LOS ANGELES – Fellowship Morning Sessions
Monday, October 13, 2014 – 07:00 to 08:30
ICANN – Los Angeles, USA

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE:	Monday, October 13, 2014, Plaza Pavilion, ICANN 51 LA, Fellowship Morning Session from 7:00 AM to 8:30 AM.
JANICE DOUMA LANGE:	Good morning, everyone. Guys, if you want to come in and take your seats. And I'd appreciate if you come in close by. Good morning, everybody!
PARTICIPANTS:	Good morning!
JANICE DOUMA LANGE:	Thank you! Gosh, if I have to be here alive and awake and looking like I'm loving mornings, you do, too. It's a thing called fake it. Good morning, everybody. Take your seats.
	This morning we are in a shortened version so that we can all get to the welcome ceremony and the president's opening speech. I just wanted to quickly have up on the screen a reminder from yesterday, from our newcomer session. The multi-stakeholder model words are going to get kind of overused this week. You heard someone yesterday start to say maybe we should transition into calling it a little something else, how we engage, how we label ourselves. But one way or another, we are a

place where everyone comes together to be able to represent their voice, whatever that might be.

So in the multi-stakeholder model this week, you are going to be exposed to different sectors, different individuals with different agendas and different voices, and somehow everyone kind of finds a home in one of our communities – a stakeholder group, a constituency, a supporting organization or an advisory committee.

So we're going to keep bringing this model up every morning as you start to get this sinking in a little bit more about this space called ICANN.

This morning it's my pleasure to have the chair of the Not-for-Profit Operational Concerns. It was such an unusual name for a constituency that I'm always tripping over it. The Not-for-Profit Organizational Concerns is a constituency within the Non-Commercial Stakeholder Group. So tomorrow we'll have the chair from the Non-Commercial Stakeholder Group, but today it fit into Rudi's schedule and I was pleased to – or I should say fit into our schedule. So we're pleased to have him here and talk a little bit about his constituency.

Rudi?

RUDI VANSNICK: Thank you, Janice. Welcome in LA, although it's not my city. I'm quite happy to be here. It's a pleasure to see the new GAC. It looks good. I think it even looks better than the real GAC. I see more people smiling, which is not often the case in the GAC.

As Janice said, I'm the chair of the Not-for-Profit Operational Concerns, very often named NPOC. We are the youngest constituency in ICANN. We have been created in 2011 and the Board resolved resolution to have a structure that looks into the problems, issues, concerns, that the not-for-profit world has when we talk about the domain name space. Even just a bit larger than the domain name space. It's not just domain names. It's all about the Internet governance at the end.

It's the third year that the constituency exists we had the founder of the structure, Alain Berranger, who passed away last year. It was for us a big loss, because Alain was really driven to get this off the ground. He was followed by Mari-laure Lemineur who, due to professional reasons, had to step down or step aside last year. So I hope that this is the third trial of having a chair that the chair will stay on until the end of the mandate and I will do everything I can to stay on and get this vibrant structure.

I have some experience in doing this in ICANN. I started in 2005 with a lot of colleagues in Frankfurt building the building blocks of At-Large. I am also the cofounder of the European Regional At-Large, the European RALO. So I have some experience.

I left At-Large two years ago to engage myself in this constituency, because I think that this constituency needs to be seen as a structure that will give ICANN direction in not losing a big part of the community.

When you look into your country, NGOs very often are the structures that are delivering services to the citizens or giving depth in what is needed to keep a community alive, to help young people, help other people, help children.

NGOs are a big fortune, and very often they don't have an income. Their marketing is very, very small and very low, and especially in periods when you have an economic crisis, it's very difficult for them to step up. They don't have the funds to speak up in domains that are not their priority.

That's the reason why I'm now trying to fight for more space for the NGOs. And especially in the context of the IANA transition, I think it's important that ICANN can demonstrate they are really multi-stakeholder. Multi-stakeholder means you have everybody around the table. If you don't have them, you have an issue, because there would be nobody to speak up for that group.

Actually, within the NCSG, within the GNSO, first of all – because that's the big pillar in which we are sitting – GNSO is the place where policy is developed and policy is implemented. That's very important to make the difference between the GNSO and, for instance, the ACs in At-Large. In At-Large, they are doing policy advice.

And you all know you can give a lot of advice, but nobody has to accept it. There are no rules that say, "This is law." The law is created at the other side, through the PDPs. You will learn about this. And I see some faces that I see are coming back already a few times to these ICANN meetings. The PDPs are the most important ones, because they are the law. They are defining how you implement policy, and we need to have NGOs in these working groups in order to represent their concerns.

And as we are still a small group of people, it takes a lot of energy to be present in all the discussions and debate, although NPOC has demonstrated the last year to become an important player in that work.

I myself an co-chairing a PDP working group that, at the end, seems to be one of the most difficult ones. It's translation and transliteration of contact information in the WHOIS database. You can imagine that when we have to handle the question "Is it desirable that there is translation" – and I would say is it mandatory that translation or transliteration of contact information is done.

