
COPENHAGEN – ccNSO Members Meeting - Day 1 (pt 1)
Tuesday, March 14, 2017 – 09:00 to 10:30 CET
ICANN58 | Copenhagen, Denmark

KATRINA SATAKI:

Good morning, dear colleagues. Please take your seats. We'll start in one minute. So we're ready to start. Good morning, everyone. Again, it's a great pleasure to welcome you all here, the ccNSO days. I just cannot not mention that even with greater pleasure, I would like to welcome Keith, who's here again with us today to make our day even brighter.

Well, somebody might wonder why anyone who left so cheerfully would ever want to come back, but sometimes you go visit a zoo for example to look at what's going on there. Probably Keith decided to have some fun and look at us and wish us a very successful meeting. So welcome, Keith. I would like to ask you all for a round of applause.

Thank you again, and we'll start our meeting. And I would like to invite our generous host. Thank you for the wonderful gala and all the organization, I'm sure you helped a lot and contributed a lot to this meeting. Let me give the floor to our host, Jakob to address you and wish you good luck, hopefully.

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.

JAKOB TRUELSEN: [inaudible] Can I stand, actually? I'll try to stand. I'll try to speak up.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: [inaudible]

JAKOB TRUELSEN: I need to stand up to do the presentation, I think. Can you hear me? I hope that you all had a wonderful gala last evening and enjoyed the special Danish dish, stegt flæsk and persillesovs, which is a Danish language exercise just to pronounce it.

I will say some few words. What you have probably seen or discovered during this ICANN meeting, whenever you have met someone from Denmark, we always speak about this lovely city of Copenhagen. We are very proud of having ICANN here in Copenhagen.

We are actually in Denmark very proud of Copenhagen. We are very proud of our country, and I thought for preparation for this little introduction here, I'll try to find out why. And the only reason why I can actually find that we are so proud of being Danish is probably this.

It's probably something we have back from when we were Vikings. Actually, we still see ourselves as being Vikings. That's

why when we are talking about the weather in Copenhagen, we find it very nice right now. It's very warm outside, at least in our understanding. We have something left from the Vikings, I would say.

So actually, we used to own the world. That's sort of the thing that we are carrying on as being Danish. Now, it's a bit different. Those were the good times; now it has changed. And just to give you an overview of our situation as being the country code top level domain in Denmark, we are a country of 5.6 million inhabitants, which makes us quite a small country. That's why we are dreaming of when we were owning the world. Today in Denmark we have 1.3 million .dk domains under our administration, and we have around 700,000 customers.

The reason why I'm mentioning this in this little introduction is that we have in Denmark the model where everyone who have the right to use a domain name have to be a customer by default. That gives us some challenges and it gives us some opportunities.

And when I'm talking about we, I'm actually talking about two different companies. One organization, actually, and a company. I'm talking about DIFO, which is the organization that holds the agreement with the government in Denmark which

gives us the right to manage .dk, and I'm talking about DK Hostmaster which is the company doing all the practical stuff.

We have two entities: one with a political angle on things, and DK Hostmaster with a very practical view on things. And actually, we have two different challenges right now that we are working with, which is very defining for the things that we would like to bring into the different debates during this ICANN meeting.

The two issues is about balance – that's one of them – and it's about growth. The balance thing is a FIFO thing. The growth thing is a DK Hostmaster thing. And balance for us is the process or the initiatives we have to take to find a balance between what we are doing to fight those who are actively abusing domain names today.

This is a rising problem. I think we see that, all of us, but on the other hand we also need to find this balance point where we also can give free access to domain names for all. That's a challenge.

I can say without exaggerating anything that law enforcement in Denmark are very eager to discuss this, and they see that we are one of their tools to manage this, which gives us some challenges, and that's why this is such a big topic for us currently.

That's one of the challenges that we're working with and one of the things that we would like to bring into these discussions. Our panel's point so to speak is we would like to say welcome to all who want a .dk domain.

We have a setup where we need to know the identity of who owns the domain name. We as DIFO and DK Hostmaster must take care of that and must ensure that. And we must ensure that the information that we have about the one having the domain name is correctly in the WHOIS database.

That's something that is in the day-to-day life a bit complicated to manage because it makes it a bit uneasier to get a .dk domain, but on the other hand, it adds something to the domain. The domain name should be easy to get and easy to have. I think we can cover that easily.

The other obstacle or the other challenge that we see is the curve here that I have seen others present as well, which is the decline in growth rate. We as DIFO are limited in what we can do.

We cannot add other top level domains to grow our business. It's not possible for us since we are working under these legislations that we are. We cannot just add another top level domain to grow. We need to find other initiatives.

And we need to find a way to add more value on top of the domain name product, you could say. So that's the other thing that we would like to bring into this. We are very eager to find new opportunities to do that.

And let me finish by emphasizing one of the things that we actually see works very well, and that is actually this multi-stakeholder. We are trying right now to use that as a platform for some of the solutions that we need to find with the Internet Society of Denmark because we need this balance and we need to find it together with law enforcement on one side, the commercial players on the other, and we can only do that by working together with them.

So we see for us a future in Denmark where we will have more cooperation with our stakeholders in a broad term. Of course, also the government in that. And then we see a future for us hopefully where we can grow together with our colleagues.

We have had many interesting talks during this ICANN session and also the previous ones about how we can do things together, and we would really like to continue that.

I think that should be my words for now. Thank you for this opportunity to say a little bit about DIFO and DK Hostmaster. That's one of our favorite topics. I hope you will enjoy your stay

here in Copenhagen, and I wish you all a successful and very rewarding ICANN 58. Thank you.

KATRINA SATAKI:

Thank you very much. Are there any questions to our host? If no, then again, thank you very much and it's a great pleasure to be here, especially for those who do not have to fly to the other part of the world like myself. Thank you.

Now, we swiftly move to highlights of our meeting days, and I give the floor to Alejandra.

ALEJANDRA REYNOSO:

Good morning, everyone. This time, we have a really exciting agenda for you. Let me walk you through it, but first, I want you to have a really good look at the people who are assigned to build this program.

