COPENHAGEN – ccNSO Members Day - Day 2 (pt 1)
Wednesday, March 15, 2017 – 09:00 to 10:30 CET
ICANN58 | Copenhagen, Denmark

BART: Good morning everybody. This is the result of a very nice evening. We're going to get started. The first part of the session is, Peter will introduce it on the exchange of letters and accountability frameworks, and afterwards regional organizations will do an update.

We are a bit flexible around the timing. These sessions, so if we have a good discussion around the accountability frameworks and exchange of letters, then we can extend it a little bit. So, just a pre-warning. Peter, over to you. Let's get started.

PETER: All right. Thanks very much, Bart. To set the framework, it was actually a question that, I don't know where it came from, from some of the sessions concerning the IANA transitions, probably. The question is, now that the IANA stewardship transition took place, that we have PTI currently as the operator of the IANA functions. Question was, is there a repercussion with regard to the exchange of letters, or the accountability framework that

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.

many of us, ccTLDs, have signed or concluded with ICANN in the past?

So, we did a little, well, I did a little verification, and some from ICANN side did a little verification to see where we were, whether there is an impact for now, or not. We want to share with you our basic findings, and if I'm not mistaken, Martin, it's up to the council further, to take any decision or to point any direction of travel.

Minding, of course, that we also want to look for feedback from the meeting room. So, shall I continue with my findings?

[SPEAKER OFF MICROPHONE]

Okay.

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: So, included you see the scope of the session, why it was done, why it was organized. This came up in Helsinki and in Hyderabad, especially in Hyderabad, then we said we would get back to you at this session. So, a little bit of background on the accountability framework, and the exchange of letters.

Because it's a very interesting history. The exchange of letters and the accountability frameworks are based on the first ccNSO guideline ever, which was adopted in January 2006, and you can

still find it on the ccNSO website. So, a lot of things happened in between, but this one is still there.

It's not part of the guideline review committee. And it's only, and it's precisely what it is. It's what the title says. It's a guideline, it is to assist ccTLD managers to discuss an accountability framework with ICANN. And it's effectively, if you really go back, it is the counterpart of the ccNSO, itself, the role of the ccNSO, and the role of accountability frameworks.

So, based on this guideline, 2006, ICANN developed templates for the accountability framework, and later at the request of the CC community, on the exchange of letters, and these templates have been adjusted over time, not in substance, but for example, we had new CEOs, and the language has been corrected a little bit.

What is important to understand is from an ICANN perspective, accountability frameworks and exchange of letters are considered similar or equal. So, there is no preferred route either for accountability frameworks or exchange of letters. It's purely up to the ccTLD manager, whether it wants to enter into accountability framework, or an exchange of letter, to meet their own requirements.

If you look at the number of existing accountabilities to date, there are around 70. So, 29 accountability frameworks, and 51

exchange of letters. And the reason for having the session right now, there are two requests pending, and we first wanted to check whether, from an ICANN side, whether there was an update needed before we want to enter into these negotiations because you don't want to do this.

So, if you look at the process, how accountability framework is in exchange of letters are entered to, is if a ccTLD manager is interested, and again, this is important to understand, the initiative is what the ccTLD manager. It's only if the ccTLD manager wants to enter into an accountability framework that the process will start.

It's not an active goal of ICANN global stakeholder engagement group, or the secretariat. So, it's purely the initiative of the ccTLD manager. And they contact either a regional office, the regional offices, a regional VP, there are one or two already in the room, like for example, [inaudible] from the Middle East. And I don't know… Is there someone else from the regional VPs here?

Yeah [inaudible], and okay. Doesn't matter. So that you can contact the regional offices, or the ccNSO secretariat and we will then point you through to the regional VP. And one of the first steps, one of the first things you will be asked is whether you want to enter into an accountability framework or exchange of

letters. And you will be, we will send you the templates and the templates on which we would discuss are the starting point for a discussion between, or dialogue, that's a better word, dialogue between ICANN and the ccTLD.

And in parallel, there will be some background checks in the IANA root zone database. One of the major ones is whether there is a transfer of revocation pending, because we do not want to, from an ICANN side, we do not want to create the illusion that the accountability framework or an exchange of letters does impact that process.

So, that's one of the reasons. And then going back, so if all is well, then we have the dialogue around the templates, and yeah. If a ccTLD wants to diverse or diverge, that's the word, diverge from the template, say, if you would look at the website, you will see all kinds of variations. But say, the template is the starting point, and ICANN really wants to understand why you want to diverge from the template.

That's the correct way to phrase it, isn't it? I'm learning. So, which templates are the…? So, there are current models of the ccTLD manage to ICANN exchange of letters, and the ICANN to ccTLD change of letters, and there is the accountability framework. You can see the URLs. I've talked enough about it,

and let's go into the substance. So Kim, could you start with the ICANN to ccTLD exchange? And I'll pass the floor to you.

SAM EISNER: Hi everyone. I'm Sam Eisner, I'm Deputy General Counsel with the ICANN Legal Department. And since I joined ICANN in 2009, I've been working with Bart on ccTLD exchange of letters, and have been involved in many conversations around them. So, after the IANA stewardship transition completed, and we've had the questions of, how does that impact the exchange of letters, and is there anything that we would need to do to modify them, in order to bring us into the post-transition world, and so we committed in Hyderabad to come here and start this conversation with you.

And I know that there are, as Bart mentioned, a couple ccTLD operators that are looking to enter into exchanges of letters. And so, we'd like to have some direction on this sooner rather than later to allow the operators to move forward.

So, when we started… The exchange of letters, if you're not familiar, we have an ICANN to ccTLD and a ccTLD to ICANN. They're a lightweight framework that sets out commitments of how we'll recognize and work with each other, most particularly to work together to uphold ICANN's mission of security, stability, and resiliency of the internet DNS. And then also, with how

ICANN will take in and act upon changes of information such as, server, name server changes, etc.

And the companion obligations and commitments from the ccTLD operator of timely notifications of updates so that we can make sure that those are in the database. And so, we took a look through the existing documentation, and really where we've come to is the good news, we don't think that there are any changes that are required as a result of the IANA stewardship transition.

We've been very careful over the years, and if you look at earlier versions of the exchange of letters, this isn't the case. But since we moved past, and particularly the 2009 and beyond, we've been very careful to not reference specifically IANA within the letters. And it would be those types of references that we'd be concerned about in the post-transition world.