Most of us will say yes. If a Chinese address is in the WHOIS, we will probably not be able to read it. We cannot validate. We cannot say we trust the information we can find in that one. So that's already to give you an idea of what are the issues that we have to tackle.

Coming back to why the NGOs are important in the ecosystem today, we have been doing a survey on the United Nations ECOSOC list. I don't know if you know the ECOSOC – economic-social – list that in fact groups all – should group all – the NGOs in the world by region.

We went through the list of NGOs that more than 70% have mentioned their website and their domain name, their e-mail address, but more than 70% the domain name doesn't resolve anymore or ends up in a structure that is not there. So you imagine what they are losing at the level of marketing, because that's between brackets, that's free marketing. They are pushed into the Facebook and social media where they're losing their value because Facebook and others are using your information to become rich. The more information you drop in, the more people will visit Facebook, the more the commercial bodies will try to publish their announcements on it. But the information of an NGO will just [fly] away. It's there for a while and it's gone.

So it's important that they get their domain name back. And that's one of the issues that we are going to bring to the table. First, what is the reason why they lost their domain name? When we talk to them and we ask them, "You know that you lost your domain name. What year?" When you ask," Why did you lose it?" they don't know. They don't find the reason why they lost it.

When we go back and look into what happened by doing some specific research, what we have seen is that in the beginning in the .org community especially, many NGOs got their domain name [inaudible] didn't have to go to a registrar, and the registrar was registering the domain name on their name, but quite often what happened is that the domain name was registered with an e-mail address, which is in fact the key back and forth in the communication between registry, registrar, and the registrant. That e-mail address was quite often an e-mail address of the registrar and that is the way to capture it. When you want to change something, the [messages] are only going not by post anymore – it's too expensive – but by e-mail.

It means that when the registrar saw that there was a value on that domain, they just didn't inform the registrant that there was a renewal. You have to renew your domain name every year. If you're not informed, you lose it. And that's the way we discovered that many NGOs lost their domain name, because their domain name was seen as being very valuable. It was a lot of traffic – something that registrars quite often sees also.

So that's where the value of the NGOs has been taken away in the Internet ecosystem and that's why NPOC has more concerns now than

we had in the beginning when we created it, because we have discovered that there is now an urgency to address that issue.

And we need to realign everybody in order to be able to put again on the focus the requirements, the expectations of NGOs. When I look into the stakeholder group in which NPOC is sitting, it's the NCSG (the Non-Commercial Stakeholder Group). In fact, we have two bodies in it – NCUC, the Non-Commercial User Constituency, and we have NPOC.

We are most often sitting aside each other and I dare say we don't work with each other. And that's something we have to handle and tackle, too. It's something we have to change and we can only change that by having more people coming to us. And I'm looking especially to you all, because I know that many NGOs are present here and you're here because you want to be heard. That's what we want, too.

Unfortunately, due to elections, we lost our Council on the GNSO Council, which means we need another way of making us very vibrant and heard. And that's something we will do. I can guarantee you.

It's important to have good incentives for newcomer. If a newcomer sees that a structure doesn't end up in a higher level, the incentive to join that structure is very low. And I see many ambitious people around here. That's why I said this is a better GAC than the real GAC, because there is a lot of ambition here around the table. You all want to get a step further, and we in NPOC, we can help you.

I have someone sitting on the left side who knows about [it]. And we are really pleased by having Martin coming and joining us and will be part of our executive committee soon. We need to go through the process and

the administrative work, but we will soon have Martin among us and it's good to have people like you coming and joining us.

The more we can demonstrate that NGOs are important, the better we will be in positioning ourselves at the higher levels, because actually, in At-Large, you have some NGOs, but that's it. And as I said, in the society, NGOs quite often represent 40% of the support and services to the community itself. So why shouldn't NGOs be 40% of the structure of ICANN?

And I leave the question open to you. Think about it. Bring up ideas to increase our number. And I think I'm going to end at this point and leave the floor for questions and opinions.

JANICE DOUMA LANGE: Do you mind if we just have Martin [inaudible]?

[MARTIN]:   Hello. Good morning, everyone. I'm just going to talk a little bit about how I actually arrived to NPOC real briefly. When I started in the Buenos Aires fellowship, I was an honorary fellowship there. Rudi can speak exactly to this. He was with Mari-laure and [inaudible] collaborator of NPOC.

I just was curious of what he was saying, so I went to the NPOC meeting and I started asking questions. They seemed to appreciate that I was there asking questions. It wasn't only me. We were actually – I think [we were] three fellows. It was [inaudible]. I think they are also second- or third-time fellows. It became instant that they want us to be there. They

literally told us, "Join your table. Don't sit in the background. Come here and [ask] questions."

We went through the agenda of NPOC like if we were part of NPOC. At least, for me, it was real refreshing that we opened the space to people that actually didn't know anything about NPOC, that they were learning about ICANN. In a few months, a few meetings, that just grew, grew and kept growing. Nowadays, I'm officially and fully getting into NPOC. I think, as a fellow, I find my place. I started in the fellowship and will always be a fellow. Once a fellow, always a fellow. But at least I think myself as a history of [little] fellow success, because you enter, you don't understand anything. You're lost. I found myself in NPOC and I think you should also try to find yourself inside ICANN.

