
LOS ANGELES – ccNSO Members Meeting Day 2
Wednesday, October 15, 2014 – 09:00 to 15:30
ICANN – Los Angeles, USA

BYRON HOLLAND: Good morning everybody. Welcome to Day 2 of the ccNSO Meetings at ICANN 51. Hopefully everybody's coffeed up and ready to go. As we said yesterday, there was a slight change to the Agenda because Becky was not able to make it here, so effectively we've cancelled that brief session and allowed everybody to start a little late. Now we'll have a report from the SOP, which is being Chaired by Giovanni. Giovanni's going to be delivering the SOP Report. Over to you Giovanni.

GIOVANNI SEPPIA: Thank you Byron. Good morning everybody. An update about the work of the ccNSO Strategy and Operating Plan Working Group. Our work so far in 2014, we have provided input on the ICANN Draft Strategy Plan 2016-2020. The Plan hasn't been approved yet. It was supposed to be approved during the first Board Meeting in early September but it's been postponed and is likely to be approved this week. The Final Strategy Plan for 2016-2020 should be ready to be launched in the coming weeks.

Linked to that, and after our input on the ICANN Strategy Plan, we've also provided input on the FY 2015 OP and Budget. During the meeting we had last Sunday, usually the Working Group meets on the Sunday before the ICANN Meeting starts, we've explained quite extensively that finally after several years of limbo the ICANN family now has a precise

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.

structure for the Strategy and Operating Plan flows. That means the Board will soon approve the Strategic Plan 2016-2020 and then the community, all the stakeholders, will be invited to comment on the Five-Year Operating Plan, which is going to be released immediately after the approval of the Strategic Plan.

So there's going to be a more long-term planning process in place, which the Working Group has been asking for since the beginning. In addition to that there will be the yearly FY planning, also on which the Working Group is regularly providing feedback on to ICANN. Concerning our work concerning FY 2015, this FY 2015 Operating Plan and Budget was approved by the Board on its meeting on 9th of September. Unfortunately, the responses of ICANN to the public comments were posted much later than the approval of the Board, so they were posted only on 29th September.

All those who've contributed with comments and provided feedback to ICANN about FY 15 Operating Plan and Budget, they were responded and therefore their comments were addressed by ICANN only a few weeks after the FY 15 Operating Plan and Budget was approved. However, if you look at the FY 2015 Final Operating Plan and Budget, you can see that against the initial draft there were major changes, and that's partially thanks to the comment that the ccNSO Working Group provided to ICANN. The main change has been a reduction of the revenue projection.

ICANN had quite a high estimate concerning the new revenues from the new gTLDs, and that has been re-dimensioned, as well as the sanction regarding the new gTLD registry accreditation. It's been resized. That's

also in light of the concerns that the ccNSO Working Group expressed when commenting on the Draft Plan. There's also been a reduction of the operating expenses, and also the ICANN staff has reviewed the final part of the Operating Plan and Budget, which relates to the risks and opportunities. Certain risks, the level of the risk, which is classified as low, medium, and high, they've been upgraded to high.

Mainly, the two risks that have been upgraded to high, the first one being the lower number of transactions per registry and the functional budgets, which have little contingency. So those two factors, which were considered as a medium risk in the draft planning, they've been upgraded to being a higher risk in the Final Operating Plan and Budget. If we look, there are around 30 comments provided by the ccNSO Strategy and Operating Plan Working Group on the FY 2015. We can see that 12 of our comments have been fully taken on board by ICANN and have therefore led to changes in the structure of the planning.

Ten, they've been taken on board but they will be addressed in future. Seven, they were not taken on board and ICANN has written back in the responses to the comments that they've taken note of the input but that basically is something that's not foreseen at present. Probably again, if we reiterate the comment in the future, they may probably take it on board, evaluate it and incorporate it in future drafts of the planning process. There is still room for improvements. The room for improvement is something that this Working Group has been underlying many times during the six years of the work of the Working Group.

The main points are relating to the introduction of more KPIs. That's something that we'll never get tired of stressing against the ICANN staff

in charge of the Strategy and Operating Plan. They need to introduce better timeframe projects and deliverables, in the sense that if you go through the Strategic and Operating Plan you'll see many times sentences saying, "We'll do this in the future," "We'll assess this in the future," but "in the future" is quite a broad concept that the Working Group doesn't like much.

So we invited them many times, ICANN, to make sure that "in the future" is changed into Q1 2016 or February 2017 – at least there be a reference that can help the community to see if ICANN is progressing well against what is an action or an objective above the action. The refinement of the revenue projection, if you read the latest FY 15 Operating Plan and Budget, what you see is that basically ICANN has re-dimensioned the projection for the revenues, on the basis of a more accurate assessment of the possible new gTLD registrations.

There is still refinement, as I wrote on this slide, because we do believe as a Working Group that there is enough data available in terms of registration terms, to make a more precise assessment about what could be the revenue coming from the future. ICANN has taken on board this input and therefore reviewed the revenue projection. Another comment that the Working Group has underlined several times is that ICANN should assess more often what... Okay, better than the mysterious noise of yesterday during the common session with the Board...

The Working Group has underlined several times that ICANN staff in charge of the Operating Plan and Strategy Process should assess more often what has been already done or what is being done, and that will

serve for future planning. This is something that's slowly getting incorporated in the text that we've been seeing over the years. But as I said, things have changed quite significantly since the Working Group started. We've now a structured planning process. We have now this Five-Year Strategic Plan that will be followed by the Five-Year Operating Plan. In addition to that there's going to be the yearly FY Operating Plan and Budget.

So it seems now that there is a structure in place. As I said, things have improved. There is still room for refinement and there's still room for basically making sure that ICANN stays on track whenever they plan actions. During the meeting we had on Sunday, I believe that the most worrying element that one Member of the Working Group, Lesley, basically found out, is that ICANN doesn't have currently financial principles. ICANN staff in the room acknowledge the absence of financial principles, but reassured the Working Group that they will soon start working on financial principles.

We'll make sure that this doesn't go into any forgotten land. We'll make sure that we will reiterate the need to have financial principles in place to have a better planning process, especially from the financial perspective in the long-term. Regarding the Working Group, the Working Group started in 2008/2009. The latest review of the Charter dates back to 2013. As I wrote, the brave Fellows that are currently Members of the Working Group are those listed in this slide. There are some Members who joined the Working Group in the past couple of years. There are some who've been in the Working Group since the beginning.

It's one of the most valued Working Groups in the ICANN constellation – to get the name of [unclear 00:19:03] of this meeting center – in the sense that we've been mentioned many times. There's a reference to our work in many ICANN documents, and it's something that ICANN has commended on numerous occasions, because the Working Group basically has provided very constructive input and at the end never gave up in underlining what could have been improvements in the process. What is the future of the Working Group?

Basically, during the last meeting, last Sunday, there was an agreement to review the current Membership. Soon the ccNSO Secretariat will send out a message to the Membership, to call the existing Membership to confirm their intention to stay in the group, or if they'd like to step down, as some Members have already stated, then once this process is completed the next step will be to launch a call for next Members. I'm looking at all of you, and maybe you may look to some of your colleagues to be future Members of the Working Group.

What are the requirements? Because we've put up some requirements thanks to this six years of experience. You must be good-looking. I'm kidding. We are all good-looking, but you must be able to dedicate, on average, about six to eight working days per year to read carefully the documents. I must tell you that the first time you go through an ICANN Strategic Plan or Operating Plan document, you have about one hour of completely lost feeling, and you don't know if you have to go to any church to light candles, or you have to pray or resign, but you must again never give up. It's not mission impossible.

We've done it in the past six years and it's an extremely interesting exercise – especially if you approach it with a constructive attitude to make sure that you're doing this in the interest of the community, our community, and you make sure that the right things are in place. As I said, six to eight days on average. This is what we believe is the amount of time needed to invest in the Working Group on a yearly basis. The Working Group so far has met on the Sunday before the ICANN Meeting. They last approximately two hours. The last one lasted a bit longer because we had to discuss the Membership aspects.

You must be proactive also. That's really important. It's not just a name on the chart. It's a commitment to be proactive. Even with a paragraph. You don't need to write a 20-page response to an ICANN Draft Strategy or Operating Plan. Just what you believe should be improved, or eventually what you believe is well done, because it's not only that we provide comments to refinement, but also from time-to-time we make sure that ICANN is praised for the well done work.

As I said, at some point, not only to commit in terms of time, also to be ready to work off business hours, because hopefully it will not be the case in the future, but so far what happened is that the ICANN Strategic and Operating Plan were released with a very short timeframe for comments. Therefore you might be on holiday, you might be having higher business priorities, and so sometimes it's difficult to basically find the time, especially to read the document you're supposed to comment on. So this is the scenario, but again, as I said, it's not mission impossible. On the contrary.

Personally I found it extremely interesting work – for the community but also for yourself – to be more involved and eventually to know more about what ICANN is planning in the future, because it’s really a sort of learning process, to understand what the long-time views are of ICANN. As I said at the beginning of this presentation, ICANN has committed to have this Five-Year Strategic and Operating Plan, so the structure is going to be better in the future. At the end of the membership review and expansion, the plan is that at the meeting in Marrakech to confirm the revised Membership and appoint a new Chairman of this Working Group during the ICANN Meeting in Marrakech.