However, what the letters do currently is they recognize ICANN as the IANA functions operator, which is supported from the transition proposal, ICANN in that role, of course, contracts with PTI to provide the naming related services for ccTLDs as well as gTLDs. But because it's stated in that higher level term, we think that the exchange of letters remains an appropriate expression, and it doesn't require modification to allow people to move forward.

There is language within the document about ICANN through its designated point of contact, and that also allows ICANN to say PTI is your designated point of contact for these purposes. So, we think that the language here, gives enough flexibility without having to change the templates, or to have to do any sort of wholesale review of the existing documentation to go back and change it.

Just one note, and one thing that came up in our conversations. We, of course, know that the FOI is currently in the process of implementation. This is not a transition related issue, it's a FOI implementation related issue. If there is a need for us to go through and modify the terminology used in these letters to match with the proper terminology that's supported through the FOI, that of course, is something that ICANN is willing and happy to do alongside the cc community.

But we don't see that as a change that's required as part of the transition, but I think that's part of the conversation that we're happy to leave open.

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: Thanks Bart. Thanks Sam. You know I'm a lawyer. You know what lawyers do.   They start their conversation with a preliminary remark. So, the preliminary remark I wanted to give is that I have been looking at a number of template versions

about the exchange of letters and the accountability framework, but do not forget to do your own homework. The findings that stem from her side, and me from my side, that we have come to, or based upon the documents that we have been studying.

Now, while all of the different versions are only slightly different, it doesn't hurt if you double check the exact document that you have engaged with. So, that being said, the good news is that my findings match 100% with what some just has told us. There is no direct mentioning of IANA as the instance, the organization that's taking care of some functions.

Neither in the exchange in latter document, neither in the accountability framework documents. So, that means, according to me, that there is no real urgency to go back to the signed versions, and make updates on those. If IANA was literally mentioned, then you would probably have ran into a problem, because you want to replace IANA by the organization that is performing the IANA functions.

Since we have had the transition, and it's now currently PTI that is the operator of the IANA functions, and it might be that at some point of time, it becomes another organization, but anyhow, you cannot just refer to IANA. You need to refer to the operator of the IANA functions. So, there is no need, whether it's in the current documents, whether it's in the templates that are

going to be used for future EOLs and accountability frames, that will be concluded between TLDs, ccTLDs and ICANN.

However, what I have discovered is that ICANN is identified as the counterpart, but it's also, like some explain, it's written in a way that's like, ICANN that is performing the IANA functions as well. So, it could perhaps be advisable to have an update there, and to specify in the templates that are going to be used in the future, also to say that ICANN is operating through the designated operator of the IANA functions.

Just to make it clearer, to rule out any ambiguity. Is there a strict legal need for that? No, it's nice to have. I mean, nothing will happen that put us in, at least according to my findings, nothing is going to happen for ccs that in the future, would engage into an exchange of [inaudible] accountability framework based upon the current wording, but just might be advisable to do it.

Same note that some made earlier, now both in the accountability framework document as in the exchange of letter template, we find wording that should be looked upon within the context of the FOI recommendations, and I think you know what it's about, it's about the word sponsoring organization that is in both of those documents.

So, that's clearly what I would consider to be further work, that needs to be investigated. Yeah.

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: My suggestion is, are there any questions relating to this bit around the accountability framework and exchange of letters? So, going back to the, could you put on the slides please? Thank you.

[SPEAKER OFF MICROPHONE]

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: [Inaudible]. You were present at the particular point of time when we changed our previous version of the letter that we had with ICANN. ICANN was a little bit reluctant to understand why we're doing this, but they accepted our [inaudible]. There is not… Using one of these templates is not a requirement. It's an opportunity, but you can write anything you want. Yeah?

If you have a legal department, it's better to do your own thing. We put in our new version, already, our performing the IANA function at this point in time. We still abide by it. We don't really foresee a reason to change it, should there be a different, a better language that comes into the letterhead, we just update our letters. But as I said, my experience in doing these letters is,

ICANN was not reluctant to accept particular very clearly defined letters that are very exclusively related to one particular ccTLD.

It's not that you are required to use their template. Just wanted to point this out.

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: Thanks [inaudible]. That is the case. You know, from the ICANN standpoint, we've always been willing to consider documentation, as Bart said, will ask the question of why, we want to understand why the change is being requested from the template, or why the new language is there, but we've always been willing to consider it, as we move into, as we're in the post-transition phase, we would of course, you know, consider anything that comes out of that as part of our considerations of language such as explicit references, the IANA functions, how those need to be expressed in the letter, etc.

But again, we've always been willing, and will remain willing, to consider any language proposed by an operator.

DAVID: Good morning. David [inaudible] from Dot IE. Just want to ask why is it that we're not taking the opportunity to remove sponsoring organization from the template? The FY spend many years of very hard work, was put to the Board, the Board passed

it, it's now with the management, if I can call it that, of ICANN to implement. So, as a ccNSO, why are we not pressing to take these words out? We're not sponsoring organizations.

It's frustrating that we're not pressing this a little bit more aggressively.

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: We'll touch upon another topic as well. I think by Johannesburg, we'll have, I can't speak on behalf of the ccNSO, that's very clear, but I think by Johannesburg, we will definitely take some action.

DAVID: Okay, that's another, how many months away? [CROSSTALK]

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: …it's two and a half months away. But you want…

DAVID: Okay. Thanks for the answer.

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: Just to follow-up, David. As I noted in my introduction remarks, we recognize from the ICANN side that changes are likely needed in the letters to match the terminology coming out of the FOI.

We're ready to be part of that conversation. So, there is no bar from the ICANN side from changing those.

The question that was framed to us was, what's required to change as a result of the transition, so [inaudible] transition, there were no required changes. But the question is, what's require to changes as the result of the FOI? That's a different conversation, but I think you can tie them together.

DAVID:
Okay. I do understand the distinction, but the FOI has been there for a long time. Thank you.

NIGEL:
Thank you. Nigel [inaudible]. I see three lawyers sitting at the front here. I think we ought to be tempted not to get too deep into the weeds on this one, but I think there is definitely a conversation that needs to happen. I think there is a little bit of… It's a shame Stephen is not here. There is a little bit of history that's involved here. And David has kind of alluded to the fact that this sponsoring organization, as an example, has been a thorn in our sides for many years.

It was presented to us as a feta complete by one of your predecessors, and we were simply just told that is it, unilaterally. ICANN is going to call you sponsoring organizations from now

on. I'm going to thank you for what you said about ICANN being ready to look at individual wordings.