For NGOs or for people that are interested in the structure of ICANN, of the legitimacy of ICANN, I think NPOC is also something [inaudible] that NPOC is a new place. It's still in a formation state and there's a lot of work related to multi-stakeholder concepts and procedural legitimacy. So those are my two cents. Thanks.

JANICE DOUMA LANGE: Perfect. So again, just to point out it's been one year exactly since Martin joined us literally walking in, not off the street, but from [his] university in Buenos Aires at the suggestion of another fellow alumni, Celia Lerman, who he had been working with.

A lot can happen in a year when you look and think, "These people around me must have been working forever to get to this position to sit at this glorious head table." No. It just takes your initiative, your drive,

your passion for what you believe in and where you think you can lend your voice and do.

So I want to open back to questions. There are lots of hands, Rudi.

HANANE BOUJEMI: Good morning, everyone. My name is Hanane Boujmemi. I have a question about the domain name not being resolved for some organizations, and I think you looked only at the list of the ECOSOC-approved NGOs which is a very small list, because not every organization can get the ECOSOC status. So I can imagine that there is a whole range of different domain names of NGOs which do not resolve.

But this poses a very important question, like the online presence of these organizations don't seem to be important to them and that's why they don't realize they lost their domain name. So if you're saying that the registrar usually uses his or her own e-mail for these domain names, I think it's wrong. It shouldn't have happened at the beginning.

ICANN I know they're more probably interested in the business interest. There is no follow-up to have a proper procedure to verify the owner of the domain, and I think there should be some mechanism set up from the very beginning to verify the owners of the name.

I think there is a lot of work that needs doing to convince these organizations that an online presence is important for them for business reasons. But it's a not-for-profit. Therefore, their online presence would be to get funding from the relevant funders and they should have enough resources to [write] information that is going to present this

organization in a way that people would like to invest in them as nonprofits.

So I think the work of your constituency is probably like covering other aspects rather than just the online presence.

And I know very well this problem because I work for a nonprofit and we care a lot about our own profile and we have a special website for donors to come to us, but we have the means and the resources to dedicate to work on that. The small organizations do not have that luxury.

I wanted to comment as well about the competition between probably NPOC and NCUC. I understood that there is some kind of – they are non-commercial and I was confused at the beginning the difference between NPOC and NCUC and what's the point of having these two kinds of sub-constituencies probably doing the same thing.

I was already approached by NCUC and they were like, "Okay, run for us. Come with us." And I feel like now there is some kind of competition. It shouldn't be this way, as you said. I think you should sit next to each other, but also work together and try to benefit from each other's experience.

And I think if you focus on an NGO, I feel like it's a noble thing as well, because you basically support the nonprofit work of these NGOs regardless of what they're doing. So it could be anything. It could be LGBT rights. It could be women empowerment. It's a [nice] thing. I feel like you have a nice mission. So how are we going to resolve that kind of competition? We'll see.

RUDI VANSNICK: Well, to answer your first question about the number of NGOs we have approaching and surveying, we used the ECOSOC list because that was the easiest way to get hands on – don't forget that all this work is done in volunteering concept. We're not paid to do that work. It's because we are ambitious. We are ourselves – I'm involved in four NGOs now. It's because I see the need.

We have been talking to the UN and the UN even is pleased by the fact that we are trying to help their members, but indeed, there are millions of NGOs and we have to first start somewhere. If we can convince those who lost their domain name, they will talk to others. We are going to use them as the repeaters of our message, because they will indicate to those who don't have yet the domain name, "Look, it's important. Don't do it the wrong way." We cannot do everything. We need to help and bring up others so that they can help us.

And regards to the discussion on the split between NCUC and NPOC, if you just use the naming – Non-Commercial Users Constituency, while we are the Not-for-Profit, there is a distinction already in the naming. They are focusing more on the users. If you look into the membership, 70-80% are individuals. And it's good. We need them.

We need voices about human rights, privacy, freedom of speech and so on. But that's not the concern of an NGO; I'm sorry. NGO is not concerned about human rights. NGO [that is] fighting for human rights will probably be, but there are a lot of other issues and that's why we are going to try now to find a way in dividing the space of work we have to do. And that's why it's important to us so that we have presence in

the structures at a higher level, so that we can raise it in the GNSO Council and so on.

Anyway, by having this SO-AC leadership meetings now, I participated in my first Friday afternoon, I have a lot of hope that it is going to resolve. A lot of hope because everybody is aware that there is a need for two voices: one for the users, one for the NGOs. So I think we are going to resolve that, maybe not this year but certainly next year.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: Good morning. This is [inaudible] and I'm from India. I believe that historically NGOs were largely associated with the .ORG TLD. I'm curious about whether you see NGOs engaging with the NextGen gTLDs and whether there are any issues or concerns that you see with respect to that.