I’m looking at Bart [unclear 00:24:42] who’s been extremely helpful throughout this six years in helping the Working Group to survive the enormous challenges relating to the last-minute request of comments. Thanks a lot Bart for the work you’ve done to support this Working Group. I don’t know if I’ve missed any step in this future planning for the Working Group. It’s a call for volunteers. It’s also a call for review in the existing Membership, and then a call to be committed to improve the ICANN Strategic Plan process.

I’d like to thank not only my predecessors in this role, but also all the Members of the Working Group, because we’ve created a very-well integrated community and we have been always on the same page and we manage to again provide very valuable input. This is my presentation. The floor is open to any question you may have, and if any of the Working Group Members would like to complement what I said, I’ll be happy – except Debbie I mean. I have Lesley and then I have Debbie.

LESLEY COWLEY:

Thanks Giovanni for that presentation. I was just going to add a bit of color to the comment around financial principles, because I don't know how well that term translates to people. In the session on Sunday the Financial Director of ICANN referred to a principle of balancing income and expenditure. Some of you may well have the same principles. I don't know. It reminded me of discussions I had in my previous role at Nominet around what are the organization's financial principles?

That might be something like what you do with surpluses or profits from gTLD auctions, whether you cross-subsidize one bit of the business from another bit of the business, and particularly around in a cc context the contributions that ccs make to ICANN, whether it's full cost recovery, partial recovery, or a contribution. That's why I think financial principles for ICANN are very important. Certainly I'm very much hoping the Working Group can work to push ICANN to developing its own principles that can be agreed by the community.

GIOVANNI SEPPIA:

Thank you Lesley for the additional clarification. Very much needed, and indeed looking forward to seeing ICANN working on it. Debbie? Not anymore? Anybody else like to ask anything regarding the Working Group or the commitment to volunteer to be part of the Working Group in the future? I can see the line outside the door for possible new Members. Thanks a lot.

BYRON HOLLAND: Thank you very much Giovanni. You in particular, thank you for stepping in to be the Interim Chair. It's been very much appreciated, and I can with all honesty that the Strategic and Operating Plan Meeting this past Sunday with Giovanni as Chair was certainly the most entertaining one. With that, we're right back on schedule. I won't make any Italian jokes about timing. Anyway, thank you very much Giovanni. We now have the IANA update with Kim Davies.

KIM DAVIES: Thanks again for the opportunity to talk to you about what we're doing inside IANA. For those that don't know me, I'm Kim Davies, and I'm going to walk through some of the stuff that's on our mind at the moment. This is one of those rare opportunities probably to see all of the IANA staff, since our offices are about 15km from here. Throughout the week all the IANA staff have been here at the meeting, so I thought it was a good opportunity to show you what they look like. If you see them in the corridors feel free to say hello.

With respect to root management, those that you deal with mostly are Naella, Salina and Paula. Salina and Paula are our core root management staff, and Naella is responsible for supervising all of our transaction processing within IANA. Obviously the whole team is responsible for elements of the service delivery that you receive from us. So if you have any questions or just want to say hello, please feel free. If you identify these people to come up and tell them that you're a customer. What I wanted to talk about mostly today is evolving our registries.

For those that were able to sit in the IANA presentation on Monday morning, we went through a relatively comprehensive overview of what we do. I think particularly in light of the NTIA transition discussions, we want to be clear to the community as best we can on what we do and how we do it, so that informed discussion can happen regarding how oversight of that function might be performed. I think one of the key things that's perhaps not as well understood in the domain name community is the scope of IANA's work.

We manage a very high-profile registry, the root zone registry, but it is one of about 3,000 registries that we maintain. In maintain those, we're obviously trying to provide good customer service to all of our customers. We're trying to look at ways to evolve how we publish those registries. That's one of our key obligations, objectives. Right now the root zone itself is published via the DNS, but the bulk of the registries that we manage, the primary mechanisms of publication are on our website via structured format such as XML, and via WHOIS.

What we're doing as part of planning for future development for IANA registries is really looking at how we present all those registries to the world, and focusing on areas that we can improve. Some of our areas of focus are searchability, being able to find records and registries easily. Filtering and sorting – I'll come back to this in a bit with respect to root zone database, but we have tens of thousands, hundreds of thousands of records in our registries. The ability to quickly find records is something we want to work on further. Aggregation – we have a lot of interrelated registries that are currently separate.

We want to provide additional information and context that links those together. Again, focusing on how people use our registries and how we can better service their need. Providing structured data – I'll get to it in more detail with the root zone as well, but in essence how do we provide all of our data in the most useful format possible? People shouldn't need to drill down through our webpage to find a HTML file to cut and paste it. How do we provide our information in more formats that's more useful for everyone? In particular with root zone management, we often receive requests.

How can we do a bulk download of what the TLDs are? Can we get a list of TLDs and their categories? Can we get a file with a number of TLDs and so on? How can we automate that? How can we get notified when things happen? Stuff like that. Lastly, we're working on developing a set of APIs. We do not have APIs right now that are customer interfaces, but increasingly our customers are becoming more sophisticated. They'd like ways to programmatically connect to IANA and communicate with us in an automated fashion. We're looking at ways to enable that in our systems as well.

To take that general perspective and apply it more specifically to what interests you most, the root zone database, I wanted to just talk about some of the ideas we're researching to apply to the root zone database itself. This is really applying a mixture of the most commonly requested features that we receive, and also a sense of what we think would be the most useful for the community based on the types of enquiries we receive. Obviously we get a lot of customer enquiries asking us questions, and that helps us as staff to formulate a good idea on what we can do to help improve our customer experience.

Right now if you went to the root zone database and looked for IDNs, you'd have a hard time. It's not been specifically designed to support IDNs. It does show the IDNs correctly but they're all listed under the letter "X" because they all start with "XN--" in their ASCII form. So it's not really intuitively designed for those who wish to look up non-ASCII TLDs in the root zone database. Firstly what we'd like to do is add the translation and transliteration of strings. This is information we already have, we simply don't publish it in the database itself.

That would enable you to go through and scroll through different domain registrations, but also know what they meant, how to pronounce them, and so on. We would also add grouping of strings by their script and language, so you could go in and look at "show me all the Chinese language strings", "show me all the Cyrillic script strings" and so on. One thing that I think is of particular note to some in this community is we have a record in the database right now called "Registration data".

This is a bit of a misnomer because it's the date that it was added to the database, which is not necessarily the date it was added to the root zone. A lot of people read this date and think, "That TLD was created and added to the root zone on that day." So what we're looking at doing is finding out if there's a way to add a new record that is an entry into service date, or some other word for that. Basically, when was the date this TLD first existed on the Internet in the root zone? I think this would be responsive to a lot of queries/complaints that we receive that that date does not reflect that meaning.

A labels and new labels – I mentioned before “XN--“. Often the technical community complains to us that we present all of the TLDs in their native form, and as technical people that’s not really useful to them. They want to see “XN--“ and so on. The ability to flip between the two representations. Looking at the taxonomy, dividing it between ccTLDs, gTLDs and so on. One thing that I think we received a lot of requests for, one-on-one, is people often ask us, “Can you tell me what this TLD record looked like a year ago?” or, “Can you tell me the earliest record you have of this TLD?” and so on.

How can we leverage our archive of records to show the history of a particular TLD in the root zone database? That’s relatively easy for the last five to eight years, because in that time we’ve had a fully automatic online system and we have a snapshot of every single change in that time period. But going back further, the records firstly are all paper-based, in ICANN’s early years, so it’s not something we can easily import into a database. We simply don’t have records prior to ICANN’s existence. So will it be absolutely comprehensive? No, but we’d like to talk to you about what would make the most sense there and where to focus our efforts.

I mentioned earlier downloadable exports, particularly with the huge growth of gTLDs. We’re adding new TLDs every week. We’re up to 735 TLDs, off the top of my head, as of this morning. Obviously there’s great public interest in what those TLDs are – tracking them, monitoring them, importing them into systems. We already provide a machine-readable list of TLDs. It’s updated every day. But beyond that, some people want categorization like, “I want a list of gTLDs, not ccTLDs,” and so on. So

expanding our offering in terms of what you can download automatically from us is part of that.

Simply counts of the number of TLDs. I have my little bobble chart in small at the bottom of the slide, but I usually present this at ccNSO meetings. That's an automatically generated chart, so let's automate that onto the website so you can look at it at any time. IETF reserve domains, so there is a small sub-set of domains that are reserved by the IETF that are not in the root zone database. Think of things like .local. These are reserved for special reasons. They don't exist in the DNS, nor will they ever exist, but should we add those to the root zone database so people at least know their purpose, and then provide perhaps a link to the relevant RFC that defines their usage.

Last but definitely not least, the IETF is working on a protocol called RDAP, which is a replacement technology for the WHOIS protocol – another way of delivering WHOIS data to the world using a web API. As a result of this, the drafts are being finalized, but our expectation is that IANA will be expected to add a new field to the root zone database, where you as TLD managers can list your RDAP servers and we publish them in the RFC-prescribed way. We're looking at adding that field to the root zone database.

Switching to a slightly different subject – and this is a carryon from discussions we've had at earlier meetings this year – the contact model that we have at IANA dates back to the 1980s. This concept of having an administrative contact and a technical contact is something that we inherited. We didn't design it as ICANN. It's really been part of the root zone for a while, but the model has aged. In particular, and the primary

driving force behind what I'm about to talk about, is that the contact model requires that we have an admin contact and a tech contact for a TLD, that they both act as authorizers for changes to that TLD, and they be listed as the public contacts for the TLD in the WHOIS.

