
KOBE – ccNSO: Members Meeting Day 1 (1 of 4)
Tuesday, March 12, 2019 – 9:00 to 10:15 JST
ICANN64 | Kobe, Japan

KATRINA SATAKI:

Good morning, dear colleagues, we are very close to the start of the meeting. Please find your best seats. Please find your fellow ccTLDs and invite them to the room. We will start in a few minutes.

So, it's 9:00 and we are ready to start. Good morning, dear ccTLDs, our friends, our partners, our colleagues. As always, it's a great pleasure to see you all here, especially after the fantastic gala that we had yesterday. Thank you very much to Hiro and all the local organizing committee. That was really fantastic. We thank you for making us feel welcome and really belonging to this community. So, thank you again.

So, we are ready to start our meeting here in Kobe, and before this meeting we had a discussion within a Meeting Programs Working Group – Committee, sorry they have been promoted – and with the council, and we tried to find ways to break the ice between the presenters here and the audience to make, or to connect better with the audience and one of the suggestion was to try something new, to try a new approach, and this is what we're going to do now. That was not it. That was not it, sorry.

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.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: Are you going to play—

KATRINA SATAKI: No, I'm not going to play anything, but ...

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: [off mic].

KATRINA SATAKI: Yes, this is something that we really need, but as I was told, you have to be a real professional and really good singer to do karaoke here. It's not what we are doing in other parts of the world. So, we are not going to do karaoke, or at least I'm definitely not going to do karaoke, but we really wanted to break the ice, and make those discussions more lively. I'm not saying that we were going to use this setup for each and every session and each and every presentation. It's really up to the chairs of the sessions and the presenters. If they do not feel comfortable, they can still use the whole setup. It's really not a problem, but for some discussions to make them more interesting and engaging, we are going to use these tools.

And please appreciate we bought them from IKEA around the corner. So, okay, okay they are not exactly local, perhaps, but yes,

they were bought here and assembled here. We had to attach that tiny thing for legs. So, I won't bore you, and I'm not going to bore you any more with the details of the bar stools. I'll give the floor to Alejandra and let her introduce the meeting. Oh, sorry, before we go to highlights, I'd like to give the floor to our host, Hiro Hotta, for a welcome, and again thank you very much for having us here.

HIRO HOTTA:

Thank you for coming. Thank you for coming. Welcome to Kobe City, Japan. Welcome, yes. Thank you. As an ice-breaker, it rains, okay? And as you see the water is provided by JPRS, yeah. It hydrates you. I'd like to give you a presentation – just a very brief presentation – about the JPRS and dot-jp. Yes, this is JPRS. Let me give you the company information.

We are a private company. It's for-profit. Even if it's making more money, it's for-profit, so not a non-profit organization, and it was established on 26 December 2000, so almost 19 years old. We are based in Tokyo and we have a branch in Osaka, and we have 91 employees, but almost all of the employees are for the dot-jp and DNS. So, 90, I think 90% of our income is from the dot-jp, the main domain registration.

We do service, of course, the dot-jp registry, and we also are an accredited gTLD registrar. So, we are the second-biggest one in Japan, number-wise. We began to provide server certification, so-

called SSL, server certification [inaudible], and are a registry service provider to new gTLDs. Just to customers, but we do that.

About dot-jp. We have 1.5 million domain names and we have 600-plus registrars. It's a big number, right? And local presence required for registration. We stick to the local presence requirement to the registrants and registrars. So, it's not easy to have a dot-jp for the organization, so our presence living abroad, but we stick to this because of some good reasons. And the dot-jp domain name, we have the second level registration and the third level registration.

This is the number of the breakdown. I will skip this. Yes.

And the history of JPRS. As I said, very small, a small red point you're going to see. Alright. In 1993, [JNIC] which our grandfather organization, started of the dot-jp and it was transferred to JPNIC of Japan, and in 2000 we were established. At the moment, the number of registrations was 260,000, only, and after that the number grows very fast, and now we have surpassed the 1.5 million.

And the status of domain names in Japan. So, we did a survey up here, the annual survey to the Internet users, now dot-jp or JPRS is perceived, and the recognition of the domain names, 51% understand the words and meanings of domain names.

Well, half of the respondents said that they knew what domain name means. That's a great thing. But the survey was given on the Internet, so it's very biased, but 50% understand the word. So, now it's not easy to teach what domain name is, especially when the CNS is the first interface for internet users, especially for the small children.

A regional experience of domain names. 13% have domain name registration experience. I personally think that this is a very good number and registered TLDs in Japan, 60% for dot-jp and 50% for .com and so on.

And of our activities for the growth of understanding of the Internet and of the domain names, we distributed – sorry, it's in Japanese, but we distributed it into the schools, the elementary schools and so on with Manga to teach what the Internet is and how the Internet works, and this, the middle is the book with pictures, and the right-most one is the DNS, *Easy Understanding the DNS*, that's the name of the textbook.

And this is the contracted framework of our company and our dot-jp management. We do have a contract with ICANN, a formal contract. I think only three of us has a formal contract with ICANN. It was in 2002, we [inaudible] with ICANN and we agreed. JPRS has contracts with JPNIC because JPNIC was the former registry of the dot-jp. So, when the dot-jp management was transferred

to us, we had to contract with them, and they still oversee us, how we are [inaudible] operating dot-jp. And the application of the TLD registries.