RUDI VANSNICK: Thank you for that question. It's interesting. And the reason why we want to focus very quickly on solving the actual problem already with the .ORG because we are afraid that, for the NGOs, the business world will take all the space again and there will be left a very thin layer for the NGOs. And that's why it's important that we are starting raising the voice now, making people aware of the fact that if you book a domain name, do it in the correct way so that you don't lose it after a year.

You're investing, as the lady just said before. They have a website which they are using for donations. If they lose it next year, they're losing their donation. It shouldn't happen.

So, you see, it's important that we focus not only on the existing ones, but also on the future ones. You probably know about the creation of the .ngo.ong which is part of the PIR, and I would say the ISOC community. I'm happy to make some promotion because I'm a member of the Internet Society Board of Trustees.

We are happy that we can again try to help the not-for-profit world in getting their domain name space, although it will be difficult also to get them in line with what we are proposing. But indeed, our focus is not only on the past, but we look into the future because we have concerns about what's going to happen with NGOs in the new round that is rolling out now. And you're welcome to join us to help us convincing everybody. Thank you.

BEN TOWN: Hi. Thanks so much for your comments. My name is Ben Town and I have two questions. One is can you remind us what was the percentage of the organizations whose name did not resolve? That seemed amazingly high.

And then I'm wondering, of those where the e-mail was owned by the registrar, how much of that was an attempt to get privacy in the WHOIS database and avoid or help NGOs protect themselves from the kind of spam and unwanted solicitation that you get. Or even when they had it in their own domain, their own e-mail, how many had just started filtering everything to that address away, including their renewal notifications and how much of the WHOIS privacy question comes into play here.

RUDI VANSNICK: Very interesting questions, especially the second one. The first one, very quickly, we took a list of 1,500 NGOs in the ECOSOC list, even in Europe only for the moment, because we need to spread it across all the regions, but due to the fact that we have to do this in our spare time and my spare time is very, very small – it's something like 10 minutes a day, if I don't sleep – and already in this portion (1,500), [if] we discover that 70% is damaged…

BEN TOWN: 70%?

RUDI VANSNICK: 70%. Seven-zero.

BEN TOWN: And that's of the orgs that were official enough to get on the UN list?

RUDI VANSNICK: Exactly. Even the UN is aware of the fact that their ECOSOC membership list is not really updated. And that's also something we are going to work on.

Very quickly, our idea – and a proposal that I've put to my executive committee this week – is that to help NGOs, especially, we will give them space in our website, in NPOC. They can become unofficial members first and request some help to help them get their domain

name back if they lost it. So we are going to try through that way to discover why it happened.

And response to your second question, which is for me the most important one, the decision that has been taken to put the privacy issues in the WHOIS database has created positive results, but also a lot of negative results.

For instance – and I'm going to use a more critical way, and it's a fight that I have been doing in the past years – when a criminal wants to hide his or her identity, the easiest way is to use the privacy rules in the WHOIS. You cannot see who it is.

So already you create an issue by putting in a solution for a certain group. You have to find the balance. And that's where, again, it's important that NGOs define and give us indication what level of privacy they want to have. It's not because individuals are requesting to have the privacy. [inaudible] NGO wants that, too.

So it's important that we distinguish [both] requests and that we put value on it. But if you have at one side 300 members saying, "We need privacy," and you have only 10 members at the other side saying, "We don't need it," who's going to win? It's also a question of numbers, unfortunately.

And that's what we have to do. We have to try to increase the numbers of NGOs participating in the Internet ecosystem. And I'm happy. I'm going to use your sample and I'm happy to have other samples. Please, join us on Tuesday 9:00 until 12:30. Join us and come to the table. Don't sit in the back rows. I will chase you there. Come and sit at our table,

like Martin and some others have already done. Join us. Bring your samples, because we can use those samples on our website and say, "Look, this is the problem that you have."

Quite often, NGOs are reacting on samples of others because most of the NGO people are shy people. They are proud of the work that they do, but they don't want to come on the stage and we have to [inaudible] that. I am going to sit in the background. You are going on stage.

I hope I answered your two questions. If you need more, please come and see us.

JANICE DOUMA LANGE: You'll know where to find him. Rudi, I'm going to say thank you because you're leaving on a great note. Byron is in the back, so Byron, I'll let you walk up.

I know there are more questions. If you are on remote – and I'm very happy to say that we've got many of our fellows on remote here listening and they were all admonishing those who had come in late. They know, even virtually, that you were late. They're amazing. They have eyes in the back of their head.

But we continue to engage remotely and here physically at the conference, so if remotely you're here and you still have questions, you can send them to me. I will make sure that they get to Rudi, and then we can start a conversation. He can have your e-mail address. We can start the conversation. But it kind of helps if I'm the clearinghouse and can gather them all for him, so during this already busy week, he's not

ICANN 51
LOS ANGELES

getting another 50 separate e-mails, but he can collect them and then be able to respond to you and come back.