Now, in practice what we see is that usually a TLD Manager will want to list customer service contacts in their public information, but they want someone of higher authority inside their organization to approve changes. Particularly as TLD registries get larger, those two purposes are at odds with one another. Another factor that is driving the evolution here is the need for stronger authentication controls. The fact that the two people that need to authorize the change for a TLD is published information. Some consider it to be a problem.

Following up from our discussions at the previous meetings, let me just recap the current contact model. For every TLD we manage two contacts. Both of them are listed in the public WHOIS. Both of them are [approved 00:42:55] change requests. We basically do a cross-confirmation process where if you update your TLD with us, we ask the admin and the tech contact to consent to the change, and only when both consent do we proceed. Then lastly, as per RFC 1591, the administrative contact for ccTLDs must be in the country.

Let me rock through this. What we're thinking about – and this is still a work in progress and I'm presenting it for your feedback – is adding a new type of contact; an authorizing contact. So what would happen is that the two existing contacts that we have today would migrate to being public information only contacts. They're listed in the WHOIS. You can update them as you please, but the idea here is you list the

relevant contacts for customer service enquiries that people looking up a WHOIS can find out, if they have a administrative question about the WHOIS, who they contact, and if they have a technical question who they contact.

But that would be distinct from who authorizes change requests for the TLD. The authorizing contact is not published. It's managed via your RDMS portal, so you log into IANA system, you can go in and update who your authorizing contacts are. These contacts are responsible for approving future change requests for your TLD. There would be one or more of these, but no fixed number. Maybe there's just one person in your organization that needs to approve a change. That's okay, we can just list one.

But to take the other extreme, we see requests for this, so this isn't completely hypothetical, some TLDs have a board of five or six people and they've said, "We want every one of these people to sign off on a change." So you could list five or six authorizing contacts and set it so that in order to do a change you need all those parties to agree. Importantly, these must be persons, not role accounts. This will enable us to more accurately establish identity.

One of the operational difficulties we have is if we have a role account on file and no name behind it, how are we to establish who that person is when we need to get an authorization? Particularly in the event for example when an email address has failed or isn't working, how do you establish who's authorized to speak for a department, when there's just a department name listed as a contact? So stronger identity is important, to allow us to have better precision in identifying who can

approve a change request, making the system a lot more secure. It will allow for flexible threshold approval options, and I'll get to that in a moment.

I guess one of the opening questions – indeed there's many – but we know there's this RFC 1591 requirement that the administrative be in-country. With this new model, how would that apply to the authorizing contacts? Would there be any obligation that the authorizers be inside the country or not? I leave that as an open question and I'd appreciate input if you have it. Now, the top of the hour is from the current model to the future model. I just want to highlight that if we were to implement a system like this, we'd need some kind of transition process.

How would we anoint those initial authorizing contacts when we move to the new model? So again, an open question. Logically you'd want to basically split the two and all the existing admin contacts and tech contacts by default become the two authorizing contacts for TLDs. But again, that conflicts with the idea that they all must be people, moving forward. So how would we do that is something we need to think through.

Just a few wireframes. These are mockups to stimulate discussion that we did inside the organization. This is the concept of how it would look to you, as a user. You would be able to log in to RDMS for your TLD and manage your authorizers. You could go in and add new authorizers, remove authorizers and so on. But importantly you could choose your authorization model. You'd be able to choose whether you wanted joint authorization, i.e. every single authorizer you have nominated needs to

approve changes, or you could have some sort of threshold authorization.

You could say for example, “Here is my pool of authorizers.” Maybe you list your board of directors, maybe you list your senior executives, whatever. You say, “I need at least two of these people to consent,” or, “I need at least three of these people to consent.” This means that not everyone needs to respond, but there’s a minimum threshold crossed that makes you comfortable that no one person can do something unexpectedly or untoward.

Now, there’s probably other models that might be useful here. Perhaps if you have a good idea on something that would make sense, we’d be very interested to hear that as well. Based on the feedback we’ve received from what our customers have told us they would like to see, it settles down to these two options – either having a pool of people that everyone must approve, or a pool of people of which a minimum number needs to approve.

I talked a little bit about stronger identity checking. Some of the great things we can do, once we have people rather than roles, as contacts, is we can start doing things like capturing our customer’s cell number so you can get an SMS text to establish your identity, if you forgot your password. Stuff like that is pretty common for bank accounts and other kinds of high security applications. It would provide a better foundation for implementing second-factor authentication – so we can give you a token, you can have an authenticator app on your phone – and whenever you wanted to transact with IANA you would need to use that

uniquely generated code off your phone. That would give an extra level of security that you could opt into for your account.

You could then set options about what level of security you want to have. Do you only require the second factor of authentication for approving change requests, or do you need it for everything? Then everyone can calibrate their security posture based on the risks that they see. To be absolutely honest, some feel that, “Don’t make it too complex, I deal with IANA once every five years and if you make it really complex I’m going to forget everything and when I need to log in I’m not going to be able to.” Everyone will be able to be empowered to make that decision for themselves about how they want to configure their security profile.

In line with this, we’d hope to evolve their web interface so it’s clearer. In particular the focus on this slide would be towards the end, that we could provide a clear description on any pending request. Who needs to respond? Who had responded? Who hasn’t responded? Again, addressing feedback we’ve received that for example who needs to respond to requests is not clear to us, so we want to try to make it as clear as possible.

Everything I talked about requires software development. We’re looking towards getting the development resources to look into how to build this into our software. Obviously we need to develop procedures and so on to support this kind of work as well. This is part of a larger development effort that Fadi mentioned during his opening ceremony speech on Monday, which is that there’s a lot of things happening in the community that’s going to influence how the root zone database is

managed. In particular, there's a root zone key rollover that's anticipated for the next few years.

We also know that whatever the outcome of the NTIA transition discussion is, it's likely to involve some level of software development that needs to be implemented, and process changes that need to be implemented by us. So in order to be ready, I think the main focus of the next six to twelve months is we want to implement a test bed internally where we can develop these ideas, where we can grow our software to support concepts such as this new contact model, support key rollovers, and so on.

I flagged this just because I think particularly as the NTIA transition discussion matures, presumably you want us to be ready as soon as possible, to implement whatever the outcome of the community discussion is. I see that as being a feedback loop between us. Obviously the day after a decision is made about a model, we can't be operationally live if we haven't prepared. So how do we channel the discussions happening in the community into our development cycle, so we have enough time to develop the systems, the processes, the tools, so we can be ready for whatever that new model might look like?

So in closing, just a couple of stat slides. Again, for those that weren't at the IANA Session on Monday, this is an overall look at our annual workload as we compiled it recently. In the past year we did a little over 1,000 domain-related requests. We did five number-related requests. For those that aren't aware, this is assigning IPv4 and IPv6 blocks primarily. Because there isn't really any IPv4 to give out in any significant number, and because IPv6 is so numerous that we don't need

to give out any more than we already have, this is a very low-volume part of our business.

I talked about those almost 3,000 registries that we maintain, the bulk of which are protocol-related registries. For those we did almost 4,000 requests in the last year. Then lastly we did over 1,000 general enquiries. These are enquiries like, “How do I re-delegate a domain?” “What does this mean?” Just the whole gamut. Lastly, we do key-signing ceremonies, as I think most of you are aware. We do four of those per year, and lastly we do two third-party audits of how IANA does its operations. One of those is a DNSSEC audit that’s exclusively based on ensuring that our custodianship of the key-signing material of the DNSSEC is safe, that our processes are followed. That’s done by a third-party auditor.

But the second audit is something we just started doing in the last year, and that’s a so-called SOC 2 audit. This is a more comprehensive audit of IANA’s registry management systems. We have an auditor come in, look at our ticketing system, look at the systems we use to support root zone management. They look at all of our controls, they look at our security configuration, they look at many different aspects, to give us assurance that we’re managing data pertaining to IANA registry as well.

Then lastly, this graph is a compilation of different stats that we publish on our website. None of this is new but this is an abridged version. These are the numbers of requests pertaining to root management for the past year or so. As you can see, we typically get anywhere between 50 to 100 requests per month. We have a bunch of KPIs that we agreed with you as a community back in 2012. In terms of meeting those KPIs, I

think most of the time we meet them 90 to 100 per cent of the time. One factor we're aware of and the community is aware of is the reason why these aren't consistently 100 per cent, and that's that we do have outliers in the root zone management process.

We do have things, for example re-delegations, that take 6-12 months. That's the nature of our business. Part of the trick is drilling down a bit and analyzing the root causes of these. We publish much more comprehensive reports on our website, so you can see this on a ticket-by-ticket basis if you wish. There are underlying reasons that I think are explainable behind some of these numbers. Importantly, the SLAs that we agreed with the community have been consistently met month-to-month. We published the average day end-to-end processing times on our website as well. That's it from me. I'm very happy to talk about anything I've described.

BYRON HOLLAND:

If anybody has any questions for Kim, feel free to ask. Nigel?

NIGEL HICKSON:

Thanks Kim. Very interesting. I'm particularly interested in the wireframe you put up. I have some concerns, and thank you for bringing this to us at this stage so we can perhaps interact with you on this. Probably less and less people in the room these days will remember that some 14 years ago IANA, ICANN, unilaterally changed not just in the case of nomenclature, which was important, but also what you describe as the authorizing model. The authorizing model of ccTLDs up until the year 2000 was not the one that IANA is currently operating.

