alumni, coaches, and next-gen ambassadors before -- starting six weeks prior to the meeting itself to get prepared them and to create the spirit of the team, and there are a couple of activities which they are doing and which are mandatory for both programs during the meeting itself, and the post-meeting summary of the experience presented by fellows and the presentations done by next-gen during the meetings itself.

And so what are the difference? The difference between next-gen and fellowship are that fellowship program focuses on capacity building, and just recently we also, based on the community comments, made this program inclusive, so fellowship now has no limitations for the countries to apply for, so everybody can apply for the fellowship program.

There are up to 60 fellows can be -- can be funded for two out of three ICANN meetings, and the third one is supposed to be only for alumnis, which is the policy forum meeting. And we have limitation in the age that they should be at least 21 years but there is no limitation with -- other age limit for this, and priority is interest in continuing engagement as a volunteer in the multistakeholder model.

For the next-gen program, it focuses on education, awareness, and future engagement, and there is a limiting age, so the applicants must be aged of 18 and 30, and enrolled in some type of higher learning curriculum within their region that the ICANN meeting is being held.

So this time for Asia-Pacific, we have students who study here in Asia-Pacific region.

The long term for programs is -- for fellowship is continued learning, active participation at the meeting, their involvement in the community, and alumni team and coaching the newcomers.

Next-gen is following interaction with staff and community at the meeting, facilitate outreach events, and Webinars in conjunction with the global stakeholder regional team and universities, and for newcomers, show any newcomer all of the opportunities available and bring them to ICANN world.

So you can see the fields and just for you -- just to give you a pure statistic, how many in this panel came through fellowship program to ICANN? One? Olga?

How many of this panel came through fellowship program?

OLGA CAVALLI: How many of this?

SIRANUSH VARDANYAN: Of this panel.

OLGA CAVALLI: I was first group of fellows, 2007.

SIRANUSH VARDANYAN: So four out of 11, so we almost reach about 40% of excellency in the fellowship program. Thank you.

[Applause]

ALICE MUNYUA: Thank you very much, Siranush. I'd like to invite the GNSO.

Michele Neylon, please.

MICHELE NEYLON: Thanks. What are you inviting me to do?

MICHELE NEYLON: Sorry. Okay. I'll behave. I'll behave. I'll behave. I'm sorry.

ALICE MUNYUA: Thank you. Yeah, behave yourself.

MICHELE NEYLON: Okay. Okay. First off, I think the framing of this entire thing needs to be changed dramatically. "Underserved" is a complete misnomer and I think that needs to go. If we can all agree on that, then it will make the rest of this so much easier. Because the -- the -- from the registrar stakeholder perspective, I mean, we went through this entire thing about -- I think it was about two years ago. There was a study done by ICANN staff around, quote-unquote, underserved regions but nobody ever actually came up with a working definition of what the hell they meant by "underserved."

If they're talking about the geographic areas, then you can talk about developing, you can talk about high potential growth, you can talk about lots and lots of things, and some of them are positive, some of them are negative, but suggesting that they're underserved means -- suggests that nobody is selling anything

EN

into those regions and I'm afraid that's not true. That's completely untrue.

Just reacting a little bit to some of the things other people have said, and then I'll speak briefly about a couple of things that I've been involved with within the ICANN space.

First off, I agree very, very strongly with pretty much everything Jonathan Zuck said. It's completely premature to have this ridiculous focus on new TLDs. It's insane. It doesn't make any sense whatsoever.

There is barely any demand for new TLDs in the developed part of the world. Why, for the love of God, would you expect anybody to be interested in new TLDs when you've got much more pressing problems in various parts of the world?

I mean, that's -- that doesn't make -- it makes no sense to me whatsoever.

I mean, the -- the fixation with the DNS industry as well, I also think is completely misplaced. The average small business, the average user, doesn't give a damn about domains or the DNS. Doesn't care. Not interested. Doesn't want to know. And they shouldn't have to know.

If they -- if -- what you should be talking about is bringing those -- those communities, those people, those businesses, bringing

them on line and helping them to improve their digital engagement, their digital presence. Now, for those of us who have a vested interest in the, quote-unquote, DNS, obviously we want to sell them domains, we want to sell them services attached to domain names and all that, but the domains and the DNS, of themselves, don't serve any purpose.