But you said always, and I'm going to take that, defining that as since 2009. So, that's okay. And the history is this, is going back to the founding of the ccNSO. Every single ccTLD walked away from ICANN, because ICANN was being ardent and was doing things, which I think nowadays, we would actually realize that legally amounted to blackmail, as in saying, we are not going to make changes to the IANA root unless you sign a binding contract that commits you to do X, Y, and Z.

I think there is a conversation that really needs to happen, and maybe this is the start of it. Maybe this is the indicator that starts this process. What is the legal purpose of this exchange of documents and so on? What they really are, what they ended up being, was ICANN retreating from this blackmail and this contractual, you must sign a contract and we own you from now on, to something that some people found that they could use in terms of showing to their own governments, their own internet communities, that they were legitimate and so on.

We are in a post-transition world, and I think we need to look from a purpose point of view and not literal point of view from now on. That's just what I would like to say, I'm happy to talk.

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: Thanks, Nigel. Again, I've been with ICANN since 2009. I think that, you know, from everything I heard, there has been a large shift in the relationship of how the ccNSO came to be, and the relationships between ICANN and cc operators, and you know. I don't think, you know, suggestions of blackmail, I don't know. I wasn't there.

I don't like to see those kinds of things on the record, but going from a standpoint of today, I think we're at a point where we're trying to make this documentation. I agree with you on the purpose, right? We do need to do an assessment on the purpose.

Make sure that if we have these documents, we're going to be continuing to refine them. We understand what we're trying to use them for. And we want to make sure that it's the appropriate expression of the relationship between ICANN and the ccs, reflective of today's world, that choose to enter into them. So, I do agree with that point, Nigel.

NICK: Nick [inaudible], Nominent, dot UK. Exchange of letters predates the 2009 one, and in fact, it does refer to IANA. I wondered if you have any advice or suggestions as to what to do about that?

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: You know, as we were organizing this conversation, we were looking at the, we kind of broke up the documents as we were thinking about them, and for purposes of this conversation, we're looking more so into the template basis for future, as opposed to going past, but I think that Nominet is not alone in that there are a handful, or maybe more than a handful, of documents that refer to IANA explicitly.

And we haven't, as an organization from ICANN, taken any position as to whether or not we would require a modification to those letters, but I think, I know we would be willing to enter into any discussion with any cc that would like to change the letters that they have, whether they refer to IANA or not.

I think it's a really good discussion for us to have.

NICK: Because I was obviously curious, because the exchange of letters or not, on the face of them, they state that they're not legally binding. So, to one extent you say, so what?

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: Right. I think that is one of the conversations that we need to have, and I think it goes back to the purpose discussion that

Nigel raised to. I think if there isn't an evolution of the purpose for why we have them, that might make a need to go back and review, and change [inaudible] the historical ones, which is more important than not.

BART: Any other questions related to this part of the exchange of letters? No? Maybe you want to move on to a, can you put up the accountability framework please?

This is, we're now going into accountability framework. The reason is, in the accountability frameworks, there is something called an arbitration clause. That's one of the major differences between the accountability framework and the exchange of letters. If you say, in preparation of this session, I did some checking. I don't have the numbers, but I know some of the accountability frameworks do have this clause in it, and some don't.

Now, so we specifically focusing on the arbitration clause. And maybe some of you want to kick off that part of the conversation. Please go ahead, Sam.

SAM EISNER:	Thanks, Bart. Kim, if you can scroll down into the document, it's on one of the final pages, where we have dispute resolution. There. At section D. Thank you.

So, this is one area where we reviewed the documents that we thought that there might be some sort of inconsistency or tension between the IANA stewardship proposal, and how it has been implemented, and the language that exists in these documents.

So, as you know through the transition, there now is a very complete and still working on, and I understand the ccNSO also has a further dispute resolution process that you're going to be working on, as it relates to the performance of the IANA functions, and whether or not you're getting the proper service from the IANA functions operator, including potential appeals and other rights of that.

And so, I do have a concern, and we have a concern from within ICANN that, a dispute resolution clause in an accountability framework, which if it's, you know, this is about how, this is a commitment about how ICANN will work with the CC operator to perform the IANA functions. It's possible that the need for this specific language has been overtaken by the dispute processes that are included in the IANA functions contract between ICANN and PTI, as well as the future work that the ccNSO is going to do.

And so, I know we'd be interested to hear your positions on it, because I think it would be ending an awkward situation where only a handful of ccs had some sort of escalation procedure set out in a contract, and it would potentially give some operators rights that are different or in contradiction to rights that are given in general to the customers of PTI and the IANA function.

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: It's true that in some of the text, there is a reference to some kind of dispute settlement mechanism, and it's very clear to me that if we are going to kick off a PDP that is going to address review mechanism, that sooner or later, this is going to have an impact. Again, I don't think there is currently a real urgency, because this PDP still needs to be kicked off. It's going to take some time before the results will come out of the PDP, so there is no real urgency.

But this is just like the wording sponsoring organization, those are side topics that popped up while we're doing this exercise, because we did this exercise and we were limited for this exercise, only to look at the IANA stewardship transition, and this is all citing and it's clear, that at a certain point in time the council will have to make a call whether this needs further examination, or if we can just park this for the time being, given the PDP that is going to be start off. Thanks.

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: Just as some factual background, as I said, going through the list of ccs who have entered into an accountability framework or exchange of letters, what you'll see is seven out of the 21, I believe, or 29 do have a dispute resolution, but also some of the exchange of letters have a dispute resolution clause in it.

So, if you have an exchange of letters, please check, and then yeah, we'll go into the next steps, and see how we are going to deal with this in the future, but maybe that's the end of this one. Any questions about dispute resolution for that?

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: Yeah, I think you actually answered the question I was going to ask which was, how many contracts, or accountability frameworks, are affected by this specific point about dispute? I think you said seven.

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: And while Bart is counting, I'll just give a point of information. Since I've been with ICANN, since 2009, I'm not aware of any disputes that have been initiated under the dispute resolution clauses under any of the documents.

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: And the other thing about is counting, this is not really related to what we're discussing, except that you'll see that it is, directly. Could we scroll down to the next clause please? I'd like to see how many, or what's in it. Thank you. I just want to see the rest of E. Thanks very much.

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: I did my quick count, so 10 exchange of letters of dispute resolution clause in them, and seven accountability frameworks. So, a total 17 out of 70, around 20%.