Of course he's going to tell you, and I will tell you, he'll be in the halls having coffee breaks, at night trying to have dinner. He'd be more than happy, I'm sure, for you to come and just say, "I was here at the morning meeting."

Rudi, I just want to point out as well, the gentleman who talked to you and the folks in the blue shirts and for Byron to know they are part of our NextGen, which is the second time since London. We've done the initiative of bringing regional university and students of higher learning into ICANN for the week. They are going to help us outreach out to their universities and bring that knowledge there, and of course we're hoping they'll join in and be able to follow us remotely when they can't follow us physically around the globe. So thank you.

RUDI VANSNICK: I had the chance to talk to him yesterday evening already. I'm happy to see NextGens, please, so that I can retire. Thank you. See you!

[applause]

JANICE DOUMA LANGE: Thank you. So I'm going to switch over, Byron, to your webpage. So while I do that, I'll let you go ahead and introduce yourself.

BYRON HOLLAND: Thanks very much and good morning. My name is Byron Holland and I'm the CEO and President of the Canadian Internet Registration Authority. We're the ccTLD. We're the Country Code Top-Level Domain that operates the .CA for Canada.

I'm also, in the ICANN world, the chair of the ccNSO (the Country Code Name Supporting Organization). That's the organization where all country code operators come together and deal with the issues that are relevant to the cc community within the ICANN space.

So before I talk a little bit about that, it's important to understand the differentiation between gTLDs – or generics like com, net, org and so on – and the country code world, because those differences are very germane in terms of how the ccNSO actually conducts itself and issues that it works on.

Country codes, by definition, serve a local population – a nation state population or territory. There are 293 country codes, and for those of you who were awake early this morning, you'll probably recognize that there's only 193 countries on the official UN list, so there is a bit of a delta there. And those are typically as a result of territories as opposed to specific countries as we typically think about them.

Anyway, all of the ccs or all of the ccTLDs operate in their jurisdiction, and that's a critical thing to note. We typically all have to operate within the sovereign confines of the nation who we serve, and therefore we operate under the laws, rules, culture, mores of that given country.

That is a really critical difference between ccs and gs, because we are bound by national law, which is a very different construct than typically

the gs operate under, because they tend to be global in nature and have a whole other set of challenges as a result of that. Our challenges tend to be related to the laws of the country that our cc actually serves.

So because sovereignty is critical to who we are and what we do, many of the issues in ICANN actually aren't relevant to us. So I'll just pick up on one that you were just discussing, which is WHOIS. And WHOIS is a big issue in ICANN and has been for all time, because essentially the g space is trying to find a path that will satisfy all these different constituencies, not the least of which are the different business interests, civil society interests, and a path that all governments can accept or the respective law enforcement in different countries can respect and work with.

WHOIS for us, as cc operators, in a sense is much simpler in that we're bound by the laws of our country so we operate privacy – I mean, a privacy regime associated with WHOIS – based on whatever the laws in our country are. So it's much clearer and crisper for us, on average, to be able to resolve the WHOIS issues because most of our countries will have some sort of privacy legislation and we have to operate our WHOIS within those confines.

So that's an example of a big policy issue that washes across ICANN and has forever that, in a sense, is really irrelevant to the cc community.

So that, I think, is a good example of the differentiation between ccs and gs as a result of sovereignty, and we take sovereignty pretty seriously in the cc community.

The other thing that's important to note about ccs is, while in a certain sense, we may all look the same, we get sort of branded as "the" ccs, the fact is we're actually very different in terms of structure, governance, size, business model. I mean, the biggest ccs are among the largest registries in the world. We have a number of ccs with over 10 million domains. Germany has 15 million right now. So among the biggest registries in the world, right down to registries that have less than 1,000 domain names under management.

So we run the gamut in terms of size. Some are operated by governments, like out of a government department. Some are still operated out of universities. Many, particularly some that have been around longer, and particularly coming from the western world, are private not-for-profit corporations that work to serve the Internet community in their country or region.

And some are for-profit entities where the Internet community, however it's defined in their country, have decided that generating income from the cc and returning it to the community somehow, often in terms of investing in Internet infrastructure or such, that's the way to go. Some are member-based. Some are operated by individuals or corporations.

So there's a really wide variety of, like I said, size, business model, governance structure and we have the overlay of sovereignty that makes us each distinct from each other, even though we do have a number of common causes or issues that we all worry about.

And that's important to note in the context of ICANN because as a result of our structures, governance models, etc., we are not contractually

bound to ICANN in any way, shape or form. We have no legal relationship with ICANN like the contracted parties do, the generics – or the registrars, the ICANN-accredited registrars.

All of those parties – com, net, org, the thousand-plus new gTLDs, all the ICANN-accredited registrars – they're contractually bound to ICANN to behave in a certain way. All of their entire relationship to ICANN is regulated by that contract. With ccs, there is no contract. We work with ICANN in a consensual, collegial basis, most of the time.