Please, if you have any comments, anything you would like to be improved, anything you really like about what we're doing here for you, let us know, approach us, send us an e-mail. We want to make this the best program for the community.

Also, please do not hesitate to contact our ccNSO secretariat. Without them, this process would never be possible. And let me also introduce you to a new member of the ccNSO secretariat

that is Maria Otones. She's sitting right here on the front. If you would stand up. She is a new member of our community, and we welcome her.

So today's agenda: we will have a little bit of a switch of rooms, so I need you to be aware of this. We will meet with the GAC at 11:00 and we will move to Hall A2. Then we come back here for a session with our ccNSO-appointed ICANN Board members.

After that, we will have lunch and we will go straight to Hall A1 to meet with the ICANN Board. So please, be aware of these changes of room and of the timing so we can always start on time as we are really known for.

We will have updates from our working groups, the various working groups that we have in the ccNSO. We will be talking about the PDP regarding the retirement of ccTLD and review mechanism of the decision and delegation, revocation, and retirement of ccTLDs.

And we will have a legal forum with the topic of law enforcement in the DNS. This will be a little bit of a different setup for the legal session, so I hope you enjoy it.

Also, .no is on its 30th anniversary, and many thanks to Norid. We will have our ccNSO cocktail later tonight. Please, be reminded that this time, we will really need you not to forget

your printed invitation, because the place holds a maximum capacity of 120 people at a time. So this time, we really need you to show that at the entrance.

But let me take this opportunity to thank again Norid for having the ccNSO cocktail for us and to, well, say happy 30th anniversary. Thank you really much, .no.

Let me continue. Tomorrow, we will be discussing the accountability framework and exchange of letters with ICANN. I believe there was an e-mail sent to the community regarding those, so please have a look at the documentation to take a very good insight of what is going to be discussed

Then, there will be a Customer Standing Committee and Root Zone Evolution Review Committee update and a PTI update. Later, we will have the ccTLD news session, the regional organizations update, and the update and next steps in ICANN accountability.

And lastly but not least, on Thursday, we will have our cross-community session regarding moving towards a data-driven ICANN. That is between ccNSO and GNSO. It will be on Thursday at 9:00 in Hall A1. So please, I would like you to join us in that cross-community topic, and welcome to ccNSO.

KATRINA SATAKI: Thank you very much, Alejandra. Are there any questions regarding agenda for these two days? If there are any questions, we have a microphone here in front. Anytime any of you want to ask something, please feel free to join us here.

It might seem too close, dangerously close to people who are speaking, but believe me, there is enough space so they will not be able to reach you. If there are no questions, then let me move to the next session. It's the update from our working groups, and now I will hand the floor to Alejandra to chair this session.

ALEJANDRA REYNOSO: Thank you very much. Thank you, Jakob. If the members of the working groups could please come up here. Thank you very much. We will start our ccNSO working group updates with the CCWG new gTLD auction proceeds with Ching Chiao.

CHING CHIAO: Thank you, Alejandra. My name is Ching Chiao and I'm a NomCom appointee to the ccNSO Council. Thanks for giving me the opportunity to serve on this money-related working group, just to make sure that people get cheered up talking about money first thing in the morning.

Once again, let me maybe take two steps back and help people to recap what's happening in the last two years. We're talking

about the new gTLD auction proceeds fund that's being allocated aside for future use, and this particular working group is set to design the structure, the framework, and the scope of what the funds should be used for, the best interests of the Internet community worldwide.

I'm the Council's appointed Interim Chair for the group. This is now truly a cross-community working group. I will spend the next few minutes to explain it and let you know the update for that, and I will come to your questions and comments.

Okay, so we start with a drafting team in 2015, and the ccNSO Council along with other SOs and ACs approved the charter of the working group late last year. We started the work in late January, and so far, we have four meetings to date.

But right now, we have approximately 80 members, participants, observers to this working group to help – once again – to define the structure and the scope for the auction fund.

Let me talk briefly about the goals and objectives of this working group. Once again, we are tasked to develop the proposal – one or multiple – for the community to consider and eventually for the Board to adopt the mechanism for the allocation of the new gTLD auction proceeds.

The CCWG are expected to consider the fund allocation with the understanding of ICANN as a nonprofit, California-based organization. So everything that ICANN spends would be bound to their tax status, which means the 501(c)(3) status.

The group in the first few meetings did aware of that, and also invited ICANN Deputy General Counsel to join the call and explain what is actually the legal and fiduciary constraints.

And third goal for us is not to make the final recommendation of who will be receiving the fund but just to make sure that there's a mechanism for how to use the fund. So you will not be seeing this working group to grant a fund to any organization but simply to set up the structure of that.

And here, you can see the several phases. Right now, this working group, I think we are at the phase one, nearly to the end of phase one. The work plan has been decided, the schedule, the timeline, and it's now on the community wiki that you can see from there. And then once again, as I said, the working group will be sending out the initial report, and then the Board will take consideration of that.

Probably this is the last one. The first few meetings, we've been focusing on the expertise for the working group members. Many of the ICANN "experts" and the other "policy engineers" are involved.

And from the ccNSO or the ccTLD community point of view, I think it's in our best interest to see how we can best contribute the experiences that founded many nonprofit organization that you've been running or been involved with, and how we can put that expertise to design the best scope for this particular new fund or new structure.

And we've been developing the work plan – as I just described – and thanks to the staff, we have been able to send out a couple of questionnaires, including one that seeks for members and even the broader community to input on the 11 chartering questions.

Those questions ranging from “How do you envision the fund would be structured? Would it be under the existing ICANN umbrella, or do you see this to be set up as a separate fund?” to another set of questions about “How do you see the scope of the fund? Which areas of activities that the participants think that the funds should be mostly allocated to?”

So the question now is also we are talking about whether those 11 questions are gating questions to each other, whether we should be answer this one and then we'll be having answer for the next few.

So we did spend quite some time, the Co-Chairs and also with the members, and we're working on the possible timeline. And

there will be a – we put it this way: because this particular working group does not have the ICANN fund to support the operation, so not all the members are able to join us here in Copenhagen. So we do have a session, but we do not call it a face-to-face meeting but we called it a session here in Copenhagen just to make sure that people who happen to be here can meet face-to-face.