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: Good morning. My name is [inaudible] from Center. Just to understand the urgency of any changes to these documents for ccs that have these clauses in them, can you explain a bit about the hierarchy of the documents? Is there reference between the exchange of letters and the AFs and the accountability frameworks in relation to any other documents that is timewise, and these rules will take precedence over any further or previous agreements?

Is there…? What is the hierarchy between these instruments?

ICANN 58
COMMUNITY FORUM
COPENHAGEN
11–16 March 2017

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: I think from the ICANN standpoint, it's not clear that any of these need to be prioritized from our standpoint, but if the cc operator would like for that to happen, then that would surely make it a priority for us. So, we're not, we think that it's important because we have two pending requests to start entering into exchanges of letters, and we didn't want to do that in the post-transition environment until we started this conversation.

It would be good to move forward to see if we can get the right language into an exchange of letters so that the colleagues that don't yet have them can move forward with them if they want. But you know, we haven't seen a critical need to press, to require any changes, but again, we're open to anyone who would like to request any modifications that are existing documents.

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: So, basically the risk that conflict arises out of different rules and AF and the new contract between ICANN and IANA is infinitely small.

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: I think based on past practice, we haven't… Because, as I said, we haven't had any disputes, if we're just looking at the dispute resolution clause, because we haven't had any disputes ever

arise before, and we have very clear documentation of dispute resolution processes and customer complaint processes now on the PTI side, and then knowing that there is going to be the PDP on additional things that the ccNSO might have, that we already have places to handle those issues.

I think that the question of if someone would like to enter into a new accountability framework, the wisdom of us entering into a new accountability framework, with a dispute resolution clause in it, is a much different question. I think that that sends a much different intention then the historical documentation that exists. And so I think, if that question were to come up from a cc operator, we would want to raise that to a high level of priority to consider the ways of continuing it in there for now.

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: Thank you very much.

ANTHONY: [Inaudible] from dot TW. [Inaudible] because of the first, allows the ccTLD, the manager, they have the size of the contract for sponsoring a contract with ICANN. So, why not [inaudible] documentation, so we [inaudible]… create the relationship between countries and manager and ICANN. So, that is my

ICANN 58
COMMUNITY FORUM
COPENHAGEN
11–16 March 2017

question.   And some provinces that are in conflict, or some would get the rate of another one. So, that is my question.

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: So, Anthony, let me make sure I understand the question. So, are you requesting that there is a requirement that ICANN answer into documentation with cc operators?

ANTHONY: Yes.   Actually [inaudible] the manager [inaudible] sponsoring agreement with ICANN.   And all of those things that are just [inaudible] inside, so I'm just wondering why, if it's in the past, so we have to reside such kind of documentation again, as ICANN or not.

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: Dot TW, say TW is just for your explanation, for the people in the audience, TW is one of the few ccTLD managers who have entered into, what was called at the time, a sponsoring agreement, and that was what Nigel alluded to.   So this is, around 2002, I believe, 2003. That was before the accountability frameworks and the exchange of letters came into play.

There is another set of documents. I think for the sake of this discussion, maybe it's an idea that we take this discussion

offline, and try to work through what you really want, and we can take that further, because this is the sponsoring contracts, yeah, in a sense, ICANN doesn't enter into them anymore, at this stage.

So, that's, you're a relic from the past.

ANTHONY: Yeah. Because it is something, because [inaudible] older that the change of ICANN is the status, and that is the multistakeholder [inaudible] something that the documentation is always there, so kept [inaudible] things that should be good.

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: Yeah, and just to follow-up from what Bart said, ICANN would not make it a requirement that any organization that's currently under one of those sponsoring agreements, reenter into a sponsoring agreement. So, if the agreements are terminated pursuant to their clauses, etc. or if they're modified pursuant to their clauses, those are both conversations we're willing to enter into, and then if the cc operator wished to enter into a different form of documentation, such as the exchange of letters, or accountability framework, we'd also be open to that.

So, we're not requiring anyone to resign a sponsoring agreement.

ANTHONY: Okay. Thank you.

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: Can you go back to this? Any other questions around this? Can you go back to the slides please? And then we're going to wind up…

It works, come on.

So, I wanted to end with this one. So, next steps. I think, first of all, thank you Sam and Peter to really looking into the exchange of letters and the accountability framework. I think based on this conversation, the two pending requests can be dealt with moving forward. There is no urgent need to readdress the exchange of letters and the accountability frameworks to date, with relation to the language around the IANA stewardship, or the IANA functions operation.

But cc managers, please check your own exchange of letters. What you have included there, and ICANN is willing to enter into a dialogue to see what needs to be updated in that respect. So, that's with respect to the scope of today's discussion. I think, moving forward, it's very clear that sponsoring organization and the user sponsoring organization, is very sensitive area.

We just need to find out and define a process from, I would say, ICANN's end to, yeah, see how we can change this in conjunction what is happening with the IANA root zone database, because that's where the reference point is. And I think around the arbitration clause, and maybe other aspects, maybe it's an idea for the meeting in Johannesburg, that we'll reopen it and more in-depth into the, say, accountability framework and exchange of letters, and even maybe into the guideline itself, see if there is a need to start updating that, the whole context.

So, that would be the next step in my view, and then I think the program working group has something to do with organizing a next and follow-up session. Thank you very much. I'll hand it over now to Peter and the other regional organizations. I hope this was useful for you. Thank you. [Applause]

PETER: Good morning everyone. My name is Peter [inaudible], the general manger of Center. And we are staring the regional organizations session. We have about 45 minutes. The idea of this session is that you get the highlights from what's happening in the regional organizations, and some of us will also go a bit more in detail on that one particular project that we think is worth sharing with you, from the last six months.

So, welcome. We're going to do this alphabetically, so Barack will take it off with AF TLD.

BARACK: Thank you, Peter. Good morning everyone. I'll give a quick update on what is happening in the Africa region. So, Africa is complex and large. 54 countries, different languages, different political contexts. So, we are always going in an [inaudible] cycle, trying to fix the same thing sometimes, but also coming up with new things.

But I'll just highlight a few events that are taking place in the region, where we have put our attention and focus. Right now, our focus is to bring the community together, because as a result of the diversity, sometimes the situation in the northern part is not the same as the situation in the southern part, or even in central Africa.

Most of our countries in the north are also part of the Middle East group of countries. Actually, if you look at the ICANN global stakeholder engagement team, there is the, the Middle East part that is coordinated partly by [inaudible], and you'll find some countries in the north like Egypt, Tunisia, they are part of the activities in the Middle East, and they are also part of the activities down in Africa.