Yeah, we try to do it in that multi-stakeholder bottom-up consensus-based method, but at the end of the day, ccs can go and do what they need to do in their jurisdictions regardless of what ICANN may or may not think about the issue.

And that influences pretty dramatically how the ccNSO, which is the global organization of country code operators within ICANN – one of the core constituent groups that make up ICANN – operate.

The ccNSO is a volunteer organization. No country code has to be a part of it. You join. Every cc is welcome, but you have to put your hand up and say, "I'd like to become a member," and identify somebody in your organization who will represent you. But all ccs are welcome.

There is no mandatory financial contribution; again, which is different from the contracted parties who will all have some sort of mandated financial arrangement with ICANN.

That said, the country code community, or the ccNSO, has worked with its membership to generate a voluntary financial contribution regime – so a suggested financial contribution to ICANN, which is fundamentally

based on the size of your registry. Recognizing many different business models, the size of registry is kind of a generic proxy for one's capability to pay, and recognizing it's not a perfect model, it's as good as with can get.

After three years of working group working with ICANN to come to that regime, it's certainly not perfect, but it's about as good as we can get.

So it's a voluntary body that has a suggested voluntary financial contribution regime. Within ICANN, the ccNSO is fundamentally structured so that we work on policies that would be global in nature and relevant to ccs.

Now, having just said what I said, you can imagine those are pretty few and far between. A lot of the work that we do is best practice sharing, information sharing, capacity building. Because it's a fairly collegial typically non-competitive environment – I don't compete against .UK in the UK, for example – that it's a much more open sharing environment in that we will often share a lot of the technology issues, security issues, challenges and problems we've had, issues with registrars, etc.

To use a phrase, we generally are pretty open with each other in a way that financial competitors would not be.

So that is much of what happens inside the ccNSO, but we do also work on global policies that would be of interest. An example of that would be IDNs (Internationalized Domain Names). In the past number of years, how IDNs, the policy was structured and how the IDN program was rolled out across the world was a policy component that was very much

worked through in the cc community. In fact, it was worked through in the cc community before it got rolled out in the gTLD space.

So those kinds of global policies do get worked on inside the ccNSO, but they are very few and far between. Very few and far between, because of the sovereign nature of our ccTLDs.

And as a result, like I said, most of the work we do is around capacity building, information sharing, and issues more like that.

Right now, inside the ccNSO, we're very focused on a few different subject areas or streams, but they are very much inter-related. If you haven't already heard about them, I'm sure you will hear about them endlessly over the course of the week. There's the IANA oversight transition issue. So that is core to who we are. That is what I would call an existential issue to the ccTLD community. So that's one key stream of work.

The other is the ICANN accountability issue. So as the U.S. government recedes from its oversight role, how is ICANN held accountable for the work that it does, for the policies that it imposes? The assumption is IANA functions would continue to remain under the umbrella of ICANN. Although that's an assumption, to be clear, that's not etched in stone at this point. But the general assumption is that it will.

So with the U.S. government out of its role, how do we hold ICANN accountable? Particularly if it holds the IANA functions within it and the IANA functions are the core reason, actually, that ccs come to ICANN. Because IANA, those functions are the most important supplier we have. IANA is where the TLDs get delegated or re-delegated or revoked.

So you can see why this is an existential issue to us. It's right at the core of do we actually have the delegation to operate the ccTLD from a technical perspective?

How ICANN is held accountable becomes absolutely critical to us, and it's critical to everybody, but it's particularly critical to us, because on the third stream, this is an internal working group for the country code community is what we call the FOI (the Framework of Interpretation) Working Group.

And it's the working group that's been focused on the policy issues – the substantive policy issues – around how ccTLDs delegations are allocated, revoked – delegated, revoked, etc. There isn't accepted policy on these issues. There are a number of different policies and a number of different actions that ICANN has taken over time that mean there is no crisp understanding and policy framework that is clear to everybody and makes us all comfortable that it's predictable and consistent.

So that's a third critical stream of work that that was happening separate and before the U.S. government made its announcement, and to be frank, is pretty arcane and dry and not a lot of people are paying attention to it, even though it was critical work for our community.

All of a sudden, it's elevated to the top of our list because those issues need to be sorted out in some way, shape or form, or we need to be comfortable they can be sorted out as the IANA oversight transition happens and as we try to find a new accountability framework for ICANN.

So those are three of the really fundamental issues that are being worked on in the ccNSO and the ccTLD broader community as well.

I don't think I mentioned we have 153 ccs within the ccNSO, so the significant majority of operators are inside the ccNSO or are members of the ccNSO. And of those 150-some, that represents over 80% of total country code domains globally.

So we certainly comprise a significant majority of cc operators, but there is a ccTLD community out there beyond just the ccNSO. Regardless of that, those three issues that I mentioned are germane to all of us – critical to all of us – so that is very much what our focus is right now and will be until these issues are resolved.

So that's a quick journey through cc land, and I'm happy to answer any questions that you might have.

NICK DAGOSTINO: My name is Nick D'Agostino. I'm from the University of Toronoto. [inaudible] I have to say Happy Thanksgiving.