How many of you here have a domain name?

Okay. How many of you have a domain name with no service attached to it?

Okay. What do you do with it? Do you hang it up on the wall and look at it?

[Laughter]

MICHELE NEYLON: Do you frame it? Do you kind of go up and look at it every evening and polish it or something?

I mean, you know, this is -- this is -- it's nutty. I would use stronger words but I'm trying my best not to when I'm on microphones and being recorded.

I mean, the JAS thing, again, I agree it was fundamentally flawed, but I have to disagree strongly with pretty much Tijani said because it's the multistakeholder model which means

everybody gets a say, so they're going to have people in there criticizing and that's the reality. If you don't like that, you're in the wrong game.

 I mean, talking about barriers for people in less connected parts of the world, I'm sorry, if you can't get on line, how are you going to run a domain registry? Be reasonable. You know, you need to look at this in terms of something more pragmatic.

 So going to stuff that I have been involved with, over the last couple of years I've been -- I've been involved with some of the projects that ICANN has done in various parts of the world, both in Latin America and in Egypt, which I can't remember which region Egypt falls into. Is that Africa or is that Middle East? I always get confused about where the lines are.

 So when ICANN has been doing some work there.

 And, you know, the focus is around enabling people and -- to, you know, make money on line, make money through -- through the Internet. So for example, I've spent -- I was in Paraguay -- I think that was two weeks ago, two and a half weeks ago, I don't know, I'll have to check my passport, and, you know, bringing together a group of entrepreneurs, a group of people both from existing country code top-level domains and ones from other parts of the region who were -- had an interest in exploring opportunities on line. I'm talking about practical things. How

do you do content marketing? How do you actually take this idea and make it into something that will pay the bills?

I mean, the -- you do not need to physically come to ICANN meetings to play part in all this.

And, you know, it costs money to do -- to attend an ICANN meeting. It doesn't cost that much to send an email.

But you need to look at it in terms, again, about, you know, something realistic, something pragmatic.

In parts of -- in parts of Latin America and the Caribbean, the biggest problem they're facing is, you know, actually getting on line because there's only one telco in some place -- in some of those countries and the telco has a monopoly and abuses it. That's a reality. That's outside ICANN's remit.

And that's the other thing as well. Some of these things are outside ICANN's remit completely. I mean, we had a session yesterday where we were talking about content, we were talking about other things like that.

Oh, she's shutting me up. Okay. I'll shut up now. Sorry.

ALICE MUNYUA: Thank you, Michele. We're running -- really running out of time and we've got Rubens and Abdalla, so Rubens, five minutes, and then Abdalla, and then we open the floor.

RUBENS KUHL: Thank you. Rubens Kuhl. I'd just like to start by challenging a concept that a region that is being underserved in any gTLD dimension, -- gTLD registrations, gTLD registries, gTLD applications -- is an underserved region by the domain industry. That's not true.   Most regions that are usually called underserved are pretty much served by other players in the domains that are not in the gTLD industry.

But focusing on the gTLD issue, the question we had for the panel: What does ICANN do to support underserved regions? And unfortunately, the only thing I can answer is that only -- it creates barriers of entry and barriers of adoption. It does a disservice for these regions.

And the reasons for that goes back to the year 2000 when we had 20 million domain names in a single operator. That single operator charged like a hundred dollars a year for every domain, so that make it a 2 billion a year dollar -- $2 billion a year industry.

And that's where the ICANN contractual framework was born. It was an already developed industry, yet people were trying to make it less prone to antitrust issues, and that bring us horizontal separation and that also bring us a strong dependency of two parties to the system, both registries and registrars.

A technology note of that time. Most of those registrations were only what are called thin registrations so the registrar has a strong role in keeping user credentials and domain details, and there was also no data escrow service, so the registrar was the single point of failure and the only place where data could be found.

That has involved over the years. We now have thick WHOIS models. We now have data escrow. But we still have a contractual framework that is heavyweight just like in the beginning.

So that is a barrier of adoption that could be much lowered by facing the reality that now failure of a single registrar is not critical to the system, is not critical to registrants that would still see their domains working, so a lightweight registrar model could be developed to address that.