It was unilaterally changed by ICANN without any benefit of policy, without any benefit of discussion with the community. It just simply happened and we were told we had to lump it. Now, for our own TLD that caused us very few problems because we're a small TLD and getting everybody to agree, in a four-or-five-person organization is a lot easier than getting, as you described, a board of five or six people. I think there's a danger of a fundamental mistake being made here, and I'd encourage you to continue this process of discussion with the community before you spend a lot of money on development and implementation.

I think that if you do that, you get the best of what you're planning, and what we need. The problem is this: today the registrant, as it used to be called in the Internet database, the sponsoring organization, as it was recently called, or the ccTLD Manager as we know it, is usually an organization. It's a legal entity of its own standing, separate from persons. That's why role accounts are useful on occasions. The difficulty here is I see you moving to a model of finding that one person, let's say the technical contact in a remote country that might not even be in that country, can block a transfer or a change of name server.

I think you really need to look very carefully at the authorizing list that you've got accurately representing the legal power of the organization to instruct a change, or more to the point to block a change. I'd be happy to take this offline and discuss it with you in much more detail, with a picture of those wireframes in front of us. I welcome what you're doing, but I think there's a danger here that IANA can once again unilaterally change policy by an implementation method, and I'm slightly concerned about that.

KIM DAVIES:

Thanks for that. I think you've hit the nail on the head in terms of some of the risks and why we're trying as much as possible to empower the TLD Manager themselves to nominate the model that works for them. We're not trying to impose a new paradigm on anyone. If you are happy with joint authorization by an admin and tech contact, this model will allow you to continue that as is. I won't speculate what happened 15 or more years ago, but I think moving forward we want to make our customers happy, and it's really that simple.

Now, what's the precise mechanism by which we refine this model? We discussed this at the last meeting in depth and there was a lot of comments, and I think it was universally positive. We've put a bit more definition on it this time. We're getting to a point where we want to start writing specifications to show to our software developers, to think about how this would be implemented. Now is the time to have that discussion, and I'd appreciate your input and what formality you might think needs to surround that.

Does the community need to buy into it in a formal way? Or is this an operational detail that we can continue working on? I'm happy to be guided on that question by the community. Obviously we want to make progress, so please help us do that.

NIGEL HICKMAN:

I'm not going to speak much longer, but basically it's a danger of being either. If we work together on this, and there's some mechanism where

we can work together on this, we'll get a result that suits you and suits us.

BYRON HOLLAND: Thanks Nigel. I'm going to take one more question from Jay. If we could keep it relatively brief? Or not. I think we'll go to Stephen instead.

STEPHEN: Kim, I commend you and IANA for realizing that enhanced searchability of the website is of paramount importance. As part of my work on the FOI Working Group I found a great deal of frustration with regards to looking things up on that website. I understand that during the course of a review of a revocation delegation request, one of our parties may request confidentiality with respect to their correspondence. I have a couple of questions however with regard to the practice of the ICANN IANA withholding this correspondence, subsequent to the publication of the revocation delegation report – Board approval, etcetera.

I cite specifically .um. You have a lovely report on the website that has a postscript with respect to subsequent correspondence received from the Department of Commerce regarding .um. You quote from it extensively, yet the correspondence itself is simply not there. I have two questions. If you have redacted correspondence during the course of an investigation into a revocation redelegation request, fine, but after the fact when everything is published, you cite from it extensively in your report. Why don't you publish the actual correspondence? That's my first question.

My second question is if you're not going to publish the actual correspondence, which you yourself cite extensively in the report, is there a place on the website where one can go and find, "Okay, we had this correspondence but it was redacted, redacted, redacted," so that one doesn't waste their time looking for it.

KIM DAVIES:

I think the process of publishing redelegation, delegation and related reports is something that's evolved over time. Certainly for the last ten or more years, the process is to publish a distillation as a report. We don't publish an archive of the correspondence that happened in association with that report. I feel that to change the model as it is now in a significant way would touch on what Nigel was referring to earlier – that it would definitely crossover into something more like the policy realm.

I think to make a change in that fashion would need some support from the community that this is the right thing to do, and be thought through quite thoroughly. I don't know if that answers your question, but it's an evolving process. We obviously need to make a lot of changes as a result of the FOI Working Group, in terms of changing the nomenclature we use, in changing some of the processes we use. In line with that we've also already committed publicly that we're going to publicly identify pending delegation transfer requests.

Once we've established the identity of a party and once we've established that it's not a spurious request, our intention is to have a register of pending requests, so that's public information prior to it going to the ICANN Board. Similarly, if there are other changes to the

reporting associated with that, that's something that the community should discuss and we can discuss moving forward, and work out how that should work.

BYRON HOLLAND:

Thanks Kim. Given the timing, Jay, I'm going to have to ask you to take your question offline with Kim. We'll move onto the next segment of our Agenda. Thank you very much Kim. [Applause] I'm sure there are lots of helpful suggestions from our audience here. I'd like to welcome our Board Member. Welcome Chris. We will get going and hope Mike shows up shortly.

CHRIS DISSPAIN:

Good morning everybody. Thank you very much for letting me come and say hi. I saw most of you last night. I left Mike upstairs ten minutes ago and said, "It's at quarter past, it's on the Plaza level, it's on west side," so I've no doubt he'll be here at some point. Speak of the devil. There is our friend. Obviously it's about us answering questions or listening to what you have to say. I'm happy to say a few things but I'll let you guys go first, if you've got specific questions or topics that you want us to talk to or about. We'd be happy to do that. No doubt you've been saving these up for most of the week, or possibly not.

It's come to a pretty pass if the ccNSO doesn't have any questions to ask the representatives on the Board, apart from Nigel. Do you want to ask something Nigel? We are clearly doing a good job.

NIGEL HICKSON:

Nice to see you both here. Congratulations to Mike on your election unopposed back to the Board from the ccNSO. It's on that subject, although a little bit more esoteric and removed from that. Obviously we're very happy with our two Board Members, clearly, as you're elected unopposed each time. So I'm not talking about any political ambitions I might have here, because I'm just on Council and I'm not thinking of running for the Board. However I've got a question for you and a suggestion, and it's something I've vaguely mentioned to one of you before.

There'll be a time when both of you become term-limited, so no matter how much we want to keep putting you back into the lion's den, the ICANN bylaws won't let us. Being on the ICANN Board is a lot more work, a lot more involved than it probably was 10 or 15 years ago. Would it be possible for one or both of you to take an understudy or three from the community and give them a bit of an idea of what current Board work is like? So that when the time comes that we then have a pool of three or four candidates who actually know what being on the ICANN Board is, and perhaps don't run for election, get elected unopposed and then find, "Oh my God, what have I got myself into?"

CHRIS DISSPAIN:

Nigel, thank you. That's actually completely aligned with what we're currently doing on the Board with new Board Members who arrive. We're trying to find a methodology for helping them get up to speed and also working on a way of getting a clear understanding of people's first three-year term and how they progress through the Board. For example the Committee slates – there's not a complete rule but a rule that if

you're in your first year you're on one Committee. You can go to all the others and watch, and in fact you're encouraged to do so, but you're on one and so on.

So yes, I think that it would be a fine idea to do that. I suppose you could do it on a self-select basis. You could run a session as a side-bar at some point in the week, for those interested, and just talk about the workload and the Board and so on and so forth, rather than specific topics. Just talk about the overarching way that it works. Happy to take that on board and see where we get to.

MIKE SILBER:

Look, Nigel, it's a pity you weren't there yesterday because I made exactly that offer, because I am term-limited at the end of my term, and I've made the comment and I'll make it again, that if any of you are interested in potentially standing, if you'd like to understand the time, effort, range of topics, skillsets required, please feel free either publicly or privately to contact myself or Chris, either or both of us. If you're concerned about confidentiality and perceived political ambitions, let us know. We'd be more than happy. Because I am term-limited it has no impact to mentor somebody, because I think it would be very useful to have at least one, if not a pool, of candidates.

One of the frustrations I've had in this round of selection is that having asked informally there was nobody who put up their hand and said, "I'm interested." I asked some people quite hard if they'd be interested, because after five years I think it's time. I'm not going to claim it was under protest, but I would have been very eager for some new blood on

the Board, and next time around there has to be. I would encourage the community to start thinking about it.

If it's not you – and this is the critical thing, if you think from my perspective – while Chris is a cc Manager who's been in this community, actively involved, I'm a slight outsider to this community but fortunately – and thank you – trusted enough to carry the mantel of the ccNSO forward onto the Board. But I'm not an active cc Manager myself, which means there may be people who are sitting on your boards, who are involved in your local community who you think are appropriate, but it's not necessarily you.

You may be looking at this going, "I've got a day job, I can't devote the time and effort to the ICANN Board," but there may be somebody back in your community who is right, and if they're not a day-to-day participant in ICANN then drag them to a meeting that's convenient, let them start working with Chris and I to get an idea that this really is of interest to them.

JAY DALEY:

Thanks. Jay Daley from .nz. There was an interesting moment in yesterday's Registrar Board Session, where Elliot from Tucows made some comments about ccTLDs not being under contract and gTLDs being their major contributors. Thank you Chris for quite how strongly you objected to that. I'm wondering whether there is a general feeling, that we're not particularly aware of, of people who would like to see the ccs under contract, or who believe that ccs not being under contract is an anomaly that needs to be fixed?