So, the telecommunication law was amended to oversee us because, before that, before the law was amended, there was no mentioning about the domain names in Japanese law, but in 2016 the law was amended to regulate us, but the regulation is not very strict, so we have dot-jp and dot-nagoya, dot-tokyo, dot-yokohama and no dot-kobe [inaudible].

Three cities and Okinawa and Osaka, two cities, and what obligation do we have to document our Internet rules of administration, and we have to provide a fair service without refusal, of course, and reporting significant accidents to the government if there is, and publication of our financial accounting. We hate this, but we have to publicize our financial accounting statements.

And dot-jprs are on the and the platform, and if someone attended yesterday's Tech Day, Shinta of JPRS explained the experimental environments dot-jprs where we can learn lessons from realistic full-scale simulation of usage incidents and errors.

So, you're suggesting in your corporation, using this dot-jprs experimental platform. Please come to us, come to our engineering staff, if you want to use this, [inaudible] environment.

Alright, I think this is the last one. Joint research with local ISPs. Yes, we have eight local ISPs, and they ... Here, the area covers geographical areas without overlapping and they collectively cover the whole of Japan. So, we distribute our JP DNS authoritative data to all of them and they can serve that. So, if some part of Japan was struck by typhoon or tsunami or something, the unaffected area can be served by the Internet. So, this is the experimental phase.

Alright, thank you. May I answer your questions?

KATRINA SATAKI: Are there any questions, we have questions. Please use the mics here.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: Hiro, thank you for that, and this is kind of a follow up question for the presentation that was made by your colleague yesterday in Tech Day. If I understand it correctly, you guys went to ICANN, gave them the 100-and-something-thousand dollars to get JPRS, you don't sell any domains from it, you strictly want to use this as an experimental top-level domain to test out this and that, is that correct?

HIRO HOTTA: That is correct.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: And if I understood your colleague yesterday, you're running into some obstacles from ICANN with respect to some of the things that you wish to try out with that.

HIRO HOTTA: Yes, that's true because if I can say it's an experimental platform. So, for example, the details of [an attack] should be simulated on the dot-jprs, but dot-jprs is a gTLD, the real gTLD, so there is an SLA [for the operation] gTLD, so it's a kind of dilemma.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: I have to say I find it really ironic that ICANN is not letting you guys do some important research because they think you're running JPRS as like dot-xyz is being run, or something like that. I was kind of shocked at that yesterday, and I certainly, as a registry operator, I fully support what you're trying to do, and I think we should all collectively push back on ICANN because this is idiocy on their part. Thank you, though.

HIRO HOTTA: Yeah, thank you for your cooperation, yes?

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: Good morning, Hiro. I think, obviously, you have been a pioneer in IDN, and you are doing a great job, but I did not hear anything around IDN in your presentation, and I have a difficulty to even get my omelet done in a hotel. Nobody seems to understand English, and it's a huge difficulty to communicate. And when I see that at one side, on the other side I see IDN is almost dead. It is not being used. It is not being in practice. It is not being ... So, what are the hurdles you, as a TLD operator for IDN is facing, and is there any technical challenge, policy challenge, or is it just that the priority is not there?

HIRO HOTTA: Maybe the Internet users are accustomed to ASCII of course – so far, of course, and they can use the ASCII domain, at least the domain name, dot-com, it can be in English alphabet. I think it's enough for them at this moment if the text part of the email or the website is in Japanese. So, maybe I think there's no big demand for the domain name part or account part for IDNs. Maybe that's the reason, at least at this moment.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: Okay, alright. Thank you.

KATRINA SATAKI: Okay, sorry. Sorry, no more time for questions. Thank you very much, Hiro. One more thing before we go to the highlights of this particular meeting. I'm really happy. We try to bring new things into each meeting, but I'm really happy that some things do not change. I'm so used to seeing these familiar faces sitting where they are sitting almost every time. So, probably, that's why I have difficulties to distinguish one meeting from the other because it seems like the same faces in the same seats.

Nevertheless, I'd like to ask the audience, are there any newcomers who are here? Great, fantastic. So, please, let's welcome all our newcomers. This may be your first time, but I certainly hope not the last one. So, because you know some members to our community, even after they leave the community, they still keep coming back, and take a seat somewhere in the back and oversee what we are doing here.

Keith, welcome back.

KEITH: Thank you.

KATRINA SATAKI: And with that, let me give the floor to Alejandra. She will tell you more about the coming two days. Alejandra, the floor is yours.

ALEJANDRA REYNOSO: Thank you. Thank you very much. Can you hear me? No, yes, okay, thank you. So, here you can see on your screens this is membership of the Meeting Program Committee. So, please if you see any one of them here in Kobe, do not hesitate to approach us and let us know what you like, what you should think that it could be improved or any suggestions that you may have, please. This is all of us and we are mandated to make these meeting as appealing to you as possible.