We did receive one letter from Steve Crocker mentioning about possible fund to support the operation of the working group, which many in the community thinks that's needed.

Before I wrap up, I'd like to bring up one thing, is that eventually, this is a GNSO fund generated from the gTLD activities. So with that, the ccNSO, ALAC and GAC, other and SO and AC pretty much would like to help the overall community to build the right structure of that.

One incident is that the GNSO, the current Co-Chair, Jonathan Robinson decided to step out of the leadership role because of the potential conflict of interest, and that really shows I think as a Co-Chair to show that declaration of interests is critically important to make sure that those people who design the scope will not be the ones who eventually get to receive the fund.

So I think we spent a couple of meetings in the past just to make sure that everybody understands that particular point. So we'll

be having the Co-Chair – I hope – by the end of this week, the new Co-Chair for this working group. So let me wrap up here and see if anyone has any question. Thank you.

ALEJANDRA REYNOSO: Thank you very much, Ching. Are there any questions? Yes, please, the microphone is here in the middle.

STEPHEN DEERHAKE: For the record, Stephen Deerhake, .as, American Samoa. Given that these funds were generated based on the new gTLD program, is there a sense on this working group that the GNSO participants are first among equals? Does the GNSO feel that they have a bigger say in how this working group comes about with their conclusions on how the structure should be worked out?

CHING CHIAO: I think that's a very legitimate and interesting question. I think at the ongoing basis and also the practices for this particular working group is that every meeting in the beginning, we remind people of that particular declaration of interests.

Speaking of which, I'm not seeing that they have a bigger say, but I'm seeing then potentially because the revenue this particular fund is generating through the GNSO gTLD activities.

So I think it show there's then more responsibility, although we are not really talking about the certain percentage or whether they feel that they have a stronger say. I think from my personal observation, I believe my colleagues – Peter and Mathieu – you can always jump in on yours, but my observation is that I think at this point, we basically have an equal say on how the working group works. Thank you.

ALEJANDRA REYNOSO: Thank you very much. Are there any other questions? I see none. Thank you very much, Ching, and we will continue now with the Guidelines Review Committee update.

KATRINA SATAKI: Good morning. Thank you for the opportunity to present the work of the Guidelines Review Committee. I'll start with highlighting some changes, so what we've done since our previous update in Hyderabad. We have completed – and actually these two guidelines have already been adopted by the ccNSO Council – so two guidelines. It's ccNSO Council Practices and ccNSO Liaisons and Observers.

And currently we've started and still working on three guidelines. It's about the Council elections, travel funding, and these new things that we need to have in place as decisional participant and powers that we exercise under the new regime.

As you remember in Hyderabad, we proposed to have a new process which implied that before submitting the final guideline to the ccNSO Council, we asked community for input. And these two guidelines that – as I mentioned – have already been updated, they were the first ones that gone through this process.

You may remember that we had two weeks public comment period on both of them. We did not receive actually any input. I don't know, I hope, I would like to see this as a sign that you approve of what the Guidelines Review Committee had done with these guidelines, not that you just didn't have time to read them.

Those people who have read them said that they were happy with the work, and so I really hope that others did read them too. In any case, now the process is clear. And if you still think that there is some need for improvement, I really would like to hear your ideas and your thoughts about that.

Again, going back to the guidelines that we are working on, we'll talk about the ccNSO Council elections more tomorrow during the Accountability session. And that discussion is really

important for us because we would like to understand the sense in the community of where you would like us to go with this one.

So tomorrow during Accountability session, we'll have another, a more detailed review of this guideline. But now, I'll try to explain about our plans for the next period, so we will continue working on the ccNSO Council elections guideline, and that's why we need your input on it.

But we'll work on travel funding guideline, and one of the things that we would like to change there is we would like to – actually, that's the ccNSO Council that wants to change the thing – it's about the number of funded travel slots.

So this is really important for us, so here we're waiting for decision from the ccNSO Council and some next steps. And then perhaps we will need to update this guideline a little bit more.

And again, I think that we'll have some more detailed update later these days, but there are two very important guidelines that we need to have in place. So the first one is about the rejection actions, and then second action is about the approval actions.

Okay, now we'll start still some things that I would like to tell you about. One thing that we hopefully have resolved with the help of the ccNSO Council, according – now we're talking about

council elections guideline – according to the Bylaws, the timeline of the ccNSO Council elections looks like this.

Basically, it is assumed that the elected councilors take their seats at the third annual meeting, which is the last ICANN meeting of the year. That’s what happens with the NomCom councilors. NomCom councilors do take seats after the third meeting.

But our current practice is a little bit different. What we do during the third meeting of the year, we run a Q&A session with candidates, which means that before this meeting, we have this call for nominations. And then when we already have a set of candidates who are standing for the Council, then at the last meeting of the year, we have a Q&A session, candidates have an opportunity to present their views, they answer the questions from the community, and then if there are several candidates per seat, we have elections, which basically means that our elected councilors take their seats at the first meeting of the year, right after the first meeting of the year.

This is our current practice, and it has some practical reasons why we're doing it like that. Because if we want our councilors to take their seats after the last meeting of the year, it means that we have to run the election process earlier in the year.

And if we want to have this face-to-face session with candidates, it would mean that one of the options is to have it in the middle of the year, which would mean that elections would start in the middle of summer, which for some of us is a high season to just go enjoy ourselves and forget about all the things that are related to the Internet, running the Internet. The Internet still works, but we don't care about that.

So due to different practical reasons, this is our current practice. And when we raised this issue with the Council, the Council decided that, for different practical reasons, let's continue it as we're used to. So this is our timeline and it will not change.

Another thing that we discussed was, who do we elect actually to the Council? Is this a beauty pageant, so do we select the most beautiful candidate? Or we select professional who works for a particular ccTLD? Or we select somebody who does the work?

This is something that probably everybody has to answer for themselves, but we strongly believe that we want individuals who do the work, and we do not care if they're beautiful, if they work for a particular ccTLD – which of course helps, being beautiful helps, and working for a particular ccTLD might help as well. But at the end of the day, we want somebody who does the

work. And that will definitely be reflected in this Council elections guideline.