ICANN 58 COMMUNITY FORUM
COPENHAGEN
11–16 March 2017

So, we are finding a way of just ensuring that we are able to collaborate across the region. So, one of the key events that AFTLD is part of, and will be participating in is the Africa Internet Summit, and that will be in Kenya, from 21st May to 2nd June. Ideally, this is an event that brings together all of the African I-STAR, or internet organizations. And it's a meeting for us to network, and also it's a meeting for us just to bring the community up to speed with activities that are happening in many parts of the continent.

So, for AFTLD specifically, we have a program, a trainer's program, that we will be conducting during the African Internet Summit. We will also have our General Assembly, and we intend to have a forum for registries and registrars. And basically, invest us, interested in the Africa domain name industry during the African Internet Summit.

So, you are welcome as members of the ccNSO to come. We've already seen interest from our counterparts in other regions, in participating in this activity. The second issue is the African domain name system forum, which will be in its fifth year. We started this in Johannesburg during the ICANN meeting, I think it was in 2013.

And we've seen tremendous progress on the continent, and we've seen that the event has also been replicated in a lot of

ICANN 58
COMMUNITY FORUM
COPENHAGEN
11–16 March 2017

other regions, which means that it's something good. But, as a continent, what we are doing now is we are having national DNS forums. So, countries like Benin in West Africa are having their second year.

We are hoping that this year in Nairobi, we'll have the first national DNS forum, Kenyan DNS Forum. And going forward, we are looking forward for most of the African countries localizing the domain name system forum. We still have a challenge of growing the business at local level, because we have a small number of registrars, or generally investors in the DNS business at local level.

So, the DNS Forum will be in [inaudible] from July 26th to 28th. And again, I'll take this opportunity to invite all investors in the DNS industry, and anyone interested in doing business in Africa, just to come and join us. Just to give statistics, right now, if we combine the domain count in the region, it is unlikely to surpass the 2 million mark, out of a population of more than a billion people.

So, for those who are doing business, I can assure you that this is a good market, and we are really looking at a way of ensuring that our ccTLDs also are able to take advantage of the vast untapped market. We are working hard to support our registrars

in building their capacities. Most of our registrars are not as strong.

We only have about eight ICANN accredited registrars. We set out about three years ago, or four years ago, to build a number of registrars to 25, with the support of ICANN. But this has not materialized. Even though we have not given up, so we are really working hard to try and build the capacity of our registrars as well, so the DNS focus, among other things, we are going to bring in a lot of resellers, young people with startups who are getting into the industry, just try and mentor them and build their capacity in the upcoming DNS Forum.

Finally, we are considering a common payment gateway to facilitate payments across the region. As I mentioned, we have very diverse economies on the continent, all the way from North Africa, West Africa, Central Africa, East Africa, and Southern Africa, some countries don't even support PayPal and other international payment solutions.

So, we are looking at in any of the regions. It is a common payment platform that is being used, that we can borrow ideas from. And this is something that we are really keen on discussing during the DNS Forum. So, again, if you have ideas on common payment platforms that can support inter-continental payments, then we welcome such ideas, and we welcome you to

ICANN 58
COMMUNITY FORUM
COPENHAGEN
11–16 March 2017

also come and join our panels during the Africa DNS Forum in [inaudible].

So, I would like to stop there. Those are the major issues. Thank you, Peter.

PETER: Thank you, Barack. Are there any questions for Barack on the AFTLD's activities? Any suggestions on the payment platform that they are looking for?

Thank you, Barack. Next in line, [inaudible]? Update from APTLD, thank you.

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: Thank you, Peter. I was about to intervene when Barack was talking, because I was really wanted to ask who talks diversity? Because you know, if, I mean while talking about APTLD, given that the sun climbs up in New Zealand first, and goes down in Mexico, which is our associate member, I would claim that the sun never sets over the APTLD region.

And you know, 60% of the global population, more than 3,200 languages spoken. That's what I would call diversity. Anyway, can I have the first slide please? So, sorry.

So, as you would imagine, with such a vast region, we have a lot of challenges, and some of them are, let's say, global, and some are local. And you can see them on the screen. And obviously, these are not new to many in the room. Yet, I just want to mention that APTLD is home to the biggest registries, of course, such as CNIC and [inaudible] of India, and some others, while at the same time, we have quite a number of very, very small members, and that they're particularly vulnerable and an urgent need for best practices and technical assistance, which is quite understandable. Another point to make is that there are many organizations, and you know their names, the World Bank, the Asian Bank for Reconstruction and Development.

So many others, which are doing some job of delivering technical existence on the different levels. Yet, those attempts are poorly coordinated, understandably. And it often happens that our members are not recipients of any technical assistance from such organizations, because obviously, we our members fall beyond the scope of the operations, because they mostly focus on development of local infrastructure.

So, that is, these are one of very few of those challenges we face in the region. Yet, we try to address those challenges by mobilizing our own resources, and you can see that we have quite a number of fellowships, which either launched or renewed since the year 2015. And given again, the vastness of

the region, the biggest challenge, of course, is to get people to whatever venue because it may involve thousands of dollars in travel fees.

But we found some way to cooperate with some other I-Star organizations in the region, and that was quite a success, I would say, over these years, because we managed to get more people to our meetings, as well as other events across the region and beyond, including, by the way, ICANN meetings and ccNSO meetings.

And some of our members have been recipients of this. So, ccNSO travel grants, which was very, very useful for them. Also, we started a sub-regional workshop, which makes sense in the region which is divided roughly into four sub-regions. Just as a reminder, APTLD region is so big that it takes four ICANN vice-presidents to run.

So, the first sub-regional workshop took place last year in Beijing, and we hope to replicate that experience. What is rarely known is that, even to me. It was an eye-opening development, that some of our members have already engaged in some kind of bilateral technical assistance project.

While trying to reach out to certain members and having sessions, Skype sessions or telephone sessions with them, I learn, for example, that a very small registry of Oman dot OM,

have engaged in some very special project on helping Bahram, another Gulf State, to build their ccTLD registry, which is practically non-existent. Also, New Zealand is very active in engaging with, let's say, neighboring, by neighboring, I mean several thousand miles of travel, southern Pacific islands, to help them bolster their capacity.

So, in other words, what we found out is that capacity building is at the core of many of our members' operation. It organically emerged as [inaudible] of let's say, the APTLD community rather than APTLD as association, activities. With that, we realized that all of those efforts were, by and large, inconsistent, opportunistic, which means that they were made either on request, or just by some good will of whatever [Donner?] member.