Lesser fees, lesser requirements.

ICANN board already has ruled on one, which was the insurance requirement, but that didn't -- didn't went nowhere because legacy gTLD agreements still required those, but that can be also addressed. And we then come -- when new gTLDs were proposed, they didn't have 20 million domains to start, but we still are applying that framework to them. And that's because of a policy that's called vertical integration policy where even a registry that can now own a different legal entity still has to go through many hoops of being a registrar for every -- every other TLD.

So that can prevent all new gTLDs from flourishing in any underserved region of any metric, either geographic communities and any cuts that we want to make. Thank you.

ALICE MUNYUA: Thank you very much, Rubens.

Abdalla from the ccNSO.

ABDALLA OMARI: Thank you, Alice.

I know we have run out of time. I take not more than two to three minutes.

Most of -- I'm speaking from the ccTLD perspective. Especially Africa.

Most of the points have been raised by Tijani, but I'll just pick a few because of our position of lack of time.

Now, in Africa, most African countries, but quite -- there are a few which are quite advanced. As the research has been presented here, you'll notice that consumption of especially eCommerce activities, because at the end of the day, the domains, as one of my colleagues here said, it has to be actively in use, and the bigger part of a domain being actively in use is being used for business. So if you look at it from the eCommerce perspective, most of African countries, small-scale business people, who are the highest number of businesses, do not appreciate a domain being a necessity, because it will come Number 4, 5 among the checklist. So I think as the topic says, what ICANN can do on the underserved region, is to see how to assist the region -- the region to have marketing skills and assist them to appreciate a domain that is a necessity to growth of business.

Now, I also see some of -- a number of ICANN materials to be a little bit technical, so if they can be simplified so that most people can go through and understand them, because if you look at it, they have enough information but sometimes that

information is intimidating and if someone tries to go through and a lot of money has been made in preparing those materials, so if they can be simplified for the underserved region, especially Africa, for consumption.

Then another level is to look at translation, translating most of these materials to the local languages.

In east Africa, we are doing a bit of work on the wiki. We are assisting in translating it into Swahili. So I think the other regions can also benefit if these materials can be translated to benefit the local community.

And another issue is technical capacity, because you'll find that most ccTLDs, when they get challenges from the technical point, we have to run around and get support from other regions, so you know the technical capacity and marketing has a direct correlation to consumption of domains. I don't want to take a lot of Alice's time because the audience need to make their questions. Thank you.

ALICE MUNYUA: Thank you very much, Abdalla, for that very brief presentation.

I'd like to hand over to my co-chair, Pua, who will facilitate the next session. Pua.

PUA HUNTER: Thank you, Alice. We want to open the floor to questions and comments, and I want to invite the last gentleman that was standing at the mic earlier. Sorry for interrupting you. Is he still around?

K.S. RAJU: Yeah.

PUA HUNTER: Please come up to the mic. Thank you.

K.S. RAJU: Can you hear me? This is K.S. Raju from Internet Society, ICANN, (indiscernible). What I can tell you is the underserved regions should be removed from the overall process. Today if you look at the world, all over the world, at least 2.4 billion people are still the poor people.

We should come up with a plan how we can create a system which helped the people for their survival. That is important.

The second thing is 80% of the content which is moving on Internet is, I feel, junk, okay? The required information should help the people how to grow their economies and how to move

forward. We should work on that model in such a way it can reach the masses.

One more thing is we are talking about currently 1 billion -- United Nations also move forward. We should think how to link up the 3.4 billion people, middle class people, underserved people, and poor people and have (indiscernible) system and create a model, give (indiscernible) to the undeserved people and said model can be helpful for the overall process. Thank you.

PUA HUNTER: Thank you.

MANMEET PAL: This is Manmeet, an ICANN Fellow and NomCom2 working party member. I have first question for Jonathan. I have two questions. First one is for Jonathan, of course. Since ICANN's core mission is to serve the availability and integrity of the names and numbers, do you think giving freehand to the registries or the registrars to basically price their domain names will serve that purpose?

JONATHAN ZUCK: I'm sorry. I didn't -- the ICANN's responsibility is availability integrity of the DNS. And then what is your question? What will serve that purpose?