Speaking about the other important guidelines that I mentioned, as you may know that according to the new Bylaws there are several rights that we the empowered community acquired.

Speaking about rejection actions, here you see the list of things that trigger the process. And as we can see, we believe that the most urgent or the nearest events that might trigger this are ICANN budget and IANA budget operating plans and so on. So we really need to have that guideline in place, even though we hope that none of these events would trigger the rejection action.

Another is approval action, and we did not worry much about it because we thought that probably that one can wait, and then it turned out that the Board wants to introduce some change in the fundamental Bylaws, which effectively means that we need to have the guideline for handling these approval actions in place by Johannesburg.

A little bit earlier than we expected, but, well, that's life, especially in the ICANN environment. And then now we're coming to a very important issue, and that's ICANN Bylaws. Here, I must thank all the members on the Guidelines Review

Committee, and especially Steven. I really keep repeating it because the work that he's doing is very important.

When I try to read ICANN Bylaws, I look like that person on the picture. What Steven does, he reads this Annex D and translates it to us normal people. I'm not saying that Steven is not normal; I'm just saying that somehow he can really understand what ICANN Bylaws say. And believe me, that's not easy.

Here I have a couple of examples. This one, for example, if you start reading it, for me, it takes at least ten times. I need to re-read it ten times. But what Steven does here is for example he picks up important bits that we have to take into account.

Actually, one interesting one. As you can see that ending date here is given like 11:59 PM as calculated by local time – not UTC, local time – at the location of ICANN's principal office.

If we read only 11:59 PM, we might assume it's UTC. No, it is not, and this is something that we have to take into account because it might turn out to be crucial at some point.

Another thing is, for example, another date in the timeline here. On the 13th day after the approval action Board notification date. So basically, you have to understand when is one date, where is another date, and how it maps on our processes.

Because as you know, we have need some time to consult the community, to gather feedback. We need some time for the councilors to actually read the materials, and then after the Council's decision, as you know, we have seven day period when the community has the right to overrule the decision of the ccNSO Council.

So all these things are very important to understand what we need to do and when we need to do it to make sure that we are on track and we do not lose anything very important on the way.

Another one, this is also really wonderful. You will have the slides online. If you don't want to go to read ICANN Bylaws Annex D, just read these two paragraphs on this presentation, and believe me, you will have a lot of pleasure to do that.

So that's basically it. Thank you very much. Again, let me stress that tomorrow, we'll have a little bit more on the Council election guideline in respect to the Council's accountability, so please be here, and we really need your opinion. Thank you very much.

ALEJANDRA REYNOSO: Thank you very much, Katrina. Do we have any questions? Please.

NIGEL ROBERTS: Nigel Roberts, .gg. Thank you for putting those last couple of slides up in particular. Not being a native speaker of the language in which that was written, I just want to say, is this what \$40 million got us?

KATRINA SATAKI: Yes, that's right. And at some point actually when Steven did the translation, provided translation service to the community, I offered to be his agent negotiating with the ICANN Board perhaps that we could sell his services. So yes, and I really volunteered to be his agent for a reasonable percentage of 30% of maybe not \$40 million, but at least 20. I think translation is just as – we have a...

JORDAN CARTER: Me? Yes, hi. Thanks, Katrina. Jordan Carter, .nz. Steven and [inaudible] thank you for all the work that you've been doing on this translation/understanding point.

I'm a bit bemused by one thing, which is that ICANN on the staffing and organizational side spent tens of thousands of dollars preparing relatively easy to understand diagrams about how these processes would work.

Did the ccNSO give any thought to asking Göran and the staff team to build some model translations and processes for this so

that you guys didn't have to do it from scratch? Because it feels like a huge job to be putting a lot of volunteer time and effort into. Is it something that ICANN could help more with?

ALEJANDRA REYNOSO: The microphone, please. Thank you.

CRISTIAN HESSELMAN: Short answer is, yes, we do have documentation material from ICANN, and Trang has recently put together a slide set that is going to be quite helpful going forward. The other part of that answer is it's kind of a trust and verify thing, to really get a thorough understanding of what that stuff actually says, because the way – I'll expand on this a little bit more tomorrow – but the way it's all set up, as you know, is there are some critical, tight timelines. It's explicitly stated that there's no compensation for missing a timeline deadline, and if a deadline is missed, the process terminates and ICANN prevails.

ALEJANDRA REYNOSO: Please.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: Okay, thank you. Thank you for raising this. Apart from the translation, I want to ask whether the Council will consider

sessions on just the ICANN Bylaws when we come to ccNSO membership day. Because some [of us] is information overload, and some of us who are not native speakers will interpret it wrongly. And whether you consider that when you draw your program, that members will have time to look at some of the difficult issues of interpreting the Bylaws. Thank you.

ALEJANDRA REYNOSO: Thank you. Well, thank you very much. I will close the queue for this update, and now we will have the CCWG Use of Country and Territory Names as TLDs with Annebeth Lange.

ANNEBETH LANGE: Well, while we're waiting, I can say good morning, everybody. I'm Annebeth Lange from .no. I've been working as a Co-Chair for the Cross Community Working Group for the use of country and territory names as TLDs.

As many of you know, they were taken out of the process in the first round, and now it's a discussion on how – or if – we're going to do something with that protection in the next round. As we know, it's different opinions.

In the last round, all the different stakeholders had different opinions, but we ended up with a compromise, and the question is now, should we do something else in the next round?

I'm chairing it together with two Co-Chairs from the GNSO, and it's also attended by GAC members, if not very much, they are welcome to the group, and participants from ALAC. And we have Jaap there as a specialist on ISO 3166, and he has really been a great help for us.

So let's see. Isn't it this one? Nothing happens, just a moment. This is not good. Oh. This is too fast. Okay. We are only discussing the first level. That is really important to stress.

There is a lot of confusion between the second level domains and the first level domains, so be aware that when we are discussing country and territory names here, it's the first level as new top level domains. And it's all based on the ISO 3166 list, nothing else.

What we were given in mandate was to review the existing policies like RFC 1591 and the fast track, overall policies of IDNs and ccTLDs, the new gTLD policy, and then the AGB (Applicant Guidebook Module) 2 where geographical names were treated in the last round.