Also, for the newcomers, these are the faces of our amazing secretariat who make all of the things we do possible. So, here you can see their faces, their names, and also you can write them an email to the ccnsossecretariat@icann.org. And, again, welcome. For you, newcomers, please take note that we have a new event. There is a session that we are implementing this meeting. It's a newcomer session that will be held on Thursday, please if also you are thinking how you may join a working group, or you are interested in participating in a working group, you are more than welcome. And if anyone else wants to participate and tell what you are doing in the ccNSO, please come.

Also, we have developed a ccNSO Quick Guide that I'm holding here with the microphone. If you need one, please don't hesitate to reach either me or Ivy here in the front, or Sean by my right. So,

please if you need one, ask any of us, and we can give it to you, no problem, or you can find it online also on our website.

For this meeting we have lots of resources you can use. All the presentations are uploaded in the ICANN schedule. It's the quickest access. So, maybe when a presenter is already presenting, you can see the presentation. There is also the agenda. There are session summaries. If for some reason maybe you didn't have the time to catch up with what the discussions were being done, there's a summary. And there is remote participation, and there is the Google Calendar that you can add to your own calendar so that you will get a buzzing when a new session starts.

So, for the first day, today, we will start with our Working Group updates, and then we will – again? Yes, it is something that we will do frequently. We need to update you on what we are working on. Then we will be discussing on how to shape the policy forums. Those are the middle meetings, and the coming one in Marrakesh we will be meeting with the ICANN board. They will come to us, to a room, and we will have a policy session.

Also, we will be talking about IANA naming functions. We will have an update on the study group on emoji and second level domain names. And, finally, an update on the ccNSO organizational review done by the Meridian Institute. The day will end with a

very, very generous cocktail provided by JPRS. Thank you very much, here again, for making this happen.

Important things to know. So, as you can see over there, it says “Sticker Required”. So, you see this yellow thing with you, this is not something you can use to enter into the cocktail. It says on the very bottom, in white lettering, that you must have a sticker. So, the stickers can be found either with Bart here at the back, or with Kim here at the front, and please, please, please, we do have a limited amount of people that can get in, and only with a sticker can you get in. So, think this through for a moment. If you are really able to go, please ask for a sticker. If you think you might not make it, don't take one and let others attend.

So, with that, we go to the second day of the meeting. So, tomorrow we will have a legal session. We will be meeting with the GAC and we are going to move to the next room which is a [weather] room, number B. And with this I need to ask a question to all you because it has been brought to our attention that the GAC would like to change the day where we meet with them. Normally, we meet them either on Tuesday or Wednesday in our members meetings day, but they are asking if we can move that to Sunday. So, by a show of hands, who would not have a problem with moving the GAC session, the joint session with the GAC, on Sunday? Not have a problem. So, shall we move it to Sunday? Yes? Okay, now, shall we not—

KATRINA SATAKI: Sorry, sorry that I jump in.

ALEJANDRA REYNOSO: Yes?

KATRINA SATAKI: Yeah, we were thinking about ... Well, first ,why do they want to do that because they usually meet with other SO/ACs and apparently groups on Sunday, and logistically for the GAC secretary to support people, it would have been easier to do that on Sunday. But we thought that we need to discuss it with the GAC because many ccTLD people might not be here on Sunday. So, for them, this is an opportunity to meet with their GAC representatives. It's easier to sit with their GAC representatives and ... So, we thought we might suggest to the GAC that we stick to the principle that we have during our members meeting days when the ccTLDs are around. And we just want to give this as one of the arguments why we think it's a good idea to stick with the same principle. But, yeah, this is one of the things that we will discuss with the GAC. Meanwhile, you can think about it, yeah, and provide your input. Or, we can do quick show of hands with the temperature cards. So, if you think it's good to leave things as they are, please raise the green card. If you think we can change,

the red one. If you think that it doesn't matter much, then the yellow one. I think that the majority have green ones. Okay, thank you. We will convey the message to the GAC. Thank you.

ALEJANDRA REYNOSO: Okay, thank you very much for that. Now, we will have also [Ros] updates, ccTLD news and finance session, and we will talk to our ccNSO appointed ICANN board members and have the ccNSO Council meeting at the end of the day, but we will move from the room. So, please take this into consideration. We will be meeting with the council in the Emerald Room.

So, for Thursday, really quick, a reminder of the new ccNSO newcomer session. Please do attend. There will be a cross-community session on universal acceptance and some ICANN sessions that you might be interested in, and at the end of the day there is a wrap-up cocktail.

So, very quick important information. Do you speak English, raise your hand? Okay, I see. Good, good. Now, are you a native English speaker, raise your hand. Not so many, right? Okay, so please to our presenters and anyone coming to the microphone, do try to speak slowly, paced, articulate, so everyone in the room can understand you.

Now, whenever you go to a microphone, will you please say who you are, who you represent, and if you haven't seen the microphones, we have one here, by my side, and one at the front. So, whenever there are questions, please come up to the microphones, or if you feel like you are trapped in the middle of the table, raise your hand, so we can go to you with one of these roving microphones. Or, if you don't feel like talking, you can connect to our Adobe Room, that's the link, and you can find it also on ICANN schedule, and you can type your questions in the ICANN room so the secretariat can read it out loud for you.