MANMEET PAL: Giving freehand to the registries and registrars, new gTLD registries and registrars, to price their domain names, will that serve that purpose?

JONATHAN ZUCK: I mean, I guess I don't -- I don't know the answer. I don't know that I see the connection between those two things. I mean, it's a -- I think you want to give them the ability to price their products because they're going to try to differentiate them. So if I'm -- if I'm .BANK, for example, and I'm trying to offer a kind of a certification program that says that nobody in this domain is allowed except actual registered financial institutions, I have a higher cost to bringing on new registrants than others do. And I'm going to charge more as a result, but I'm delivering more value as well.

And so I think that you're going to see variations in cost and competition -- maybe some competition on cost, but competition may be on service as well.

So I think, yes. I think to answer your question, I think letting them choose their own price is the best way to maximize availability.

MANMEET PAL: Thank you. That does answer a part of the question.

Of course, there is a second question that I want to ask. Michele mentioned, while I completely agree with what he said, that there's barely a need for new gTLDs in developed or undeveloped regions. Of course, been in the industry for 15 years. I know there's only .COM everywhere or ccTLDs. 160 million .COMs compared to about 20 -- 35 or 30 million gTLDs. Still a long way to go. But what's happening is -- I'm sorry. I had it written here.

But now that they're here, what are we actually doing to, you know, bring that awareness into the market so that end users are the consumers who actually cannot get their hands on the name that they want, they get a different gTLD? So it's basically related to the awareness that we're trying to bring in the market for gTLDs since they're already here.

It's not for Jonathan. It's for actually -- it was my initial question to the GNSO team.

MICHELE NEYLON: Sorry, do you mean the GDD team? Do you mean ICANN's GDD team?

MANMEET PAL: No, GNSO team.

I'm sorry.

ANDREW MACK: I can tell you -- I can tell you that what has happened to this point has clearly not reached critical mass in the general public, okay? So if one -- if your question is about are we reaching the kinds of people who ostensibly we wanted to touch through the new gTLD program, I think it's a pretty resounding no.

We are especially not reaching them in the global south. But I think it's fair to say we are not reaching them in the global anywhere else in a meaningful way.

There are -- we talked to -- we talked to a conglomerate head in Pakistan and a couple of people in Thailand and Cambodia who were very concerned that not only were there going to be problems of awareness but also there were conceivably technical problems. And so I think some of the -- it's not just a question to get the knowledge out there but also to make sure that people realize that this is, in fact, something that can work technically. But that said, there's no question -- this is going to be a slow build and the newer the region is -- the research we did, the newer the region is to active participation in the DNS as a business activity the more time this may take.

So to Jonathan's point, I think that -- Slower? Got it. Okay. To Jonathan's point, there's no question that this is not a silver bullet and there is no question that people around the world are not there expecting that a new gTLD is going to revolutionize their personal economy.

That said, it is one tool.   I would argue that we as the community tasked with looking after this part of the technical world, we should see what we can do to see if it can't have a positive impact on the global south. And so at whatever point in time, whether the marketplace catches up now, in future, or even never that this at least is an option for people from the global south who wish to pursue it. Thanks.

PUA HUNTER: Excuse me. Thank you.

Before we carry on, because we're terribly running out of time, I just want to invite Anne-Rachel to come up to the table please because there may be some questions that you will be able to respond to.

And to our people coming up to the mic, please state your name before you carry on. And be mindful also of the time. Thank you.

NASRAT KHALID: I'm Nasrat Khalid, a fellow from Afghanistan. My question is on the word "underserved." Our colleague mentioned that the word "underserved" should not be there because we're selling something there. I come from Afghanistan. It gets really personal to me to -- to see that somebody who want to take that word off me. We are underserved. And it needs to be recognized. And the last thing we need is for somebody to say we're not.

I would give you examples. We are underserved because in the last ten years, I don't think two staff from ICANN have visited my country. We are underserved because of that. And the last thing we want is for somebody to take that off me.

We have .AF going on there. Nobody knows what domain names are. Not majority of my country knows there. We need people to come there and train us. We need people to come there and invest it. We need at least ICANN staff to come and talk to people like me. And we need to understand that we are really underserved.