And they tend to be dispersed, which means they emerge in this or that sub-region, or area rather than focused, which means that there has been no consistent attempt to make an emphasis on a certain member, and you know, get the process done within a certain jurisdiction.

And of course, it's really hard to track whatever developments, and to measure those developments, and to see how efficient and effective those capacity building efforts have been to date. So, I made this kind of presentation very similar at a recent

APTLD meeting in Hochman City, and there was that general understanding and rough consensus, that there should be a more consistent effort in building small group of those well-developed and mature registries, member registries, able and willing to contribute to the process of capacity building across the region.

And that group should focus on some individual member rather than all members at once, which is impossible to do. And APTLD should not be that super-imposing power, rather an umbrella to facilitate, to do some clerical functions for such efforts, and this kind of clearinghouse, getting together both sponsors, potential sponsors, and recipients of that technical assistance and capacity building exercises.

And then, if we see that that works, it might be scaled up and replicated across the region. Who knows? So, we believe that this is a win-win solution, simply because stronger members means strong APTLD, and another interesting fact, as I mentioned, as there are many players in the region willing and keen to deliver that technical assistance and capacity building, then of course, if they see that we are successful, we might as well, contemplating on the big [inaudible], you know, just complementing those activities with theirs.

So, we can come to some terms on how that could be done. And then, as we at APTLD at times, find it really hard to identify our mission and to justify our existence, such a capacity building exercise or program might be a very good answer to that existential challenge. What we are and why we are here.

So, speaking of that, I mean, we will of course, welcome input from the community, from the broader community, the ccNSO community, and that's an unique chance for everyone to join us for an event which, in a location, which is, I would say, somewhere in the middle, halfway for everyone to travel, and that's [inaudible] the Republic of Georgia, and that's September 14th and 15th.

So, you can see it on the screen. It's a beautiful city, beautiful country, most hospitable people. And for those who find it hard to realize what country I'm talking about, here is Georgia. So, you can see, a shortcut for many of you. So, you're quite welcome. We hope that it's going to be a very, very much cross-polling event for all of us there. Thank you.

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: Thank you [inaudible]. Are there any questions?

All right, thanks. I'm next with an update on something we did at Center. But rather than talk about the topics we covered or

the issue we dealt with, I would like to share with you the results of work that has been going on for a while.

It's mainly the brainchild of one of my colleagues, Patrick Miles, and he has been working for six years now on a platform called Center Stats. Over the years, this platform has become larger and larger. It's mainly for Center members, but there is also parts that will help the public at large to get more information on new gTLDs, or even for registrars to understand the specific EPP codes that are being used.

So, and this is what I would like to focus on. You've been saying it for some time now, but 2017, looks and still looks like, a decisive year for the domain name industry.   And that assumption is mainly based and purely based on statistical analysis that we've been doing over the last couple of years.

The presentation I'm about to give is a recycled presentation from domain posts, that took place about a month and a half ago. So, those of you who have been there for, it will look quite familiar. Next slide, please.

So, agenda for the next 10 minutes. We're first trying to define a problem statement. We're going to look into what it means to be in a new global TLD market with the introduction of new gTLDs as of 2014. We'll zoom in on registration, what it means,

how do we find growth? Compare ads, renews, deletes, work with the term ratio, and we'll look into market shares.

Our last point is we'll have a brief impacts of the new gTLDs and the Chinese domain investments. To then to conclusion…

[SPEAKER OFF MICROPHONE]

Sorry, I didn't hear that.

[SPEAKER OFF MICROPHONE]

Apparently there seems to be a technical issue. All right.

[SPEAKER OFF MICROPHONE]

Apparently the screen goes blank when they're in display mode.

[SPEAKER OFF MICROPHONE]

So, yeah. Very stubborn slides there. So, it is a problem. How do we, as an industry, maintain long term revenue, stability, sustainability, in a market of declining to stagnant growth? An essential element of the role of ccTLD is that it provides stable, secure service and infrastructure to its local internet community.

So, at one point, you're going to run into a budget crush once your market is declining at a rate that doesn't allow you to continue investments needed to achieve those goals. So, if we, next slide please. If we go to an overview of what happened over

the last nine years in the domain name market. Next slide please.

It is a very pretty picture, and I hope it translates well to the screen here. Nope, it does not. So, I can tell you what you're missing. You're missing a fabulous animation of the whole domain name market since 2004, but that movie is available on the Center channel too. So, I was hoping to be able to talk you through it, because there is interesting things happening.

One of the conclusions is that with the introduction of the new gTLDs, we've seen for the ccTLD market, a pretty flat growth. And the thing that we wanted to look into was, what is the relationship? Is there a causality between those two events in time?

What has also changed significantly, is that when… This is a screen, this is basically the earliest picture that we have of the TLD universe. At that point in time, it's us plus a handful of gTLDs. It's a completely different market, it's a completely different dynamic with regards to the channels in particular. And there is a quite spectacular difference by the time you get to the end of the animation.

There is no way we're going to make it work. No. Too bad. Okay, next slide then. If you look at the market, I think most of us have a very specific narrow focus on domain names. And

ICANN 58
COMMUNITY FORUM
COPENHAGEN
11–16 March 2017

they're using the domain name and their product, and they're looking at it as a technical tool. It's a process, the DNS is a process that translates a domain name into an IP address.

When you start looking at the domain name from a different perspective, and you regard it as an identifier, you would have quickly come to the conclusion that the market that you should be studying is not just those of your fellow domain name managers, but it's much broader than that.

We haven't developed that part into too much detail yet, but it's definitely an area that is being explored, and for instance, marketing working group in Center. And just look at how many Facebook accounts there are. What are the alternatives to your online identity? And how easy it is to get those others and how cheap it is to get those others.

If we compare ourselves in that mark, it's the online identifiers. You see that the right power of all domains, across all TLDs, compares quite poorly to, for instance, even Twitter accounts, let alone Facebook accounts. The simplistic conclusion from this one slide, could be that there are at least 1.4 billion people out there that have a Facebook account, but did not think it was worth getting a domain name.

Next slide, please. So, if you look at the total markets on a global level today, we see that the gTLDs cover about 52% of it,

ccTLDs are 40%, and the new gTLDs are at 8%. It goes without saying that in a sense we've been consistently asking that to both consumer, competition and consumer trust review team, and ICANN at numerous occasions, is that if you'll look in particular at these new gTLDs, it is important to understand what the usage is in order to understand how they will behave in a year from now, when renewal time is up.