So, please do participate. There's no excuse now. And, again, keep calm and be on time, mind the time. We do have to follow the next sessions. And with that, I will go really quick now because I'm running out of time but keeping calm.

So, please your feedback is super important to us. So, tomorrow there will be a survey. It will be sent online. Fill it out, let us know how you feel about the sessions, what you like, what can be improved, suggestions, anything you want us to know. And do keep in touch with us. The ccNSO does not only occur at ICANN meetings. We can still have a conversation between meetings. So, those are all our contact points, and notice that we have a newsletter now. This newsletter you can subscribe to it and get all the news in your inbox.

And welcome to the ccNSO. At that, we call our next session.

KATRINA SATAKI: So, the meeting is open, and we start with the next session. Barak, the floor is yours, and the mic too.

BARRACK OTIENO: Thank you very much, Katrina. So, I would like to invite the panelists for the next session. Jacques and Regis, Ching Chiao, if you can come over please and Giovanni. Let's appreciate them as they come. They need some warmup. No, no, you can stand. Okay, thanks. Yes, please? Please come over Jacques. Okay, so without further ado, we'll hear from TLD Ops what's new for us.

JACQUES LATOUR: What's new is it's the same old slides that we have. No. Alright. This is our TLD Ops status of late. Oops, back in time, I'm still in 2018. So, let's skip, check the quality of our ...

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: No, just you have to present the projects.

JAQUES LATOUR:

Oh, that's it. Okay, so we're here to sell stuff. So, quickly, so TLD Ops is a contact repository of all the security contexts within a ccTLD for all ccTLDs that are a part of the ccNSO, and not part of the ccNSO. So, we're trying on how to get as many as possible ccTLDs to joint TLD Ops, and the goal of TLD Ops is for other ccTLDs to be able to reach each other in case something, a cybersecurity event happens. It's not meant to replace the security team of a ccTLD, but it's a community that's available to outreach when something happens.

So, I'll talk about it, but I just want to put things into perspective. In the last couple of months there was a domain hijacking incident that happened. There was a lot of news media around it, and what we learned after the fact is that TLD Ops was actually used by ccTLD to reach out to other ccTLDs to let them know that there were actual compromise of DNS that happened.

So, there was a lot of feedback that came back that it was actually useful for the security community to use TLD ops specifically for this incident. And so, there are a couple of updates. We had our meeting on Sunday to talk about what we need to do in the future to make it better. There are a couple of recommendations that we need to look at, but with the last security incident it was used, and it was useful, and the community is asking for more functionality out of TLD Ops to make it more useful for the community.

So, we have about 380 people, 380 contacts listed in our repository and we focus on adding only security people, not sales or marketing. There is none of that happening. It's just focused on security.

So, every two weeks we send an email to the entire mailing list with the up-to-date information that we have in our database which includes the name, the contact number to reach the ccTLD, ASCII or the IDN that they have in their control, and their personal phone number so that somebody can text somebody and email somebody to say, "I need to talk to you, because something is happening with your ccTLD." And we also have their personal email address, as well as the business address. So, if your ccTLD is under attack and you can't use your own ccTLD email, then we know to trust to john@whatever, that he's a trusted email that we can work with to remediate or work with.

So, in terms of alerts, we add this as an example of a few, but recently there were a lot of issues with malicious activity with DNS hijacking and especially there were domain registration hijackings. So, people were stealing, the bad actors were stealing the credentials of certain registrants and then logging into the portal and redirecting the domain somewhere else so that they could steal traffic along the way, and there was a lot of media around it, and that's where the TLD Ops became really apparent that it was useful, and the number one thing that I heard back is

people would like to add one more attempt to the list which is a 724 phone number for the ccTLD.

So, we have three contacts that we can reach, but people said, “You know what, it would be really nice if we can call this phone number, it's 724, we reach somebody all the time to tell them this is bad stuff happening with you.”

And the idea behind TLD Ops is that it's only ccTLDs talking to other ccTLDs and in this instance some CCs became a proxy to other people outside said this is happening to dot-whatever, and they'd reach out to a CCs and say we need to reach this ccTLD, and then we use the list to reach out. And what happened is when we emailed, we got "out of office" or replies to say – the next day, we called the voicemail, and it's like tomorrow we'll get back to you, blah, blah, blah.

So, having a 724-phone number that we could reach would be super useful in this instance, and sometimes, time is important. If you wait eight hours to restore a critical domain, you know it's being hijacked. That's too long. So, I think adding one more thing to this would make the incident response time faster and better for all of us.

So, we had two notifications, and so this is the update since our last meeting. We added one new ccTLD to our list, .dot-sx. I don't know why it took so long because – shall I say that? Yeah? Yeah,

dot-sx is the one we operate, so yeah it took a long time. I had to read all the process and procedures, how to add the ccTLD. It was super easy. It took five minutes. So, we added one more.

So, we are at 202 ccTLDs, so far, and so we added the one. We need to do more outreach in Asia, in Africa and in Latin America, so we're working on that. We're also working on making our statistics better because I think that we have more than this list under control because what we know about this is that some CCs will show just one ccTLD under the control, but they have more. So, we need to figure out how to add more in that list to make it more accurate. So, that's an action item we have.