CHRIS DISSPAIN: No, basically. There are people who complain about the ccTLDs' financial contribution. We get this room, we get these facilities, and we pay what we pay. I think going through the process that we've been through with ICANN to get to the point that we've got to with finance, that's taken the wind out of that argument's sails. I haven't heard a single sensible person argue that ccTLDs should be under contract. I'm sure there are some government people who might think that, but certainly not generally speaking.

MIKE SILBER: Government people?

CHRIS DISSPAIN: Yes.

MIKE SILBER: Under contract of the government rather than...?

CHRIS DISSPAIN: Probably, true. No, no, that's not true. There are some governments who want their ccTLD to have a contract with ICANN. There is a lack of awareness about the accountability frameworks. People don't realize they're there. Almost all of them actually make a very clear statement that, "I, the signer of this accountability framework recognize ICANN is the right place for all this stuff to happen," and so on. Is it legally

binding? Of course it isn't, but it's not legally binding if you put it in a contract either.

I think a bit of an awareness lifting of the fact that something like 75 or maybe more ccTLDs, if you add in the anomalies like us with actual contracts, it comes up to something like 80 ccTLDs who actually do have exchange of letter, whatever you want to call it, with ICANN. I think that's a very good thing. But no Jay. I don't believe that there is a push anywhere for contracts.

JAY DALEY:

Okay. Can I have a follow up? In the awareness piece that you're talking about, do you think that we need to be doing more to raise the alternative model or models that we represent for Internet governance and for accountability, so that that perhaps influences some of the thoughts that go into the development of gTLD contracts and gTLD accountability and compliance mechanisms?

MIKE SILBER:

It's an interesting question you're raising. Personally I think yes, absolutely. We need to be publicizing the work that we're doing – in ICANN, outside of ICANN, in our communities – and the fact that this DNS industry is not just a gTLD business. For example there are many ccTLDs that are bigger than all but the biggest gTLDs, and many people just gloss over that section in the state of the domain industry report. There is of course the risk that some people in this room fear that if we make ourselves too public and publicize what we do too much, then there are going to be people who are going to want to put their fingers

in here, rather just keep it quiet, and let us carry on doing what we're doing.

I'm not one of that school of thought, and I think it would be fantastic if the ccNSO, as a grouping, were to embark on a publicity campaign to show, "This is what we do, and by the way guys we've got more domains than you have so shut up."

CHRIS DISSPAIN: We'll put it exactly that way. Lesley?

LESLEY COWLEY: I wanted to draw your attention to a conversation we had at the SOP Working Group on Sunday. We've briefed ccTLDs on it. We had a moment where we realized that ICANN has not yet got financial principles. We stumbled across a financial principle of balancing income and expenditure, which is familiar to a number of us. I think through the SOP it's very likely we'll be raising the issue of a conversation about the longer-term financial strategy and financial principles. I just wanted to float that so you are aware, but also to ensure that through you the Board will be aware.

CHRIS DISSPAIN: Thanks Lesley. I think I understand. You said there should be a principle of balancing income and expenditure?

LESLEY COWLEY: No. Xavier expressed a principle of balancing income and expenditure, and I don't think we've ever heard, "These are the following financial principles of ICANN."

CHRIS DISSPAIN: I see. So someone from ICANN said we have a principle that balances income with expenditure, but there isn't a document that says, "These are our financial principles." Coming back to us on that is great. I don't imagine they meant capital F, capital P. I suspect they were just using words, but nonetheless it's a valid point. You know we're going to publish a Five-Year OP and we've worked extremely hard to rejig the budgeting cycle so we can try and get everything done. A small number have people have said to us even May isn't early enough now.

You get to a point eventually where you think, "When do you want to do it then?" There is a significant amount of work to do to get these things done. We're reaching a point now where we may have got to a point where, if we're able to pull it off this year, where we really are not able to go much further back. We're getting pushback now that there are too many comment periods. It's amazing how eventually you achieve balance but sometimes the seesaw has to keep moving until you get there. Did anyone else have a question before I weigh in with what I wanted to say?

I have a couple of things I just want to talk about, and I'm sure Mike will have some stuff now. Who was in the GAC yesterday with the Board? What you missed was a concerted and I believe planned effort by a number of countries to derail the transition process. They would never say that, but I'm giving you my personal opinion. It was like going back

to 2003 in the GAC. We had Brazil, Indonesia, China and Iran all saying, “There has to be a new international organization,” and this sits both in the accountability and the IANA piece. They will simply not sign off on this without substantial and major changes to the foundations of ICANN.

A lot of this may be grandstanding, the Plenipot is coming, etcetera. What they also did was start talking in terms of, “You will not get this done unless you do what we say.” What that brought home for me was I’ve heard that from pretty much everyone over the last six month – cc’s, registrars, registries, the NCSG – people saying, “We won’t sign off on this unless you give us what we want.” What I wanted to try and say to everybody is, “Guys, can we please just concentrate on working in partnership to get this done.” Or not. If we say we don’t want it to happen, that’s fine.

Let’s say we don’t want it to happen. But if we try and use this process as a grab-bag to get every little thing we’ve been saying we want – just as a simple example, if cc’s were saying, “We’ve been asking for a totally automated process since God was a boy, and unless you give us it we’ll not sign off on this,” we’ll never get this done. I think Keith’s idea of having a list of things that we want to talk about in the future and having an agreement with ICANN that they will be talked about in the future, and a process for doing that, is a very useful way forward.

The more we throw into this process and insist it’s done between now and September, the less likely we are to have this happen. I acknowledge there are some people who don’t want it to happen and that’s perfectly fine. I want to ask us to think about that. The other thing I wanted to say, which I kind of said yesterday when you came to

see the Board, was, “I’m concerned that the pure cc piece of this, which in my mind is the appeals mechanism that sits above a decision to revoke and delegate is the one piece we need to be comfortable with and we don’t seem to have started working on that yet, and that concerns me hugely.

I’ve heard ideas being floated – a Committee of Wise Elders – all of which sounds perfectly fine. If you’re concerned that with the USG going out of the game we should put in something to be the last gasp stop, then you need to work out what that is. That’s unique to us. The CCWG isn’t going to do that, neither is the ICG. We have to do that. We have to come up with something acceptable to all us, even if only temporarily acceptable to all of us, and get it crafted as a paper so it can go up and be included in the deal.

Otherwise you’re going to miss out on that opportunity. It’s great we’ve been working out who should sit on which accountability Working Group and who on the ICG and how many people – that’s all cool – but we also need to do some real work on that particular part. Otherwise we’re going to miss the boat. Thanks.

MIKE SILBER: I think Chris has presented a very powerful statement and one that resonates significantly with me.

BYRON HOLLAND: Any other questions or comments for Chris or Mike? Jay?

JAY DALEY: Thanks. You mentioned Chris that you've had some pushback about the number of consultations running simultaneously and things?

CHRIS DISSPAIN: I was speaking specifically on the proposed ones for the financial ones but it's a general point as well.

JAY DALEY: Where do you think the line should be drawn between ICANN developing and setting the rules and processes around which consultations take place, and where the community should set out, define those rules and ask ICANN to operate to those?

CHRIS DISSPAIN: I'm going to answer that question in a slightly roundabout way, but I'll get there. Yesterday in the Board NCSG Meeting someone, Bill Drake I think, asked the Board if they thought that the accountability events that have taken place over the last few months, leading to the current proposal, was a good example of the multistakeholder model? I said yes, because it shows that we made a mistake, we got pushback and we fixed it. Is it perfect? No. But nonetheless we did all of those things, so I think that's a good example of the multistakeholder model.

Then we started talking about how much work had to go into that and if we hadn't made the mistake in the first place we wouldn't have had to do all that work, and I get all of that. If you look at it, what it revolves around is public comment. One of the claims, quite rightly, is that we didn't put the second iteration out for public comment. The balancing

act Board and staff had to do is how many times and how much do you keep going backwards and forwards?

I think that it goes back to us saying to Lesley about the seesaw. Now we're getting pushback from saying we've having too many public comments. The danger there is that we then don't have public comments on stuff and then we end up getting pushback. I think we have to accept that this is the way this model is going to work. Eventually it will teeter to a standstill and then something will happen to make it tip again. I'm not sure I've answered your question.

JAY DALEY:

I'm suggesting there might actually be a different model, which is that rather than ICANN do some work, produce a proposal and then we comment on it, that ICANN waits and that we in the community get together, draw up the proposal and put it out, and comment takes place that way. Perhaps for some elements of things we do, there is an urgency requirement and maybe you can't wait, but I don't necessarily see an assessment being made on a case-by-case basis as to whether that urgency requirement exists.

MIKE SILBER:

I think you raise an excellent point. Part of the concern over here is what I could maybe call first maneuver advantage. You're right – the typical model in ICANN is to put out the straw man for comment and then the community gets really upset because sometimes they don't realize it's a straw man and we don't do a good enough job communicating what the actual purpose of the document is –is it a

straw man proposal for you to respond to or is it our actual plan for implementation and if you don't object vehemently to this in the next 30 days it's going to be implemented exactly as per the document.

I think ICANN doesn't do a good enough job, as an organization, in communicating what the purpose of some of the documents and proposals are. The other one is waiting for things to develop out of a groundswell in the community and the ability of the community, for example the ccNSO, to put up a straw man proposal for the rest of the community to interact and engage with. We don't have a clear enough process that would allow you to do what the staff does; which is prepare something, put it out for comment and see where it goes. I think that is a deficit in our current system.