So what we were asked to do was to assess if it was possible, or the feasibility of a definitional framework for the use of country and territory names as TLDs that everyone could agree on.

It is not a PDP, it is a cross-community working group, and the meaning was to give advice to be included in the policy development process at a later stage.

We have a lot of teleconferences weekly, and face-to-face meetings. See if we can move forward. Yes. So I'll actually start with the main conclusion, that it was impossible to reach a harmonized framework. We find it impossible. And that's kind of interesting.

We have been working together since 2014, had a lot of meetings, and we have discussed important things. But to find a way forward together, that's proven to be too difficult.

The stakeholder groups were too far from each other, where the commercial view on the one side, like [inaudible] to earn money quickly, and on the other side, long term thinking, trying to beware of what could happen to open up country and territory names, and also the thought of what will happen with those areas of the world that are not too developed now, when they discover what happened if we open up for taking away the country and territory names.

We found that the mandate seemed to be too limited to reach consensus. It's a lot of parallel efforts going on in the community now. It's divergence out there, it's uncoordinated.

We have this group, the cross-community working group, we have discussion of geographical names that go on plus country and territory names.

In the startup of the subsequent procedures in the GNSO, they have actually decided not to discuss it directly just now. They are leaving this project to await the result of our work. But they are very interested in starting that discussion.

And then the governments in the GAC, they are discussing geographical names going much further than what we do in this group. They are discussing names of geographical signification in addition to country and territory names.

So the interim paper that's out for hearing now, we have some preliminary conclusions. The best one is actually that we have agreed on what to do with two-letter strings.

The working group supports a recommendation that the existing ICANN policy of reserving two-letter codes for ccTLDs should be maintained.

And it's not only those in the ISO 3166, but all two-letter combinations. This is consistent with RFC 1591, and this is a standard that's established and maintained independently of us.

It's outside the DNS, and ICANN, as I said, is not in the business to decide what is and what is not a country. And a two-letter combination that's not on the ISO list now might easily be put in later on if a new country will be established sometime in the future.

The other interim paper conclusion was that – if we can call it a conclusion – is that it's a lot of divergent views on the three-letter codes. That's a next step in the ISO discussion.

So what should we do? Should we maintain status quo as it is today? It's impossible to register a three-letter code on the ISO list. You can have three-letter combinations outside the ISO list, but not those that are in it.

The dynamic nature of ISO 3166 – as I said, there might be new countries in the future – might create problems with that. And IDN ccTLDs overlap with the definition meaningful representation.

So we have some possible solutions on the table. Three letter codes on ISO 3166, should they be treated as ccTLDs? It's some ccTLDs that have actually raised that question.

Three letter codes ISO 3166 allowed as gTLDs, and if they are, should it be with some restrictions? For example, support or non-objection from relevant public authorities or ccTLDs. Today,

that system is for capitals and some cities in the applicant guidebook we have today. Or should we allow all codes and names as gTLDs with no restrictions at all?

A wide range of views was presented on three-letter codes, but no consensus reached. So what is the current status? In these interim papers, it's a lot of observations, conclusions, and tentative recommendations. That is out there for public comment.

We have an overview of use of country and territory names over time, and Jaap really made this a very good introduction. To those who have not read about this before, please do. It's both before, pre-RFC 1591, what happened then, and what happened post-1591, and the evolution of proposed use as new gTLDs.

It is in the overview of assigning methods in ISO 3166. We have documentation of the working method, resulting deliberations of two-letter codes, and lack of results for three-letter codes.

So the problem here is that the only recommendation we could give is not on the material result. It's more how should we continue the work we have started. We didn't reach a result, but could we do that in another format? We should continue to work in this area, but should we consolidate all efforts into one?

All these processes going on out there now, should it be a clearer link with policy development processes? But how should we do that? Should it be treated like an inside the GNSO PDP? Should ccNSO have their own PDP, or should we have a new cross-community working group with extended mandates? What is special with these geographical names, especially the country and territory names? It's that both the GNSO and the ccNSO have interest in it, so it's more special than the usual gTLDs that are out there for registration.

The next step now is that we are awaiting public comment on the interim paper, then provide updated recommendations to the ccNSO and GNSO Councils. And another question that we have to consider is, we had a study group before we started a working group, and that study group had a recommendation, and that recommendation was that it should be sent a letter to the ICANN Board from the ccNSO Council to exclude country and territory names until – what we said in the study group – until we had reached some result, a common framework, something that we could agree on. But until now, we haven't managed to do it. Should we wait forever? How long should we wait?

So what we do now is to await the final report, and even if I say, "Read the report," this is quite heavy stuff to read. And I also must say that the recommendations in the end, it's not easy to understand. Nigel, you said that you didn't understand it

because it was in American, but what about us? I'm Norwegian. I have big problems understanding what it really says.

Especially those recommendations where there are three alternatives, it's very difficult to understand what are these alternatives. What we tried to explain there is, should all be treated under one GNSO PDP, or should we have other PDPs? Or should it be a changed mandate in a cross-community working group to go forward with it? A clearer interaction with the PDPs out there. But please, use the link, see if you can understand it, and don't hesitate to ask Bart or me if you need clarification. Thank you for listening.

ALEJANDRA REYNOSO: Thank you. Are there any questions for Annebeth? No? Thank you very much, Annebeth, for your presentation. Yes, there's one. Yes, please, here at the front. Thank you.

CHRISTOPHER WILKINSON: I just wanted to remind the meeting, but first, I'd like to congratulate the working group on tackling what I know is an extremely complex and difficult subject. I want to remind the meeting that there is a distinct ISO list of three-letter codes which is used for currencies. And although these are not widely

used on the Internet, they're very widely used in financial markets.

So when you say, "Should the use of three-letter codes as TLDs be restricted?" there would certainly have to be restrictions. I'm quite sure that the financial institutions would not accept TLDs representing currencies as separate TLDs out of their control. And as Giovanni will know, the three-letter code for the euro is EUR, and that is restricted, I expect. Thank you.