This is our project management plan. It's super high-tech because when we did this slide on Sunday the arrow was six pixels to the left, and now it moved six to the right, did it? No, it moved twice, right? Three times then it moved another six, and so this is exactly where we were at in our disaster recovery project. And, ideally, we wanted to have a draft playbook by this meeting for the disaster recovery and business continuity guidebook.

So, we're not going to have a playbook, but we did have a session on Monday to figure out how to make this really useful, and so based on our face-to-face meeting we agreed on the structure of the playbook, and we're actually going to work on building that.

So, so far, it's working out. There's good collaboration. We have volunteers. It's happening. So, we unanimously approved [Dere] as our fearless leader. So, one thing that we noticed is that we didn't want Regis or I to run that project, so we got a volunteer to lead it, and to make sure that we have the momentum that the document gets it entered and added, and so I think we'll be on track to have something by the next ICANN meeting.

And so, for this, our objective for this ICANN was to have a draft of the document. We had a drafting workshop which we wanted to do, and we did, and we wanted to add three more ccTLDs to the list. We didn't meet that objective. We're one short. Our goal is, next meeting, to have a playbook, and we need to fix our contact repository to add the emergency phone number because I think we need to reach out to all the CCs and figure out a way to make sure that we get that done and add three more members.

So, I think TLD Ops is a lot of work to set up and maintain. We need to add more members to the list, but with the last incident, the last security incident that occurred, it turned out to be a useful tool for all.

I don't know if I just, I have new eyes. All I see is in front of me. I don't see on the side. So, if you're not part of TLD Ops, please join. Thank you. Questions?

BARRACK OTIENO: Okay, thank you for keeping time. Quick question. First of all, how many are not on TLD Ops? If you are not on TLD Ops. I assume everybody is on it. If you are not, just raise your hand. Okay, how many are on TLD ops?

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: Everybody.

BARRACK OTIENO: There are some who are somewhere in the middle. Okay, so it seems to we are working on that. Quick question, I'll take those two, and then we'll move to the next round. Patricio?

PATRICIO POBLETE: Thanks, Patricio Poblete from NIC Chile. During the workshop that we had, it was mentioned that some of the ccTLDs that have their own plans already could perhaps share them with the members of TLD Ops. Has that happened, or could that happen?

JAQUES LATOUR: Please do. We're looking for simple disaster recovery plans, and if you have simple plans you can remove the confidential information and share it with us, absolutely, and then we can take the best template for all and move forward from there. Yes, please do. [inaudible]?

BARRACK OTIENO: In the draft playbook that we are working on, there already are some examples from real plans from ccTLDs.

JAQUES LATOUR: Please, if you have anything, please share, for sure, that will make it easier.

BARRACK OTIENO: Okay, Peter?

PETER VOGOTE: Thank you, Peter Vogote, dot-be. Good morning, gentleman. Thank you for the update. I had a question about what could be described as a pre-incident situation. If I understand you correctly, TLD Ops is to report and to inform about incidents, but what if a registry would spot something, find it or appreciate it as potentially very hazardous, but you do not have a smoking gun to prove that it's going to be a cybersecurity incident, or it's going to turn into a cybersecurity incident?

Is that something that could be communicating through TLD Ops, as well, or are you saying no, where the basic requirement for us is we only deal with incident once that a sudden occurrence has appeared? And with all due respect, I would fully understand if

you say, yes, we're about incident reporting and not about pre-incident situations. Is there a way, according to you, how the ccTLDs could cooperate to keep each other in the loop, to ask like, hey, guys, have you been seeing, have you noticed, have you been noticing that type of situation in your TLD, as well? Thanks.

JACQUES LATOUR:

No, that's a good question. So, that's exactly what we're trying to do, is to have more collaboration. A few ccTLDs, once in a while, will send an email to say, "You know what, I had a big spike," or "I had a major whiz attack," or there is some of that happening, but it's very few, and it's always the same. We need to find the way of having more collaboration on it, to warn other ccTLDs of an event that might happen. Sometime people ... We know if something happens with Brazil, soon it will be happening with dot-ca and then we can ... We already exchange email on that, but it should be way more open, that information sharing. That's what we want – not after the fact, but before, to be more proactive.

PETER VOGOTE:

Okay, very clear. Thanks.

JACQUES LATOUR:

But one thing you can do is tell your TLD Ops because in your ccTLD, you have three contacts that are a part of TLD Ops. You

can tell them it's okay to share information. I think that's the first step.

PETER VOGOTE: Okay, will do. Thanks very much.

JACQUES LATOUR: Okay, thank you.

BARRACK OTIENO: Okay, thank you. A round of applause for them. Ching? Moving swiftly to the next presenter. Let's have an update on the auction proceeds.

CHING CHIAO: Thank you, Barrack. Thank you, Katrina. Ching Chiao, your everlasting co-chair for this working group who thought the job should have been done last year during the Puerto Rico meeting, under the beautiful palm tree, but we still keep up the good work, and here is to trying to keep you updated for what's being done. For those of you who know this, it's a very quick recap on this, and this is for the money that is generated from the new gTLD auction processes, as the last resort to resolve the contention sets.