BYRON HOLLAND: You should give me your contact, because we're going to host a small Canadian dinner tonight. So if you want turkey. You know the miracle of the Internet, we looked up restaurants in LA serving turkey this Monday, and lo and behold, there was an app for that. So we know every restaurant serving turkey tonight in LA.

NICK DAGOSTINO: Okay. Awesome. That's great, thank you. You mentioned there's 153 ccTLDs that are part of the ccNSO right now. Is there some sort of like an outreach committee that tries to bring in that other 20%, that other 140 or so TLDs that are not a part of the ccNSO in order to help with these three streams that are the core focus of the ccNSO? And is that a bit of a balance, more inclusion makes it more difficult to get to a consensus on these various issues, but it also increases your own leverage in terms of policy advocacy?

BYRON HOLLAND: So in terms of general membership work, we don't do a lot of soliciting for new members. The country code community understands who and where we are and they're welcome to join or not.

In terms of the specific issues around IANA and accountability, we are doing a lot of outreach on that front, but it's specific to the issue. There is a what we call a world ccTLD list. It's a global e-mail list for the managers or operators of every single ccTLD. So information is being pushed out through the world list.

There is a forum for ccTLD operators specific to this issue that's moderated and issues are put forward and debated and discussed. That is open to all ccTLD operators.

In addition to the ccNSO, there are what we call regional organizations. There are four regional organizations: Europe, Africa, Latin America, Asia-Pacific. And they tend to be a little closer to the ground and also do a lot more of what I would call operational work, from a capacity building standpoint.

Their membership is similar, but different, from ours. And they have, within those regional organizations, many operators who are not ccNSO members. They are most – the regional organizations who we work with also are also reaching out to their non-ccNSO members to spread the message.

So there are many different streams of information going out in the attempt to speak to the entire ccTLD community, not just our membership base.

JANICE DOUMA LANGE: Albert, did you want to follow-up on that? Okay. I'm just going to jump to Albert and then we're going to come right back over.

ALBERT DANIELS: Albert Daniels, ICANN Stakeholder Engagement Manager for the Caribbean. In answer to that question, part of the work that the ICANN Global Stakeholder Team does when we reach out to our regions is to try to make contact with the ccTLD manager and explain to them that there is the ccNSO and give us as much information as we can on how they can participate and what the benefit is to participating.

So in my case, in the Caribbean, there are 28 territories. So that's 28 ccTLDs. And every time I engage, we say to them, "Look, it's a good idea to find out what the ccNSO is all about, because there's a lot of benefit to participating in the activities of the ccNSO."

JANICE DOUMA LANGE: Thanks, Albert. Okay?

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: I am going to ask my question in French. [inaudible]. I come from [inaudible]. I have questions to the cc for the representation. You said that the organization, when it comes to countries, is different now. You have more now that are run by universities, by governments, by registry of commission. When it comes to ccNSO, is there a particular process that is put together to, in a way, [harmonize] all the domain names for the countries, so it could be more uniform when we see the countries to see what extension could be put together.

My question is linked to the domain names that are run by ICANN. Is it different? I don't want to call that ccTLD, but I want to call it geographical extension. Are they limited in geographical extension in one region? Is it only for region? The ccNSO is the only one running this or will there be another organization that will put together in order to defend the interests of these new extensions? Thank you.

BYRON HOLLAND: [inaudible] new geographic TLDs versus country code TLDs. How will what I'm going to call the [geoTLDS] be represented or the interests of the region that they are representing, how will they be defended?

I think the first thing is they are generics like any other. So even if it's .AMAZON, which clearly has a very specific meaning in Brazil [inaudible] other countries, .AMAZON or .PATAGONIA or .BERLIN – any, .NYC – they are a generic top-level domain just like any other, like .com, net, org. And they are bound by ICANN rules.

So there's the registry agreement, because they're a registry as opposed to a registrar, and they have a contractual relationship with ICANN the same as any other registry, generic top-level domain operator.

That is not exactly my space. I'm certainly aware of the issues that have gone on there, but to my knowledge, they don't have any specific organization that's representing the geographic generic top-level domain interest.

But I can tell you the GAC who sits in this room – the Government Advisory Committee – they have had very specific interest in geographic top-level domains, and that's why you're never going to see a .CANADA unless the Canadian government is part of that decision-making process.

So from a certain perspectives, generics, certainly at the country level – country name level – and major region level are protected in that unless the government is part of that decision-making process, that generic won't happen. They have to at least give their okay.

But those have nothing to do with the ccTLD community. Like I said, we operate our sovereign top-level domain registries inside a specific country or territory and are not in any way, shape or form part of the geographic generic top-level domains – with a minor exception, because it's ICANN and there's always an exception. Some of my colleagues in the country code operating world also operate registries on behalf of others.

Because we run registries for the most part – that's what we do – we also, or some of my colleagues, also outsource those services and run

registries for others. So some of those geographics are run by country code operators, but they're not managed or owned by country code operators.