PIERRE BONIS:

Hello, Pierre Bonis from AFNIC, .fr. Thank you very much, Annebeth, for this update. I just wanted to seek clarification about something that the GNSO said yesterday during the ccNSO-GNSO Council joint meeting. Maybe I didn't understand quite well. They talked about the launch of a PDP on their side that could fuel the reflection on the CCWG work, and I didn't quite understand how you can launch a PDP and at the same time work on the CCWG. Thank you.

ANNEBETH LANGE:

Thank you, Pierre. What will happen now is GNSO has planned a webinar the 25th of April. What they see is that both GAC and we are really interested in this field, and the confusion out there,

people have to talk together. So I think that they consider the PDP is theirs.

But at the same time, we don't want the situation that they had last time, that it is presented something that, get on the table, and then afterwards, all the different opinions come at the table again, and then we will be delayed.

I think that they at this time tried to draw in the ccNSO, the working groups, and get all things together before they go further with the geographical names.

And it's planned a large – I heard four-hour – session in Johannesburg where all the geographical issues should be discussed with all stakeholders at the table.

So we'll see. Did that answer it? I'm not quite sure what you meant. Yes, good? Thank you.

ROSALIA MORALES:

Hello, I'm Rosalia from .cr, Costa Rica. Annebeth, I've been working on this working group and I want to congratulate you on your leadership in this group. I know it has been very complicated and many years of conversations.

I just wanted to bring up the topic to the ccNSO to please participate. I think it has been an issue that has been brought up

many times before, but it doesn't mean it's not important. We need to be part of the discussion.

Right now, there's a strong – I think there are many opinions – but some of the opinions are that this should be mostly debated within the GNSO, and I think the ccNSO needs to have an important voice, needs to be heard.

So please, participate. Please take the opportunity of this public comment period to provide your opinion. We need ccNSO participants and we need the ccNSO voice in this.

It's few of us participating in the working group even though it's a ccNSO cc group. To some extent, more people from other groups have participated, which is great, but we need the voice from the ccNSO to come out.

And also, I'll just bring up an issue that I feel we cannot discuss this over and over every year and every time there's a new discussion on new gTLDs, and it would be great to come up with, or someone to come up with a solution to stop bringing up issues that we've been discussing for so many years.

I think it becomes tiring for the community to talk about this. People lose interest even though it's such an important topic, and it would be great for the ccNSO to come up with a great solution for this issue and not continue talking about it for so

many years. It creates a lot of stress in the community. Thank you.

ANNEBETH LANGE:

Thank you, Rosalia. And I would also use the opportunity to say that the working group that GNSO now have, it's leading up to the PDP. And what they do is to go through the Applicant Guidebook and ask a lot of questions, very detailed questions.

So they are sending out these days what they call Community Comment 2. It's detailed questions that they want to have an answer to. Some of them might be relevant for us, but it's at this time not asking about the geographical names.

At the moment, we are finished and I have delivered our interim paper of the answer of that. They will make a CC3, and I'm sure that at that stage, there will be questions about the geographical names.

So be aware and try to follow, even if it's not a new cross-community working group, even if it ends with that these things are treated in the GNSO PDP, we have to be aware. There are a lot of things going on there that might have consequences for us as CCs. Thank you.

[DEMI GETSCHKO]: Very short observation in the same line, more or less. Just a note on three letters code for ccs. This is inside the realm of the 3166, 3166 is our base position to have the concept of ccs.

Well, I think it's very strange that another constituency will begin a PDP inside our realm, 3166 is our realm. We can use or not the three letters, we can [dispose or not the domains] [inaudible] but this is really our region. Then if there would be a PDP, I hope that the PDP is led by ccs.

ANNEBETH LANGE: Thank you, [Demi]. I completely agree. It is our regime, but still, it's different opinions out there.

ALEJANDRA REYNOSO: I'm sorry, I need to cut the queue of questions – I'm so sorry – because we need two more presenters. No, sorry, but please, contact Annebeth for further questions or comments. I'm so sorry.

With this, I thank you, Annebeth, for your update, and now we will move with Giovanni with the Strategic and Operational Planning Working Group update.

GIOVANNI SEPPIA:

Thank you, Alejandra, and thank you for the opportunity. Contrary to the previous other three working groups, we enjoyed quite some relaxed time, because there was not much to comment, but there seems to be a competition regarding ICANN documents, how much readable and accessible they are towards standard human beings.

I must say that if you read and you go through the ICANN fiscal year 18 operating plan and budget, well, it's a good challenge against Bylaws and other guidelines.

I do not have slides. I'll just give you a quick update. ICANN has recently posted the fiscal year operating plan and budget. That was posted on 8th of March, and with a public comment period that closes on the 28th of April.

And the ccNSO SOP Working Group will produce a comment in the coming weeks and will submit it to the ICANN process during the public comment period framework.

I would like to invite you, all of you, even if you are not a member of the ccNSO SOP Working Group, to spend a few moments and go through the ICANN fiscal year 18 operating plan and budget because it gives you quite a good overview about ICANN planning for the coming ICANN fiscal year, which goes from the 1st of July 2017 until the 30th of June 2018.

The plan starts with some basic elements relating to the revenue model of ICANN, including some broad estimates for the top level domain industry and the growth level estimates for historical legacy TLDs.

They go from the low estimate of 1.5% to 2.3%, which is the best estimate according to ICANN. But you will be surprised to read that for new gTLDs, the growth estimates by ICANN go from a baseline of 29.9% to about 65% best estimate growth for fiscal year, again, '18.

So those are, again, the basic elements on which ICANN is basing the revenue model, and the revenue model is also based on the number of delegations of new gTLDs that will reach 1240. And ICANN seems to be so eager to delegate new gTLDs that it added one day to the calendar, because this is the best estimate on the 31st of June 2018. So yes, that is one extra day added to delegate more gTLDs, and that's in the plan.

But apart from this small typo, the plan reads quite well, so what I said at the beginning was quite a joke, but plan reads quite well, although if you go through the plan, you'll see that at some point, it is more detailed, at some point it's more high level for the different five strategic objectives.

That is because Xavier and his team who made an excellent presentation at the working group two days ago, they explain

again to us that their job is to work million figures, while for the narrative, it's just assembling what they receive from different ICANN departments.