The working group consists of all of the SOs and the ACs, 26 members, many participants. It started early 2017 and we really hope that this gets done by Marrakesh, this year, hopefully.

Quickly, this group's mission is to create a mechanism to distribute the fund. It's not to design in any mechanism, or it's not in the group work or scope to decide which project to fund, too. So, to put it simply, if you have some projects that you wish to receive the fund from this pool of money, keep it to your chest for the time being, but if your organization – your lovely ccTLD organization – does have a charity structure and this is the time that you can actually contribute to our work, it's to help us to build the structure for the fund.

So, here's the legal and the fiduciary requirement, which I'm going to skip. That means this, and you've seen this, the slides. Many of you have seen these many times, right now, so I'm going to jump quickly to here. So, here you can see on the bottom left of the screen it's that we are finalizing our reports and the reports will then be approved by both the GNSO and the ccNSO council. And I'm actually glad that this has already been put on the inter-council discussion agenda. I can see that yesterday.

Let me go over here, quickly, and it's that there are four mechanisms being developed. One, obviously, is to keep the money, which at this point, if we are considering the dot-web

auction money, all together it is about \$230 million in U.S. dollars. This pool of money, then, what would be the mechanism that we, the community, would hope a structure to be built? So, first the structure is a new ICANN. Is the time up? So, no one wants to talk about money. Thank you very much.

Okay. So, Mechanism A is what's called the in-source model. Everything stays inside ICANN. Let me jump over to Mechanism C. It's for ICANN to create what we call, as of now, the ICANN Foundation, to manage this money.

There are the pros and cons. Obviously, you can see, very obviously that the money stays inside ICANN as part of a department, or the money being moved, if you will, to a newly-created ICANN Foundation.

And Mechanism B, as you can see from the screen, is the ICANN departments through an in-source method, but it is in collaboration with entities, preferably an entity is aware and has a very sound knowledge to the ICANN world, meaning this could be the ccTLD which in the process we've received, for example, contributions from the Nominet, from the SIDN. Their experience is on building a charitable org and using the proceeds from their registry operation.

So, I'm going back here. So, now, with Stephan, with Peter, with Pablo and myself, we've been doing this biweekly call in the

working meetings, since 2017. So, once again, as I said, to put it simply, still it's the community – it's our job now to decide at the recommendation for the ICANN board to see whether it's A or B or C, and we still have a few months' time to sort things out. So, with that, let me stop here.

BARRACK OTIENO:

Thank you, Ching. A round of applause for him. Next, I will have Giovanni. I will take the questions at the end so that we can be more efficient in time management. So, Giovanni, please?

GIOVANNI SEPPIA:

Thank you, Barrack. A quick update on the work of the SPOC, Strategic and Operating Plan Standing Committee of the ccNSO. This is our membership at the time that the three last comments were produced. Since then, we have two new members and one observer. One new member from Nigeria, one from Japan, and one observer from Namibia. So, we are quite a broad representation of CCs in the SPOC.

The last comments that we produced were one on the two-year planning process of ICANN and then on the Fiscal Year '20 operating plan and budget and the Fiscal Year '25 operating plan and update, and the strategic plan for 2021-2025.

On the two-year planning process, those are some pics of the comments that we have submitted to ICANN. First of all, we asked ICANN what is the purpose of switching to the two-year planning cycle? We have been always supportive of having a sort of longer period for ICANN and also a second phase of consultation for the operating and strategic plans, independently from having one- or two-year, three-year or whatever process. The main important, let's say, element for us is to make sure that there is a sound process.

And at ICANN we had a meeting on Sunday, as usual with the SPOC, and we met with the ICANN finance department and during that meeting were explained that the reason behind having a two-year planning cycle is because the ICANN financial department, especially, is struggling a bit to make sure that they are on time and they're completing the review process of the comments they receive, and so it would be more helpful for them to have a longer period to take on board the comments and refine the plan.

Regarding the Fiscal Year '20 operating plan and budget and Fiscal Year '25 operating plan and update, we acknowledged several improvements in the text and also in the content and the way that ICANN is managing the fact that they are taking on board their community needs.

There is also more consistency against the strategic objectives. However, we couldn't help from highlighting the fact that when you go through the plan there is still a lot of imbalance from one section to another section in the narrative because, for instance, if you read the Recent Opportunities section for each of the objectives, you see that there is a sort of different interpretation on what is a risk and what is an opportunity. So, there should be sort of an editorial effort of ICANN to improve the narrative of the plan, especially to improve their accessibility for the non-English-speaking communities.

There are also some overlapping between the goals of some departments, like the Global Stakeholder Department and the Government Engagement Department, and there is a very special sentence in the Fiscal Year operating plan and budget regarding GDPR and it's the fact that at the time of the Fiscal Year '20 draft operating plan and budget was produced ICANN stated in the plan that's not ever the full picture of what might be the implication of the impact of the GDPR on its activities, and therefore should there be special needs – I'm quoting ICANN – it will take the funding from contingency dollars.

So, this is what's stated in the operating plan and budget regarding the GDPR, and so that's why the SOPC made this comment because the GDPR has been there for several years, so we were wondering why ICANN has not already produced some

scenarios for the different possible implications of the GDPR implementation within the ICANN framework.