It gets a little bit grey, but there is a shade of grey between me saying, "No, we don't participate." If you look into it, you'll say, "Well, how come Nominet who runs .UK, they're doing .WHALES?" Well, there are shades of grey, but the fact is Nominet is moving into the generic space. So, yes, it's a country code operator but they're bound by, like I said, all the ICANN rules and regulations and contracts that are imposed on generics. I hope that answers your question.

JANICE DOUMA LANGE: Byron, I don't think we can use shades of grey anymore. I don't know. I think that's been taken. Could be me. Not that I would know anything about that; I'm just saying.

BYRON HOLLAND: Nobody's read that book. It sold 50 million, but nobody's read it.

JANICE DOUMA LANGE: This is so awesome, Byron. I say this every single time. ccNSO comes in and we get the education, but we're not going to see as many hands. We always see a sea of hands. There are probably about six more, but I'm going to grab Omar. That will be the last question. We're going to get over to the welcome ceremony. So with that, again, remember, send me any questions. I'll get them to Byron. I've done this before. He'll get back to you sometime during the week, or maybe even next

week depending on his schedule. But he's awesome about it. I can guarantee he'll get back to you or be in the hallways or the byways.

As Byron is taking the last question, I'm going to flip back to today, other than the welcome ceremony the other places that I do expect to see you. There will be a sign-out as you leave. Omar?

OMAR ANSARI: My name is Omar. I'm from Afghanistan. There are ccs that are often run by governments and they serve local population and there are code names which are for after a city and they serve local population.

These are run by businesses. Some governments might be open, but they're government who would consider them as a competition, right? And they're powerful.

If there are issues that governments are creating problems for the businesses, they're serving the local population, how ICANN sees that, what are the regulations in case there is an issue between the government and [inaudible] local population? And were there cases like that within the ICANN community and how you address the issues like that?

BYRON HOLLAND: So now you're sort of moving towards more geo-political issues, which we certainly deal with in the ccNSO but are a little outside of our purview as well. My response to that is that ICANN is rarely going to take on a local government and tell a local government what it can or

cannot do in its own country. And ICANN has been [loathed] to do that kind of thing.

ICANN is not structured to take on governments, per se, for the betterment of the Internet community, and I certainly agree that there are a number of governments around the world who do very questionable things with regard to how they manage their Internet. But it's not ICANN's role to take them on.

Again, in that sovereign environment, the people of the land – and to some degree, ICANN – are going to be bound by national law, regulation.

It's a little bit different in it is played out as a generic, but if you think of .WINE or [inaudible], that's an issue where governments were adamant that ICANN shouldn't be allowing that process to proceed. Actually, to some degree, it happened on .PATAGONIA and .AMAZON, too, in different ways. And essentially, ICANN has had to stand down on those issues, for the most part.

Governments will make their presence felt in those jurisdictions and as a collective in regions, and generally speaking, ICANN is going to try to respect whatever the decisions of government are. But there is very much a tension right now in particular as government, the GAC, folks who sit in this room most of the time tries to exert new power and influence into the overall ICANN process.

And in part, that's because the GAC is growing. I mean, the bottom line is we have 2.5 billion people roughly online right now, and for the most part, they come from western democratic nations where the Internet

bubbled up from originally. The next 3 billion people online generally aren't native English speakers and don't come from those countries. Those countries are saturated.

So the next 3 billion are often coming from different language sets, come from different political environments, different cultural norms, etc., and ICANN is trying to adapt to the rightful needs of those new Internet users while trying to maintain the fundamental ethos of the Internet in ICANN, which has been a free and open multi-stakeholder environment.

And that's a real tension you're seeing and it gets played out very much in geographics – and elsewhere, but certainly geographics.

OMAR ANSARI: Do you mean if there is a dispute between the government serving local population and a business serving local population, ICANN is going to endorse the decision of the government, when it's part of the dispute…?

BYRON HOLLAND: So this is probably a question better asked to ICANN executives than me, per se, but none of us in the operator ICANN community are going to go against national legislation.

So if a country creates a legislative regime that speaks to whatever kinds of issues you're referring to, national legislation will trump ICANN policies. That sounds black and white – again, the shades of grey here. It still depends a bit. And that is the tension we are seeing and feeling at ICANN right now.

JANICE DOUMA LANGE: And at that, we're going to call it a morning so we can get everybody over to the welcome ceremony. Folks, come up here and do a sign-out for me. For all of our new folks, we're going to be over in the main halls for the welcome ceremony.

Immediately following that is the SO/AC-led key topics. I always call it hot topics, but the current topics that the SO and AC leaders have chosen to have discussion, moderated discussion, around. It's going to be an excellent session. That will be 10:30 to 12:00.

And then in the afternoon, we do have the DNSSEC for Beginners at 5:00 which is an excellent, even for those who have the DNSSEC in your [DNS] come and enjoy that program, because it's really well done and it answers questions at multiple levels. And then we will all be together at 6:30 for a follow-up on that DNSSEC.

Have a great day. Come up here and sign out. See you over there.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]