It's going to be difficult to try to introduce that while the parts are moving and the wheels are running, but I think you're right and I think we have to find a way of introducing it. It doesn't have to be now, but we have to find a way where the community can create a proposal that can go up as a straw man for others to respond to before it has to go to Board and staff for some degree of approval or imprimatur before it then can come as an ICANN proposal. That's something I think would be very valuable to have some work on and to share some ideas on.

CHRIS DISSPAIN:

Just to finish that off from my point of view, and I agree with everything Mike said, the closest thing we currently have to it is the ALAC's Whitepapers. The produce a number of Whitepapers and part of their frustration I think is that they just produce these Whitepapers and there isn't anything that seems to happen with them. But that's a starting

point, so at least we've got an example we can point to and say, "Let's work out how we make those up."

JAY DALEY: In the same way Lesley's noted an absence of financial principles, I'd suggest there may also be a lack of consultation principles or policy development principles that would set this out clearly for us, that says the community should be the source of these things, there's an urgency over requirement that takes place at times, there's a need for straw men to galvanize the community if the community can't do it. Those things.

CHRIS DISSPAIN: You're right. What you're pointing to is there are obviously policy development principles for the cc's, for the g's. What you're pointing to is the lack of anything that looks at cross-community policy, which of course is what the shape of ICANN, the accountability of ICANN is about. That's why we've had such a struggle with this accountability piece to try to figure out how to deal with it, because there really are no precedents other than cross-community working groups, which have never set policy. All they've ever done is get together and talk about stuff.

MIKE SILBER: Chris, I think it goes beyond it. Apologies, from an Anglo Saxon parliamentary perspective there is a difference between a Green Paper and a Whitepaper. A Green Paper is an idea that's thrown out for people to respond to, that sets a clear idea of where they'd like to go, but it's not the direct instrument. The Whitepaper is the draft legislation and the specific policy around it for implementation. I think whether we

use Green and White or some other terminology, I think what we're talking about is the difference between a Policy with a big P, which has been developed through a PDP, and a proposal for interaction and engagement, which is useful...

The other thing Chris, if you look at the amount of time involved in a PDP to derive a formal policy, it's not agile enough for some of what Jay's talking about. I think that notion to try and see if a proposal has legs before you then tell staff or ICANN instructs staff to spend the time taking the proposal and developing it into something more formal... If the community's going to reject it immediately, don't do that, but if there's a general groundswell of support then we know where to focus attention. I think that's a very useful suggestion.

BYRON HOLLAND:

Thank you. Any other comments or questions for Chris or Mike? Thank you gentlemen. [Applause] It's now the coffee break, which we're a few minutes behind on. Let's regroup back here at 11:05. I'll give you the 15 minutes. 11:05.

[Tape change to ccNSO-members-2-15Oct14-en]

KATRINA SATAKI:

Patrick, please join us here at the table. Today's ccTLD News Session will start with a presentation from .pt, Portugal, with a very intriguing title: "Implementing a multistakeholder model at .pt." As you'll all know, Winston Churchill once said that democracy's the worst form of

government, except for all the others. I think if he lived in our days he'd say multistakeholderism is the worst form of governance except for all the others. I'm really interested to know how .pt succeeded in implementing the model. The floor is yours Marta.

MARTA MORERIA DIAS:

Okay. Thank you. Hi everyone. It's a pleasure for me to be here and to have this opportunity to talk about the implementation of the multistakeholder model in .pt, in our registry. Let's start. Here's our story. From 1988 to 2013 FCCN was national registry for .pt. FCCN was a private foundation and the private foundation managed the .pt and was also responsible for the management of the national education network. At the beginning of 2013, as you can see, DNS was separated from FCCN when the latter was integrated in the public [unclear 00:04:00].

That public [unclear] is FCT. FCT is a foundation as well, but it's an institution that's part of the structure of the Ministry of Education in Portugal. The model was initially proposed by the Portuguese Government, simply to reduce the management of the .pt to one player; that institution I was talking about, FCT. This caused as you can imagine a wide-spread buzz in the community, and the community felt obliged to openly state that we didn't agree with the model that was proposed by the Portuguese Government who simply reduced the management of the TLD to one player, the Portuguese Government.

In other words, by that time, we struggled to achieve a model that would allow us to manage .pt in a flexible and participative and efficient way. In the end we did set up with a not-for-profit association, which is

DNS.pt, and the delegation made by IANA to FCCN in 1988 was transferred to this association. We used to say that it was an opportunity to make a dream come true and to create a new, independent and multistakeholder association where everybody could have a voice.

It's again the idea of the dream come true in a few months, so looking back here's the timeline that we used to present. In February 2013 the Portuguese Government is pursued after the importance of keeping .pt private and independent. In March 2013 we invited the Internet community and technical community to join this project. In April of the same year the law that guarantees the independence of .pt was published, so in May we had the formal constitution of the association and we started our [unclear 00:06:28] in June.

At that time, as nowadays, it was important to have the public acceptance. For instance in June 2013 we had the EURODIG Event in Lisbon and we organized a parallel event there. Fadi was invited to join the event and he was very supportive about our model. We'll come back to that as I've lost my slides. Who are we? Those are the founders of the association – the Portuguese Association for Consumer Protection. First, ACEPI, which is the Portuguese Association of Electronic Commerce and Interactive Advertising. This association also represents the registrars in Portugal and the ISPs. Then the third one. That institution that I was talking about represents the Portuguese Government.

This is our structure, our organizational chart, which gathers the government, the registrars, the ISPs and the consumers as well. We

have an Advisor Council as well. A special note to them. This Council has several key stakeholders. What I mean by key stakeholders are several representatives of trademarks, companies, lawyers, engineers, authors, Internet security and so on. This gathers a huge representation of the Internet community in Portugal. Again, we used to say that now everybody has a voice here. The founders of the associations are represented on the Board of Directors, and the Members of the Advisory Council advise, support and participate in the definition of the strategy of .pt.

The proposal of the association is to manage, operate and maintain the top-level domain. Thereby of course complying with the law, with the principles of transparency, complicity, the statutes and so on. It's a clear mission I suppose. This is our team. At the moment we're only 14. You can see this was a team that came from FCCN. Everybody came and joined this new institution. Reactions. Looking back again and trying to understand what the reactions and impacts were of this change. The registrants did not feel the difference. The service didn't have any interruptions and had remained operational, so it was okay for that.

The registrars as well they welcomed the change, and kept the service as before. All the providers maintained the conditions of the contracts that we had previously with FCCN. Our employees, as I told you, chose to change and are still excited about this new challenge. How are we today? As from at least September, our total number of registrants stood at almost 700,000, so for Portugal we have 10 million people so it's not that bad. We have 150 registrars working with us and as you can see, the registration has continued to grow, as in the past year. The final note here is that looking at the last information that CENTR reported to

us, .pt recorded the highest net growth over the 12 previous months, at around 15 per cent, which is good as well.

I chose this final topic that I'd like to highlight here. As of November 3rd it will be possible to register two-character domains at .pt. I do apologize. I brought you this picture. This picture is in Portuguese. It's part of the campaign we just launched. It's a play on words. It means that, "[Bed] your former or ex-boyfriend and keep him forever, because now it will be possible to register www.x.pt," so it's a play on words. Last but not least, I end my presentation with this short video. We produced this video for the CENTR awards. We were nominated for the CENTR awards. We didn't win but we were happy with it. I'm sure that this film must be the most interesting part of my presentation. I hope you enjoy it, and thank you for your attention. Okay.

[Video plays]

VIDEO COMMENTATOR: There is a little country called Portugal that despite its size has a very long history of discoveries and conquests. The Portuguese people were always brave and determined and its adventurous spirit remains today. At the beginning of 2013 the former .pt registry, FCCN, merged with a public entity, FCT. The model that was initially proposed by the Portuguese Government simply reduced the management of the .pt to one player. We've struggled to achieve a model that allows it to be managed in a flexible, participative and efficient way.

Thus we managed to present a private association, DNS.pt, and developed a new model, multistakeholder, which gathers the government, registrars and ISPs and the consumers. DNS.pt is a joint effort to best serve the Internet and the Portuguese people. We count on FCT.

VIDEO SPEAKER: This new multistakeholder governance and membership model is more efficient and flexible.

VIDEO COMMENTATOR: We count on ASEPI.

VIDEO SPEAKER: As .pt makes its move from government-only control to a multistakeholder governance model, ASEPI is proud to be part of this new chapter.

VIDEO COMMENTATOR: We count on [dego 00:14:04].

VIDEO SPEAKER: DNS.pt is acting as a [dego] potential stakeholders and key players and [unclear].

VIDEO COMMENTATOR: And we count on the Internet community.

VIDEO SPEAKER: We had a dream and that dream became true – a new independent and multistakeholder governance model for .pt.

VIDEO COMMENTATOR: The world believes in us.

VIDEO – FADI CHEHADÉ: It's that you make sure multiple stakeholders are part of the DNS.pt organization, that this is not only government, that it's not only business, that everybody has a voice. They will come, they will contribute their input to the table, and I will watch DNS.pt closely.

VIDEO COMMENTATOR: We believe too. Join our waves as [Magnumara 00:15:33] does and experience an adventure at .pt.

[End of video]

KATRINA SATAKI: Thank you very much Marta. I always watch this [wave] with horror, but now I watch it and I thought, “Well, it reminds me of our ccTLD community trying to solve the issue around IANA stewardship transition.” So any questions? No questions? I have a question. Fadi promised to watch you closely. How does it work?