And, lastly, is the strategic plan 2021-2015. We acknowledge that there is clear, a much clearer mission and vision. The five strategic objectives are better explained if we look at the previous strategic plan, the one that is ending in 2020, and there is a clear understanding of the needs and the expectations of the various stakeholders in this community, and also there is an effort to prioritize the work and the various actions.

At the same time, we would like to understand how those strategic goals, to meet those objectives, were selected because in the strategic plan draft, there is a sentence that states that there has been work to, let's say, select some of these strategic goals against the others, but we do not find any explanation on how those strategic goals were selected.

We confirmed our recommendation to have a prudent approach when it comes to funding, in terms of projections for funding, for income and also to have a restrictive approach when it comes to possible new activities, possible new engagements. Again, we also highlighted that there is some sort of overlap between certain goals, and that is due to the goal being connected to the activities of various departments, and sometimes those activities seem to overlap.

And that's it. I'm happy to answer any questions. Again, we had a very interesting session with the finance department of ICANN, as we were told in the opening ceremony that there's going to be a five-year operating plan and budget, a high-level document that is going to be shared with the community in June, and a document in its full extent is going to be submitted for public comment to the community at the end of the year, probably in December.

So, this is the plan for the next five years, and as we all heard during the opening ceremony, there is a very challenging year ahead for ICANN, according to what the CEO and the chairman of the board said, so let's try to contribute to make the strategic plan a sound document and something we can rely on in the future. Thank you.

BARRACK OTIENO:

Thank you, Giovanni. A round of applause for him, please. Next, we have Katrina with some updates from the Guidelines Review Committee.

KATRINA SATAKI:

Yes, thank you very much. So, what have we done? Thank you, Bart, for this encouragement. Yeah, okay. Since Barcelona ... Yes, the guideline on IANA functions, on the composition of IANA

functions review team is still in progress. We developed two versions and presented them to the council before our meeting in Barcelona that was in August, but we haven't finalized it yet because ... Well, I'll talk about the reasons a little bit later.

We have also finalized the template for a working group. The description. Actually, I have some sheets printed out about the Guideline Review Committee information about what we do, what we are planning to do, and so if you are interested, please let me know. I'll share them with you.

We have started working on the assessment of the Work Stream 2 recommendations, and I'll talk about that a little bit later. And we also decided that we need to create a guideline to guide the process of selection of our representatives to the different committees.

Every time when we need to select somebody, for example, to the CSC (Customer Standing Committee) or to some other of these bodies and empowered community administration, we have a separate guideline guiding the process, but sometimes we are asked to appoint people and we do not have specific guideline, so this guideline is intended to cover those cases that are not covered by any specific guideline. And we have also initiated and started collecting all those changes in the bylaws that we need to introduce.

So, this is the working group template thanks to you and thanks to your input after our discussions we had in Panama. We finalized the template and added some more information here, in order to provide as full information as possible about the work of the working group and to help people to decide whether they wanted to join a working group or not.

Here is more information about how we decided to approach assessment of Work Stream 2 recommendations. Well, first we developed a template ... Actually along the lines that we discussed in Barcelona. But, yes, first the recommendation. And then is it all implemented, because if it is, there's no need to worry about that. Yes, and then two streams, yes and no. If yes, where? And maybe we need to update this description of the implementation, and if not, no, if it hasn't been implemented yet, then is it relevant and should it be implemented, or and if yes, then in which document; and if no, then, well, no worries. And then comments if any.

Here, I have the three examples of that. This is, for example, one of these, and as you can see, yes, it is implemented. Does it need to be updated? Not at the moment. The guidelines are reviewed and updated periodically, but maybe we should come up with a table of reviews to keep track of them.

Example number two, glossary for explaining acronyms used by SO/AC groups is recommended. And actually this is something that we've been thinking about for years, or at least ever since we started working on a [inaudible] guideline because they're all full of acronyms, full of different terms that are used throughout all the documents. So, we know that we need such a glossary. And, yes, clearly, it hasn't been implemented. But, yes, it needs to be implemented.

And another example which here it's that part of it is implemented and part of it is not implemented and apparently there are things that we cannot implement with respect to the diversity requirements because we are what we are. We cannot ... If for example the ccTLDs do not encourage their employees to participate in the work of the ccNSO, we have a pretty limited pool of volunteers and there's nothing we can do to improve diversity apart from really begging ccTLDs to provide, or to let their employees participate in the process because it's for the benefit of all ccTLDs.

Here is the repository of bylaw changes. Currently, we have identified two changes that we think are necessary. So, one is the definition of the ccNSO members and that comes from the PDP Working Group. They realized that the definition had been changed and that it really needs to be updated. And the second one is about the reference to a non-ccNSO member for IFRT (IANA

Naming Function Review Team). This is also a fundamental bylaw that needs to be changed in order to make the process more ... Easier to use, let's say.

Then, here, actually here in Kobe during our face-to-face meeting we went through the list of the things that we still need to do. We finished some of the guidelines and we are going to send them to the council and after that we'll send them to you for your comments. And, actually, with that, I think that's more or less all that we wanted to report back to the community here in Kobe. So, thank you.