In terms of revenue, the picture is extremely diluted in the new gTLD market, because of these high volume, low pricing TLDs like X, Y, Z, and one penny per name domains. Next slide, please. So, if you look at ccTLDs by region, in total, we have 125 million ccTLDs across 266 ccTLDs, combined growth worldwide is 8%, and it's the highest in Asia.

Next slide, please. [Inaudible] on European ccTLDs, there are about 70 million of those. The medium growth rate for 2016 is 3.5%. There is a long-term trending decline. I think only five years ago, we had double digit growth, [inaudible] most of you. The highest growth in 2016 in Europe was in Armenia with 29% followed by Estonia. Congratulations, with 20%.

And Portugal with 12%. Average wholesale price in Europe, the median is seven Euros. What I think most of my members find quite comforting, when they're planning their next year's

budget, is that they have a predictable and stable retention rate of around 85%.

Average market share, 51%, but if I had the time, I might go about more into detail on the definition of that. It's pretty stable, and the small trends upwards. Next slide, please. So, this is a picture, and it's slightly more refined than what I've been showing you until now, but this is a picture where we compare growth rates, but in different categories of ccTLDs.

And it's, it will not be a surprise that in the largest ccTLDs, which you see on the left of the diagram, those growth rates are typically smaller. So the larger your zone, the lower your growth rate. If you look into these categories, and you would say in the zone file, that is larger than 2.5 million, the largest growth comes from dot RU.

If you look in the category from 800,000 domains to 2.5 million domains, the largest growth came from PT. And the smallest categories, so we're below 800,000. The highest growth rate is Armenia. Next slide please.

We've also been looking for a while into seasonal trends. And I know some of our members have been… Don't know some people from inside are in here. Yes, I see at least one, two. They… We've been looking to seasonal trends, so there is more detail available than this, and maybe it makes more sense to do

that on a granular, national level to take into account for specific things, national holidays or efforts by governments and local authorities to encourage SMEs to get their domain.

So, but on an overall high level, this is what the seasonal trends look like. The most visible thing is that there is a steady decline until February 2014, and then the, if you wipe out the seasonal trends, then we have a pretty stable ccTLD growth as of that point in time. If you look at the big events that took place in the course that this graphic shows, like new gTLD application rounds opening, or the introduction of the very first new gTLD in the root zone.

It didn't really give a different course to this graph. Next slide, please. One of the other factors, in addition to the introduction of new gTLDs, and the changing market is last year, beginning of last year, there was a lot of talk about stabilization and growth in the market, because of the investments from, in particular, Chinese domains, but I think it's probably as a slightly larger phenomenon.

So, we looked into the impacts of these effects, and I think it's safe to say that there were, there wasn't significant impacts, very visible in these trending lines, but the effect will be short-lived in particular because the renewal rates of those

registrations are much, much lower than the renewal rates that I mentioned earlier on.

Next slide, please. That's a summary of some things I've already been saying. So, we came from any 12.6% in 2011, to a stable 3.4 annual median growth rate in 2015 and 16. Next slide please. More than anything else, more than external market factors. Our analysis shows that two things tend to predict very accurately the evolution of your particular zone, or your market in general.

And that is, you look at the number of additions and the number of non-renewal domains. And these can be active [inaudible], these can be dropped domains. We called them [churn?]. With [inaudible] at 18.6% and a turn ratio of 15.7%, you're still experiencing a small growth. Once the two lines start crossing, you will have a flat growth.

Next slide, please. If you look at from a perspective of size of the domain name, and combine it with the new ad ration and retention ratio, then the picture looks like this. So, still high retention rates, the higher the zone, typically, the smaller the new ad rate shows, as we've explained in one of the previous drafts.

Next slide, please. This is an average breakdown of market shares by TLD. The new thing that we worked with in Center

since last year, is that we've included other European ccTLDs, and your total market picture. And that changed the percentages for some of the members, but I think as long as we're consistent in explaining the definition that we're using for local markets, we can work with that problem.

So, on average, it's 51% local market share for the ccs. Other European ccTLDs, so in how many Belgians buy a dot FR or dot LL domain, it's up to 10%. Legacy TLDs com, org, biz, 35%, and the new gTLDs 3.4. So, summarizing… We've experienced for a long time a healthy growth rate, currently down to 3.4%. The long-term ad growth rate is declined towards that turn ration intersession, so the number of renewals. Once we see that, that will go pretty flat.

The local ccTLD markets and market share is pretty stable. It's quite encouraging. Retention rates are high, which I think is the most positive news for this room. Very small impact from new gTLDs and domain name testing. My last slide, and being aware of time, I would just like to see a very quick show of hands, with what we've seen, and I hope I was able to show you that this is almost a force of nature in what is happening to our domain name industry.

I see, I think that some of the incredible marketing initiatives that some of you have, have rolled out. I've actually shown that

it's incredibly hard to make changes to these trending lines. But as an organization, we're then faced with a couple of choices. What are you going to do in a flat market?

And you're still willing to run a secure and stable operation. What do you see as options? Is price adjustment an option? So increase your prices so that you'll keep them paying for your operational costs. Would you look for new market segments? SMEs is one that we've already discussed plenty of times, but there might be others. New market segments. Shall you start cutting costs?

Reducing your membership fees or voluntary contributions to some organizations. Or will you start diversifying? In addition to being a TLD manager, will you start selling other types of digital IDs? Or doing that for somebody else? I think these are not the four only options that this group, at the moment, can reasonably ponder over.

So, I would like to see a quick show of hands. I was hoping to do this as an interactive poll, but I'm really happy that we didn't even try that one. So, quick show of hands. If you have four choices that you as a ccTLD manager should choose from, price adjustments, so increasing your price, looking for new markets, cutting costs or diversifying.

I will ask one by one to raise your hands. So, who would be adjusting their price to make sure that they can keep on running their organization? About 10 people in the room. Who would be looking for new markets? About 12 people in the room.

By the way, multiple options are possible, that's for sure. Who is afraid that there will be no other option then to start cutting costs? Eight. And then the last one, who is planning on diversifying their products and business?

You can't raise two hands, even if you're going to do… So, that's about 20 people in the room. I think that's a very interesting and healthy evolution. Well, thank you for playing. I hope you found this interesting, and maybe learned something new. Thanks. [Applause]

And by the way, the applause really goes to Patrick Miles, who did slides for this, and most of the research, if not all. Andreas, you're next, thank you.