MARTA MORERIA DIAS: What do you mean? The fact that Fadi wants to watch us closely?

KATRINA SATAKI: In the movie he said, “I will watch very closely.”

MARTA MORERIA DIAS: I don’t know. You’ll have to ask him.

KATRINA SATAKI: Okay, so you don’t feel like you’re being watched. That’s good. Of course it’s quite clear that in tyranny you can operate in a more efficient and quicker way. Are you still happy with your choice?

MARTA MORERIA DIAS: Yes. Well, we just celebrated one year of activity as a separate entity. We believe it’s still a challenge for us, because for the past 25 years we’ve had FCCN on our back. I can say that. We had a huge team that worked for FCCN and at the same time for the registry. We used to say that we are alone there. We had a team of 80 persons and now we are 14. We need to manage it along, so it’s still a challenge for us but it’s been good because we had the support of the community and the registrars at the beginning.

We thought it could be kind of strange to have the registrars with us, providing their opinions, being in the Board, being represented in the Board. Now we believe that they used to bring us good opinions, good feedback from the community, and we feel that we are closer to the community than before, so that is a good point.

KATRINA SATAKI: Haven't you noticed any of the parties trying to take over? In a multistakeholder model you must listen to others and take into account not only your position. You don't sense that?

MARTA MORERIA DIAS: For now, yes. For now our experience outside, yes. It's been working very well and we work together in a very efficient way. We hear each other, we get the opinions among the community and for the moment it's been quite interesting to share experience and knowledge, but for the moment.

KATRINA SATAKI: It would be interesting to hear an update in a year or two. We have a question.

CARLOS: Hi. I'm Carlos from NIC Argentina. When you have to make specific decisions about something, how do you board it? You have to take votes? In which way do you do it?

MARTA MORERIA DIAS: Do you mean the strategic decisions for instance? Well, we have a Board where all the stakeholders are represented, and they're all free to give their opinions and to share ideas and to try to convince the other Members of the Board of the good way to follow. It's like in a common Board.

CARLOS: It has to be unanimous?

MARTA MORERIA DIAS: Yes, yes it is.

KATRINA SATAKI: We have one more question.

[SIHU]: I'm [Sihu 00:20:44] from .ng, Nigeria. You said that DNS.pt is private and independent. How do you fund it? Do you have government funding, since you are just starting? How do you fund the registry?

MARTA MORERIA DIAS: The funding of the registry, the registration of the domains are paid.

[SIHU]: So it's purely independent, that's all?

MARTA MORERIA DIAS: Yes, completely independent, in all senses.

[SIHU]: Great. Well done.

KATRINA SATAKI: Thank you very much. [Applause] Our next presentation we have from regional organizations, and Patrick Myles will give an update on a survey ran by four of the regional organizations regarding national legislation and how 70 ccTLDs who took part in the survey responded and how they interact. Patrick, maybe you could start with a brief introduction?

PATRICK MYLES: Okay. We don't have the slides up yet. Good morning everybody. My name's Patrick Myles. For those that don't know me, I'm usually involved in the cc community quite a lot but I'm not often in the ccNSO at an ICANN Meeting. Today I'm going to replace the usual RO presentations that CENTR, APTLD, LACTLD, and AFTLD provide in giving updates to their regions. Instead I'm going to give a little overview of this survey that we took a few months ago between the ROs, called ccTLDs and National Legislation.

It's going to be about numbers. There aren't going to be big waves like the Portugal presentation. It will be a bit dry, but hopefully it will provide some interesting topic for you to discuss and maybe lead to something else. What the survey looked at was essentially three areas. They were the legal structure of ccTLDs across the globe, the extent to which those ccTLDs are affected by their national legislations, and in contrast to that to their involvement in ICANN and how ICANN policy might affect them. The survey also looked at local presence requirements for ccTLDs and how ccTLDs interact with their governments.

We thought it might give some insight. I came in a bit late to the last session with the Board but it seems that if there is some marketing of

ccTLDs or pumping up of the notion of ccTLDs in the ICANN world, maybe some of this data might become a bit interesting over time. Hopefully it gives you something to think about. As I mentioned, it was initiated by the ROs AFTLD, APTLD, CENTR for Europe, and LACTLD. The survey ran between July and September this year and it received 76 responses from ccTLD operators across those organizations, including these ones.

Thanks to everybody who did respond to that survey. It was very encouraging to receive all those responses. We haven't done too many global collaborative surveys like this where we've asked the same questions to all the ccTLDs that we could get to, so it was a good indication of interest level and hopefully we can see this again. One of the early questions in the survey related to the legal structure of ccTLD operators. There you can see what the situation is. In blue you have the private sector ccTLDs, which is most of them. You have associations, foundations, cooperatives and private companies.

Then you have a small percentage that are linked to the government, or they're the regulator or they're state-owned, and then you have another distinction of academic institutions. So it gives a bit of context about what kind of community the ccTLDs are, as far as how our legal structures are formed. Onto the question of local presence, we asked the question of what kind of local presence requirements you require of your registrants. We found that about half of ccTLDs have at least some form of local presence requirements that they put on their registrants to be within the country.

In most cases that involves a postal address of one of the admin, billing or tech contacts. As you can see, it's about half and half in most ccTLDs, but it does vary across the different regions. This slide talks a bit about an article that was recently in Circle ID, giving a bit of focus to location being brought back as something that's a bit more in the spotlight, because of the gTLDs and particularly the geo TLDs, because they're coming about it's maybe a bit interesting that they might be a little aligned to ccTLDs in their nature of being geographic. So it's interesting to keep these in mind.

There it talks about some principles about adjacency, isolation and resistance, and resistance relates a little bit to local presence as it means what the article is suggesting is that the larger the distance to the store the less likely the consumers are to shop there. Signaling some form of local presence might have some sort of value. CcTLDs intrinsically have a local presence aspect to them in that they're country codes, but having the balance between more or less local presence requirements might be something to think about and look at how other cc's are managing in that area.

This slide talks about the basis for carrying out the ccTLDs. We asked the question, "What do you consider the basis to be for carrying out your ccTLD?" and we gave a range of choices, a lot being related to government things like national legislation or decrees or some sort of agreement with your government, or ICANN-related stuff. So do you have an MOU? Do you have a contract? Do you have an exchange of letters? So that's interesting, considering the last conversation about what Chris Disspain was saying about an exchange of letters. We did

notice there was a lot of people with exchange of letters, but whether that's binding or what the implications are of that is another question.

The survey found that 54 per cent base, at least in some parts, the reason why they carry out the ccTLD on some form of government-related instrument such as a national legislation or a contract with a government or some sort of a directive. 69 per cent, a greater percentage, have some sort of involvement with ICANN, whether that be a contract, an MOU or an accountability framework. From what I understand, an accountability framework is something that's not perhaps fully understood. Then of course some people, just based purely on their original letters from Jon Postel...

KATRINA SATAKI:

Patrick, sorry, please bear in mind that not everyone is a native English speaker.

PATRICK MYLES:

Sorry, I'm speaking a little quickly maybe. Sorry. I'll speak a bit slower. This slide breaks down the previous slide, what I was talking about with if you're in the government, linked with the government, or have some sort of arrangement with ICANN. The government is on the left there. There's about 27 per cent of ccTLDs who only base something on a link with their government, whether it be a legislation or a government contract or whatever. There's a larger percent who page their reason to be with some sort of ICANN agreement. I'll go into that in a minute. Then there's a lot of people in the middle.

It gives you an idea of the break-up of how ccTLDs are defining themselves. Again, this just goes a little bit further into what type of government relation or the scope of the instrument that's being used. In this case we broke it down into service policies, reporting requirements and accountabilities, tender and financial status. There are different kinds of reporting requirements there, and that gives a bit of an idea of who has to do what. Again, as you see, the 28 per cent is a lower percentage of people who have these sorts of requirements.

That again breaks it down even further, talking about who's got what kind of instrument influencing them. As you can see in the green ones down below, the exchange of letters is the most type of common situation that ccTLDs have with ICANN. From all accounts it's a pretty low on its binding requirements. This is a separate question asked: "Where is the ccTLD explicitly mentioned?" We set a range of choices from operating agreements to legislations to trade agreements, special taxes, critical infrastructure agreements. As you see, the numbers are relatively low, although around 60 per cent have some sort of situation where their ccTLD is mentioned somewhere.

Most of the time it's an operating agreement and then enabling legislations and decrees and things. It might be interesting to know, I was talking to a member that the next question might be I wonder how many provisions in these legislations or agreements allow for the governments to come in and re-tender the ccTLD or take it back for whatever reason. That might be the next interesting thing to know, so it's something to think about. We broke it down by category and we talk here about what type of ccTLDs are within each of those categories. In

enabling legislation, most of those ccTLDs are actually the government agency or their regulator.

In terms of trade agreements there aren't too many of them. They're usually in academic institutions. Again, here we run always in the problem of definitions as well. So what do you consider to be some sort of trade agreement, and even in operating agreements. In operating agreements we found most ccTLDs are actually in private sector organizations. Again, keep in mind that the numbers are relatively low here. The next question we asked was how the ccTLD are communicating with their government. It was found that most people are very informal with the way that they talk to their government.