So what the working group will do – as we did in the past – will be to assess both the figures and the narrative, and eventually request ICANN staff to provide clarification on certain areas of the operating plan and budget that are not so clear because at some point, certain concepts or actions or projects are given a bit for granted while they shouldn't. But that's the way the assembling process of the plan takes place.

There is also a reference to our voluntary contributions, so the contributions of the ccTLD community, and those contributions are stable for the fiscal year 18, meaning that ICANN expects to receive \$2.1 million as voluntary contributions from the ccTLD community. There are no changes in the voluntary contribution, it's a revenue part of the plan.

Again, this is the third year of the five-year operating plan, so this is the fiscal year 18, and again, it's an invitation to those of you who have some spare time to have a look at this plan, because it contains a good overview of all the projects that are going to be funded by ICANN in fiscal year 18.

And it has a new entry in the presentation, which is one page where there are all the potential activities that at the end of the

planning process at present are not going to be funded because of lack of funding. So there is one page dedicated to these activities that may become funded in case there are resources available.

The working group will start working on the comments to this fiscal year 18 plan, as I said, and we have a dedicated webpage with a list of our members.

And thanks to those who were present in person or remotely to the meeting we had a couple of days ago. And if you are interested in joining the working group, please contact the ccNSO secretariat. We're always looking for new volunteers to join the working group and to participate in the comment process. Thank you.

ALEJANDRA REYNOSO: Thank you very much, Giovanni. We have a couple of minutes for a couple of questions. Peter and Peter.

GIOVANNI SEPPIA: All the Peters. Any more Peter in the room? Okay.

[PETER]: Good morning. Thank you so much for the update. Giovanni, when you talk about the \$2.1 million that is foreseen into 2018

fiscal year budget, how does that compare to money that was actually contributed in 2017 and 2016?

GIOVANNI SEPPIA: Yes, it's a good question, and I understood from Xavier that there is going to be soon a list of this contribution published. I do not have this overview at present, but I understood from Xavier that this is something that is going to be published on the ICANN site in the coming weeks. And Bart, if you want to [comment.]

BART BOSWINKEL: The way it's currently planned is that ICANN Finance will distribute that list. It will not be the definite one to avoid any issues like last year. It will be sent around for review by the cc community whether they recognize themselves and the amounts, then it will be finalized. And it should be done shortly after this meeting.

PETER VERGOTE: Good morning. Peter Vergote, .be. Thank you, Giovanni, for this first glimpse into ICANN's operational plan for 18. I do not have a remark concerning the figures, but I would like to share my concern concerning the timing. I don't think it's highly efficient for our community to have the operational plan published about a week before the start of the ICANN meetings.

I can just assume that the working group would have preferred to have this document way up earlier so that you could better structure your work, potentially already have had a first run through the operational plan, and come up with already some basic draft recommendations.

So, of course, drafting an operational plan is not something that happens overnight, but I really would like the working group to consider to have as a high level remark to stress the importance of timeliness, to have the operational plan delivered in a more timely manner. Thanks.

GIOVANNI SEPPIA:

Thank you, Peter. That's indeed a valid point, and that is something that we have already requested the ICANN Finance team in the past, and we will reiterate this point.

It was indeed – for us, it was just a matter of at this meeting listening and looking at the presentation given by Xavier and his team. But indeed a few of us had the opportunity and the time to go through such a document independently from the level of English and independent from being mother tongue, it was quite a lengthy document and it required some time to go through it. So we'll reiterate the point. Thank you.

ALEJANDRA REYNOSO: Thank you very much, Giovanni. With that, we're moving on with TLD-OPS Standing Committee. Please, Cristian.

CRISTIAN HESSELMAN: Thank you. This is an update of TLD-OPS. My name is Cristian Hesselman. I'm with .nl, the registry for the Netherlands. I'm also the Chair of the TLD-OPS Standing Committee.

A quick introduction to TLD-OPS: TLD-OPS is the global Internet response community for and by ccTLDs. We're a community that's open for all ccTLDs irrespective of ccNSO membership, and we currently bring together around 330 Internet response people spread out over 187 different ccTLDs. That corresponds to about 65% of all ccTLDs worldwide.

The goal of the community is to work together as to facilitate collaboration between the members, so as to detect and mitigate incidents that may affect the security and stability of the member services but also of the Internet at large.

The aim of the community is to further extend the incident response structures, processes, and tools that members have already in place and not to replace them. So it's really an extension that builds on your existing incident response infrastructure.

Guidance provided is provided by the TLD-OPS Standing Committee which consists of six people, mostly ccTLD representatives, but we also have liaisons from SSAC, IANA, and ICANN Security Team in there.

The community revolves around a mailing list which these 330 people have joined, and on this mailing list if you're a member, you receive a monthly e-mail that contains the incident response contact information of all the ccTLDs on the list.

There's an example down there with John Doe and Jane Doe. The information includes first name, last name, ccTLD, extension –obviously – telephone number, and e-mail.

The advantage of having this e-mail is that as a member, you will have your incident response contacts of your peers readily available in your inbox, even in offline situations. This e-mail is being automatically generated once a month on the list.

The other usage of the mailing list is to share security alerts and incidents. So far, we've had ten, roughly, ranging from zero-day vulnerabilities to a DDoS attack on the DNS root last year and also a registry got attacked. There was another report on the Sunday of another registry who got DDoSed, so it's not a whole lot of messages, but they're significant and they're helping the community to increase their security and stability posture of the TLD-OPS members.

This is something I already mentioned: 187 members right now, around 64% of the total number of ccTLDs. The underserved regions are currently mostly Africa and the LAC region, so there's still some progress to be made there.

Our progress since ICANN 57: we've had a number of security alerts on the list, as you just saw on the other table. We also managed to increase the membership by two, so American Samoa joined and also Iran.

We updated the contact information on five members, which shows that members are actually actively maintaining their contact information on the list and that it's current information, which is obviously relevant if you want to reach somebody. We also had to put two ccTLDs back on the list after they had problems with their e-mail systems and they experienced excessive bounces.