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: Just want to quickly add, that there was a technical issue, for which we apologize, and the slides will be posted on the schedule website and on the ccNSO website.

PETER: Question?

                          So, we can have one question. Yes, thank you.

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: I'll make it five, looking as one. In reaction to your question, Peter, I assume that you realize that business choices are not made, you have to pick one of the four. And that the choice, or the combination of choices, that we make, depend very much on the phase the organization is in, the environment, the market developments in their own country, etc.

                          So, I think for part of the room, the first answer is a very good one, but for part of the room, it's probably not a very good one. So, I don't know if there is anything reasonable that you can do with the outcome of your kind of short poll.

PETER: Formally, publicly, no. But I find it incredibly assuring to see that, and I've had this conversation with many of you, not in the hand waving type of interaction, but with many of you, are you considering to diversify your products? Five years ago, hardly anyone of the central members are considering that.

                          They were focusing on adding additional elements to their existing product. They were thinking about DNSSEC…

ICANN 58
COMMUNITY FORUM
COPENHAGEN
11–16 March 2017

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: I understand, Peter, but for instance, our market is probably saturated. We have a very large market share. In some other ccTLD member countries, Center member countries, that situation is different. Market is still developing, penetration is low, saturation is way far. So, there is no point then in diversifying if you still haven't got a reasonable market share in your home market, that market is developing, and you see your registrations and zones are growing.

And so, it's not always this same situation. That was my point.

PETER: I fully agree, and that's why it's very nice to see a diverse picture in the room, where 10, 12 and 20 people raised their hands. I think everybody fully understands that there is not one choice, and the choice that they make will be very specific their situation. Thanks.

ANDRES: Thank you very much. My name is Andres [inaudible], I'm the manager of the LACTLD. I am the only thing standing between you and the coffee break, so I will be very brief. I just wanted to… Normally this session consists in an update of what has been going on in the different aspects of our work in the last

three months, or two or three times a year. This time, I wanted to choose, or we wanted to choose, when particular or specific aspect to stand out.

What I choose, we want to tell this story has been happening in LACTLD community, a happy story for the last year. Actually, it's going to [inaudible] today I am turning one exact year in my position, it's March 15. Five days ago, in March 10, the creation of the four working groups of LACTLD has turned into one year.

It's because we quite [inaudible]. This was a process that has a lot to do with our strategic plan, and one of the lines of our strategic plan, especially capacity building, has been always at the very essence of LACTLD, worships, developing content, providing with any type of information to our members, particularly in this strategic plan that we had and it's running our organization for these years.

And capacity building is also one of the main… Half of the lines of the strategic [inaudible] are on that area, and especially what I wanted to stand out [inaudible] there was a call to establish those working groups. It was a need that was identified by the community to have those working groups, that those working groups had to be run by the members of the organization, and also at this strategic process, there was, one of the, I may say, one of the things, or the concepts that the process identified, is

that LACTLD should improve the engagement of members to participate in activities.

We have the advantage of Latin American and Caribbean regions, we try to consider, we understand diversity, but it's quite homogeneous region. We have only three languages, even we work in two of those languages, because Brazilians are so versatile that they also work in Spanish and English, to catch up with the rest of the members.

So, it's quite easy for us, maybe compared to what the rest of the regions are facing. So, we establish those working groups one year ago. Normally the typical goal for the working groups, it was exchange of information, and then to participate or to engage in the termination on the preparation for the workshops.

There are four working groups in LACTLD. The policy working group, the legal working group, the commercial one and the technical one. And normally, typically for many years now, we have had four workshops, face to face workshops, every year. In all of those four areas. So, these groups are some sort of sub-communities that have been formed, so they could even be more remote in what LACTLD did for its own members.

The capacity that we provided to our own members is also driven by the same community. At the very beginning, the groups are, well these are the current leaders of the groups, both

ICANN 58
COMMUNITY FORUM
COPENHAGEN
11–16 March 2017

of this for people are in a commitment of two years, so they are running the groups for one year more, and maybe they will keep that way.

So, that they wanted to, it was an experiment to have a small group of people that are involved in each of the four working groups, and this was the original idea in order to have a manageable amount of people and discussions that could be fluent and could get outcome. Not only this was really successful, and I was really surprised, and I was really happy to see how the community started to engage in those groups, but also in last October our General Assembly in Puerto Rico decided, and instructed, the Board and the management to open those working groups to any member that may be interested in integrating those groups.

So, now the amount of participants has been increased. This first part of the year, the policy working group started gathering more and more participants, but the other working groups will, for sure, increase the amount of participants in the next couple of months. And there have been also, what the outcome is not yet…

I don't know if I could evaluate, at this point, the outcome of that openness. But for example, this fear of if the amount of members of the working group is very high, and this could be a

problem for the group, it was not the case, for example, for the policy working group, not only 18 participants, but many of them, some of them in this room, are even the managers of the ccTLDs that are involved, or try to, or interested in these policy issues.

And the other working groups are also really active. Some of them or most of them, and in some place, this is changing the dynamic of this organization. And I'm really enthusiastic to see where this is going, because for example, the policy working group has instructed, or has requested the organization to take positions, public, private position that the Board has taken those requests, and has processed those requests, and has pronounced as the worker had a couple of processes where the work, institutional pronouncements, coming through the working groups.

So, now we're in the challenge of developing a new platform, or a new framework where we can understand how this flow of mutual introduction between the current institutions and these working groups and the new participants. And also, another thing that wasn't in my original idea when I chose this topic to be presented here, but we were having a collective hangout together with the original [inaudible] of the Board, a couple of days ago.

ICANN 58
COMMUNITY FORUM
COPENHAGEN
11–16 March 2017

Eduardo, the chair of our Board, was telling about this process, and he was telling us about something else that was not part of the original purpose of the working group. He was telling that he saw that there was an emerging of new leaderships also, coming through the working groups, and that was something that the organization was also welcoming.

And I was, I kept thinking about that, so I believe this is something quite promising for us. It's helping our capacity to engage more, and the ones that are part of our community are not in many working groups are invited to [inaudible] one or the four or whatever working group they want, so they just have to contact me, and we will make it happen.

So, thank you very much. I'll stop here. Any questions?

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: Thank you, Andres. Any questions for Andres?

All right, then thank you for listening. [Applause]

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: So, we now have a coffee break until 11, when we come back to the room for an accountability session.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]