And that would not be constructive enough to say the word "underserved" should not be there. We are not a developing -- anything about Afghanistan right now is not developing. We're not developing. Don't call us developing because we're not.

And I as an Afghan say that. We are underserved, and that starts by ICANN staff coming there. And it's not safe, I know. But I come from there. I have lived there. And if we are really serious about getting the Internet to the next billion people, then we need to really understand that some people in the world are really underserved. I would like your input on that.

PUA HUNTER: Thank you. Anyone from the panel? Anne-Rachel?

ANNE-RACHEL INNE: Thanks very much, Pua. Anne-Rachel for the record.

Mea culpa. We have teams in the regions. We have -- in fact, our team in the Asia-Pacific region has been trying really hard to get to everybody. It's not easy. It's not simple. But, you know, my colleagues are here, and I'm pretty sure our regional folks have heard you.

I believe we've had a little bit of interaction already in your country, not enough for sure.

NASRAT KHALID: Underserved, right?

ANNE-RACHEL INNE: Look, the semantics for me do not count. I come from the African region, and I've been involved in this process for quite

EN

long enough to understand that as you say, you just got to look at the statistics. Everybody talked about it here, okay? When you take my region, 1.3 -- 1.2 billion people. Penetration rate? 28%, okay? So right now it's the access. It's the capacity, whether at a technical level or, you know, human resources to take the networks, to build even the understanding of what this thing can bring to the community but do it also in terms of what's in it for them, okay?

The supply side is there, absolutely. But what is the demand side?

You know, we're having people in regions to also talk the language of the people, to get them there with their own understanding, okay? We talked about IDNs. We have people in region who can speak languages to go to your places and to our places to make sure that people understand what it is we're trying to do.

PUA HUNTER: Thank you, Anne-Rachel.

ANNE-RACHEL INNE: Happy to --

ICANN|57
HYDERABAD
3-9 November 2016

PUA HUNTER: Thank you. I think we will stop the questions here. We are actually -- our time is up. And we got one more question on the floor. One last question.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Hi, thanks. Thanks for the opportunity. Welcome to my country. My name is (saying name). I belong to the GNSO community.

And, yes, Michele and Michele, I think we are still underserved. You can't challenge that word. I will not going to get into the semantics here. But my question is very simple: It's not about business. We need to get up and look beyond business. A thing called corporate social responsibility angle needs to be -- and my question and comment is directed to the chair, not to an individual on the panel, because it's a collective action that we need to take.

It's underserved. Yes, we are underserved. Services could be in the way of awareness, could be in the way of investments by the registries, registrar community for awareness. Could be the registry, registrar community working, the business people working with the local infrastructure providers to increase penetration. Services, we are underserved. There's no two doubts about it.

So my request to the chair and to the community at-large would be to consider, considering differential pricing on the new gTLD especially. For example, if I'm a U.S. .BANK, I could spend $1,200 on it for sure. But if -- and it's a good business opportunity as well. I know Michele does a lot of business work, so -- I know Rubens also do it. It's just a situation.

So when you come to India, for example, if you look for a hotel, if you are a foreigner traveling to India, you will be able to get a room for $300. But if I'm an Indian and I want to stay in the Indian hotel, say the Westin, or anywhere else, I can get it for $150. So it's differential pricing.

So I would request the chair to take it up in due course for the suggestion of differential pricing. So a .BANK in India, if I'm registering from India, or a .PHARMACY or anything else, for the sake of spreading that awareness at least that contribution can be there, could be lesser than the usual price, could be lesser than the developing price. Thank you.

And there is no compromise on being underserved for sure. The word is there. Thank you.

PUA HUNTER: Thank you. We will have to stop here. I will hand over to Alice to close the session.

EN

ALICE MUNYUA: I'm really sorry that we have run out of time because clearly this is a very interesting discussion, and I'm pleased that there are other spaces and other ongoing work discussing this very issue between diversity and underserved regions generally. So I wish to thank you all, especially the panelists for presenting really fantastic presentations --

[Applause]

 - in a very limited time. And to the audience for your wonderful contributions. Thank you very much.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]

ICANN|57
HYDERABAD
3-9 November 2016