BARRACK OTIENO:

Thank you, Katrina. If you have questions, kindly come to the microphones. Please introduce yourself.

JOY LIDDICOAT:

Yes, Joy Liddicoat from dot-nz. Thank you. It's a great overview. I just wanted to pick up on the diversity point and you quite rightly point out that we're not mandated in terms of diversity beyond geographic. But, nonetheless, I wonder whether it might be possible to just to consider reflecting the diversity, other forms of diversity that are here in reporting. Like for example the number of women, you know, the gender diversity, or the other forms of diversity that might be present. Even though we aren't mandated

to do it, there could nonetheless be a little bit of leadership in terms of just demonstrating the richness of diversity that's in this particular ccNSO.

KATRINA SATAKI:

Yes, thank you very much for your question. Well, it probably was taking into account the current state of affairs. I'd say that we should worry about male diversity, not female diversity. Maybe we should encourage more men to participate in the work of the ccNSO. No, I'm not a man. [Roloff] don't look so surprised. Yeah, no, sorry, that was a joke, yes. Yes, yes, thank you. No. Yes, I realize it's probably too early, still too early.

Yes, of course, well, any diversity is good, but again we have what we have. If ccTLDs do not encourage their female workers to come to ICANN and participate more actively, there's nothing we can do about that, and if young employees of ccTLDs are not interested, either, then there's nothing we can do about it.

I don't know if you have any ideas about how we can encourage ccTLDs to diversify the pool of their employees that they send to ICANN meetings it would have been great. We, at the moment do not see how we could possibly change this. Yes, we do have, actually, if you look at the council, I think we are very, very diverse, but this is probably by accident and not some intention there. Maybe, regions, when they – okay, I hear some good advice

from the back that probably I should stop here, but no I agree, I should stop because I can talk about diversity for a whole day, and at the end of the day we are all professionals and this is what matters for the overall success of the ccNSO, and so I have good encouragement from the back.

BARRACK OTIENO: Thank you, any other questions?

[MARK]: I suppose that the proposed glossary for explaining acronyms would be know as the GEA or "gee-ah," right? The Glossary for Explaining Acronyms.

KATRINA SATAKI: Yes, yes, we definitely need to explain acronyms. Now, it's easier to use, it's easier to use them, but it's really difficult to understand.

BARRACK OTIENO: Okay, thank you very much, Katrina. A round of applause for her. Closing remarks from my panelists? Regis? Giovanni? I had one last question. We have two minutes to the break. I think we can have that slide on the auction process. Just to get a feel in the room, or around the room, the kind of organization we would like

to have. I am aware, recently, I think that the Internet Society Unveiled the ISOC Foundation, but we just saw a few options, but we really didn't have a feel of the room on the kind of organization we would like to administer these 230+ million shillings in the auction process.

So, maybe if we can have that slide? Kim or [inaudible]? Sorry, it was I think page 6, the CWG, no, just next, next page, please, 7, forward. I'm looking for the slide with the options, the four options, that one. That one, yes, back. Okay, so mechanisms considered in the initial report. So, one of them is a new ICANN Proceeds Allocation Department to be created. The next one is new ICANN Proceeds Allocation Department to be created as part of ICANN org that would work in collaboration with existing charitable organizations, and then we have a new structure to be created. For example, the ICANN Foundation. And, lastly, we have an established entity, for example, a foundation or a fund, to be used. That is that ICANN would organize the oversight of processes to ensure the mission and fiduciary duties are met.

So, probably for option 1, Peter has something to say?

PETER VOGOTE:

Yes, Barak. Hi, Peter Vogote, at dot-be, and a member of the Auction Proceeds Working Group. Just for clarification, Barak, that last option D is actually not available anymore. Through the

works of the Auction Proceeds Working Group, it became more and more clear that actually the three most viable options are A, B and C, and so D got actually ruled out at first. The Auction Proceeds Working Group had a preference for either A or B, but during the public comments, we noticed that there was significant support for option C. So, the question that is now to be addressed by the Auction Proceeds Working Group is should we stick with our recommendation that we are in favor of mechanism A or B, or should we weigh in the feedback of the public comments and change our preference more towards option C? But, in a nutshell, do not break your hats around option D. It's only A, B or C. Thanks.

BARRACK OTIENO: Thank you for the clarification. Last comment and then we break, from Patricio.

PATRICIO POBLETE: Yeah, Patricio Poblete from NIC Chile again. I don't think that we, or me at least. I don't think I have nearly enough information about the pros and cons of each alternative to say anything about which is best, but just one thing. If in each of those options what they did was nothing but pay for their own staff and operations, how long would the money last?

BARRACK OTIENO: Okay, I'll give you the benefit of being the last.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Oh, thank you very much. It's much in line with the previous comment that I think that it's kind of a trap if we say that we prefer a certain structure before we know what the strategy will be, what the advantages and disadvantages, fiscal consequences, etc., of that structure. Structure is a consequence. It's not a goal.

BARRACK OTIENO: Thank you, let's continue with the conversation during the tea break. A round of applause for our presenters for the morning session. You can have your coffee break and we'll be back at 11:00, 10:30 sorry. I see you [inaudible].

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]