In addition to this progress, we also organized a workshop on the Sunday, so the day before yesterday, and the goal of the workshop was to explore how TLD-OPS members can cooperate to fend off DDoS attacks specifically.

The motivation for that was we've seen recent large scale DDoS attacks, of course, mostly based on IoT devices, and as the TLD-OPS Standing Committee we thought it would be a very good

idea to mobilize the collective experience of the community and put everyone together in one room to discuss this matter.

Our approach was to facilitate dialog, sharing of ideas, discussions, and so forth. And we included multiple perspectives, so not just the operational perspective but also technical and strategic perspective.

And the workshop that we organized last Sunday was a closed workshop, so you had to really be a member of the community to be able to get in. It was in this room because we expected that folks would be sharing confidential information.

We had 55 attendees in the end, which was pretty good, I think. We had 35 different ccTLDs, ASCII, including 11 IDNs. We had representatives from the ccTLDs, of course, but we also had two representatives from the SSAC and one from the RSSAC, and we covered all geographic regions. Like I said, we had very substantive expertise in the workshop.

This is what it looked like. It was very interactive workshop. We organized two breakout sessions – two sessions in which we broke up into five groups – and we used these flip charts to write down and discuss ideas. It was very interactive, and on the far right down there, you see the people who acted as bouncers so that we only had the people in there who actually registered for the workshop.

Workshop results, first selection, we still need to go through the flip charts in more detail, but this is what we gathered so far. I received initial feedback from people at the workshop and also within the larger ccNSO community that the attendees at least experienced the workshop to contribute to increase the trust among TLD-OPS members because people saw each other face-to-face rather than just seeing each other on a mailing list.

We had I think excellent participation and attendance. The discussions were really interactive, and the format of having these interactive sessions also worked well.

In terms of concrete output, the things that we learned from that were suggested during the workshop was to, for each member on the TLD ops list, include a secondary incident response e-mail address in case the TLD is attacked to such an extent that the whole extension doesn't work anymore. In that case, you will need an e-mail address with a different extension to be able to be reachable.

There were suggestions to not only have the mailing list but to enhance it with live communication facilities. For instance, to help each other during an attack, a chat room would help or perhaps a conference bridge that would be on standby. Also, it was suggested to put on the TLD-OPS website various best practices to help peers to learn from each other.

And for the longer term, there have been discussions on shared services, so services that would be used by all the TLD-OPS members, such as having a sinkhole or threat analysis or shared monitoring systems. So as I said, our next step is to look through the flip charts in more detail and to put these flip charts into action.

At the end of the workshop, we asked, "Okay, was this useful? Was it time well spent?" And fortunately, we saw a lot of hands being raised there, so we're thinking of organizing this workshop again at ICANN 59.

The other outreach activity that we embarked on was the TLD-OPS post cards. Thanks for holding them up, Bart. This is something we did at the beginning of January.

We thought it would be interesting to explore alternative forms of communication, so we went back to old-school post cards inviting ccTLDs who were not on the TLD-OPS mailing list yet to ask them to join.

I think we sent out 100+ post cards to each of those missing ccTLDs. Unfortunately, it didn't have any effect so far, but if you're interested in looking at the post card – because it looks really slick, to be honest – there's a whole stack here up front at the desk here. And also, if you know any ccTLDs who are not a

member yet, then please give them that post card so they can sign up.

Our objectives for this ICANN meeting were actually to increase the membership to 194. We didn't reach that, unfortunately, so we are now at 187. We also wanted to reach out to the LAC and Africa regions. That was partly successful. We were in contact with the LAC region to organize a webinar. The African region is more difficult, but we gave a presentation in the Asia Pacific region during APTLD 71 at the beginning of March, so that's something that we did manage to accomplish. What we also accomplished is to organize the workshop that I just talked about.

Our goals for ICANN 59 are to potentially organize a second TLD-OPS workshop but then focus on the African region. And of course, we're going to put the outcomes of last Sunday's workshop into action. We also conducted a survey a couple of weeks ago, and this is something that we also need to analyze and create a few action points out of.

And we need to finalize an update of the TLD-OPS membership procedure so if members want to change their contact information or want to subscribe different people to the list, we developed a draft procedure for that and that's something we need to finalize in the coming weeks.

Still, we wanted to set a goal for the membership, so we kind of randomly set that at increasing by three members to 190. I hope that works.

Okay, so this was my update. These are the people on the TLD-OPS Standing Committee, and if you have any questions, then I'll be glad to take them.

ALEJANDRA REYNOSO: Thank you, Cristian. Are there any questions? Yes, please, the microphone is here at the front.

ALEX CORENTHIN: Thank you for the update on TLD-OPS. I'm Alex from .sn registry. I'm also Chair of AFTLD, African Top Level Domain Organization. [inaudible] lack of participation of the African countries, so something is very relevant, and I think there is one problem that we have to highlight, is the language barrier.

I think my question is, how do you face this kind of question, and what operation can we do with us, with the African region, to follow the next update?

The next ICANN meeting in Johannesburg, we are very open to help on these issues. Thank you.

CRISTIAN HESSELMAN: Thank you for that question. That's actually an excellent question. One action that we took in the past is that we made our leaflet available in multiple languages. It's available in Arabic, Chinese, English, French, Russian, Spanish, and Russian again.

So we had that set up. But when it comes to giving a webinar or something like that, then we will probably need support. For instance, if we do a webinar for the LAC region, then we'll probably also need to do it in Spanish. So we will probably need some support, perhaps from the ICANN organization or something else. We do have for instance French speakers on the TLD-OPS Standing Committee, so that would be doable for the African region. We also have – I'm not sure if we have Arab speakers. No, I don't think so. So we need to do something there.

ALEJANDRA REYNOSO: Thank you very much. I want to thank everyone for their updates. This will conclude the working group updates. I want to remind everyone that after the coffee break, we have the joint meeting with the GAC at Hall A2, and after that, we come back to the room for the ccNSO-appointed ICANN Board member session. Thank you very much.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: Just one more thing. if you're interested in the TLD-OPS post card, they're at the table at the exit. And those ccTLDs who have not yet had their voting cards, please come up to the front because we still have some spare ones.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]