They don't consider to be too formal in their relationship, but they do have informal meetings and calls. This doesn't seem to change if you're a private or public company. There you said 78 per cent for private ccTLDs and 77 per cent for public ccTLDs. The most common form of engagement with their government is actually just informal meetings and informal calls and chats. We also asked some questions about their interaction with the GAC representative of their country. Half ccTLDs stated that their interaction with the GAC is considered frequent, and a further 22 per cent consider it to be sometimes.

There was another question about, "Do you have some sort of Internet caucus of a group of politicians from either side of your government that have a keen interest in Internet topics?" This was not a particular easy question to answer, perhaps, but it was considered not a whole lot of interest from their governments in Internet-related issues there, or they don't know about it at least anyway. In summary, just over the slides we

just went through, to give you an overview of everything, the most ccTLDs are in the private sector. About half of them have some sort of local presence requirements, so generally, ccTLDs were considering to be relatively autonomous and with limited interference from government.

Then it goes a bit more into that about half of them have some sort of situation where the ccTLD is linked to a government legislation for its reason for carrying out the ccTLD, and then a lot more have ICANN agreements and MOUs and exchanges of letter. What we're thinking about with that survey is that first of all it's going to be available in the four regions, so each of the ccTLDs will have a report on their particular region, drilling down into a little bit more detail about who's doing what in their region.

We're offering the possibility to extend an invitation into if you'd like us to dig a bit deeper into one of these topics from the survey, we have a platform now. We're talking pretty well amongst the regional organizations and we have some data-sharing agreements going on, so we can do a bit of work there for you. As you see, we had 76 responses for this survey, so it's an encouraging thing to have happened, and we hope it continues.

If there's something in that survey that can help you or your business, or generally the broader ccTLD community inform some sort of decisions or their discussions you might have with IANA transition, for example, or whatever else, the information is there. Most of you have it at your disposal. That concludes the presentation. Thank you.

KATRINA SATAKI:

Thank you very much Patrick. Any questions? If not, thank you very much Patrick. Now we move to our next presenter. According to the list, Dave? Nowadays, most of us notice that there's a slowdown in the growth of our domain names. Therefore more and more registries are looking into ways to diversify their risks and services and offer new possibilities to their customers, or just try to improve the cash flow basically. .ca will tell us more about services they're developing and how they're dealing with these issues.

DAVE CHISWELL:

Thank you Katrina. About 18 months ago the Board of Directors at CIRA, together with the energetic team that work there, came up with a strategy document that said, "Our three-year vision is to move beyond just running the .ca registry, and that is what is our job number one, safe, stable, secure, but also start exploring, developing and launching new products." The next couple of slides is a quick summary of the lessons learnt over the last 18 months and some of the activities that we've done inside our hallways.

The world of a cc registry is a good one, yet it's maybe somewhat of a simple one in that there's a highly-skilled group of individuals that focus on IT and operations. There's [unclear 00:39:33] set of [channel] partners that we all meet with on a regular basis at ICANN Meetings and other meetings, and the relationships have been established and they go beyond business – they're also personal. We have some experts in compliancy and policy, in running the cc. It's a very complicated world of who registers names and the life cycle associated with those names. Compliance and policy definitely reigns supreme.

Typically there's one product – your country domain name. There's one price, sold on an annual or multi-year basis, and it's a universe that's very familiar and known. That was certainly the case at .ca, and when we started looking at other services that we could provide, we looked at them across three areas. Registry extensions – these were things inside our strike zone that we could easily roll out. Other cc's or other gTLD registries were doing them as well, so there's a known implementation model.

Examples of that would be a registry lock product, which I know many people in the room here have looked at and/or have completed. Maybe a name-spinning engine so that registrars could offer alternative cc names or .ca names when the name that they're looking for is registered, or even DNSSEC as a technology, it's an implementation but it could also be viewed as a product as you try and roll it out across the channel, the registrants, the registrars, the ISPs. Those are the extension examples of ones we looked at.

Market extensions are a little different. They're things we know about, things we do, but it's repositioning that knowledge into a product that the market may or may not be interested. That could be registry services for other TLDs. That would take what is your single-tenant platform that runs your cc into a multi-tenant platform, be adaptable for domain life cycles, be adaptable for policy, be adaptable for billing. It may also be manage DNS services. So you're involved in your zone file for your TLD, how would you extend some of that knowledge, those services and those name servers to help manage other people's second-level domain or top-level zone?

Also another area where many cc's are very active in is the systems which notify and monitor malware – bad actors inside our universe. That knowledge could also be promoted to small medium businesses or large businesses, and done as a service. The third area we looked at was technology extensions. These were the ones where a registry or a big database that's indexed by a key of some type, where else can we play inside our sovereign state or inside the global economy?

This could include directory services for your single sign-on capabilities – whether that's inside universities, hospitals or large entities – and some level of authentication on user IDs. I know some of the people in this room have looked at that. It may also be a business directory, where you support your country's business indexing online, with a knowledge base that's easily accessible and searchable, or you've launched into providing some thought leadership around the state of the Internet inside your country. That would be speeds and fees provided by ISPs, sources of how they do that, whether they're DNSSEC-enabled, v4, v6, and so on and so forth.

So really providing some data and thought leadership. The interesting thing about each one of these services is that they come with their own set of challenges. Registry extensions are fairly low risk. We know the world that we operate in, others have done it, and it's a good idea to investigate without a substantial amount of capital time or energy. Market extensions, there are questions marks. It's usually around servicing the evolving market.

Right now there's a lot of new players and existing players in this space. How successfully you can be in that space is going to be driven by your

tenacity, your knowledge and your ability to offer a unique service. Technology extensions, you're usually breaking new ground. You're not farming a field here. You're hunting. You're doing something new for your country or for a set of Internet users. They come with their own set of challenges.

Why a new product strategy? Well, I'm preaching to the choir here I believe, but every registry's market has changed and there are more changes to come, so with 1,000 new names and Google as a registry and a registrar, I don't think anybody imagined that three to five years ago. A Syrian army is there's nobody for cyber crimes and redirecting domains and hijacking DNS. The growth in our economy, in our domain space, has slowed. The days of double digit growth are no longer. Existing channels are distracted, so the onslaught of these new names and trying to position them, trying to market them, trying to upsell them has created definitely a distraction factor.

That means that maybe our country code is not in the top five choices, maybe not in the top ten choices any more, in their sales funnel. Community and city TLDs are showing momentum, so it's audience participation time now. What is the number one new gTLD, by numbers, registered in Germany? .berlin. How about the UK? .london. After a couple of months of availability it's the number one. If we take the purple-suited guys out of the equation for the US, that's .xyz, if you haven't seen them, what is the number one in the US? .nyc. Japan? .tokyo. So all of these names have just launched. .nyc eight days ago, London a couple of months ago. They're already gaining momentum from a registration count in their sovereign countries.

The other thing about looking at new services as a cc registry is the benefits can certainly outweigh the risks, and that's what we've seen at CIRA. If you look at that new product strategy, there's the obvious benefits that come along with launching a new product to your marketplace. There's the potential for new revenue, there's new customer relationships, even talking to the end user rather than your channel, and there's the opportunity to develop new channels. These are the obvious ones.

There's also new technology that you introduce into your hallways. At CIRA we had about 15 new technologies – how we gathered data, how we developed code, how we presented data, how we monitored systems – and all of that is a learning opportunity. There are new processes that get developed – how we bill. Maybe it's not on the annual basis but maybe it's a monthly basis. How we support. Maybe it's not through a product support team that focuses only on domains, but it focuses on other things. So new processes, our muscles are flexed and worked.

There's new marketing opportunities. We're in trade shows with our new products. We do brochures with our new products. We provide some thought leadership to the community with new products. So marketing engines do get to rev up and operate on additional cylinders that they didn't know they might have. There are RND opportunities for your development teams. So we're not always tweaking the [59 00:48:29] registry, but we're actually exploring new technologies and new ways of developing products that may be open-source based or may be different levels of efficiency.

So we've seen the RND capabilities have been great for our development team. There's advancement and learning from staff. Staff have appreciated these opportunities, and the ability to not only advance amongst groups but also learn new technologies, and recruitment is a lot easier when you're doing multiple things with multiple technologies in multiple markets. So CIRA, a case study, we do an annual survey of the engagement of our staff and what they're motivated by, what they're not happy with and so on and so forth.

In-between the two annual surveys we did initiate development and launch four new product ideas. One survey, there was no new product except the glimmer in someone's eyes. The next survey a year later, we had four done. That was our registry lock product. A domain name spinning alternative domain name service for our registrar channel, big and small. An Anycast DNS service with some level of D-DOS mitigation – that's our D-zone Anycast DNS, and registry services for existing and new TLDs. That's taking our single-tenant and an engine and moving it into a multi-tenant environment.

The survey results show a very positive impact of new products onto our corporate culture. I'll say that there are many other aspects that go into this increase in engagement and corporate culture, but certainly new products contributed to it. The engagement on the employees in certain areas increased by close to 20 per cent. We had a very engaged staff to start with, and then in certain areas it even increased. 91 per cent of CIRA staff answered the story question of our survey with a, "Given the opportunity I'd tell others great things about working here."

Very happy staff environment. 82 per cent of them said, “I hardly ever think about leaving this organization to work elsewhere.” We’re seeing an incredible balance – very motivated and happy staff environment. In fact, as everybody latches onto our new culture of velocity and engagement, it’s interesting to see that even the feedback that staff provided on things like benefits, pay and retirement savings, which haven’t changed over the last year and didn’t change, were very positively received and actually had a 10-15 per cent bump on how they were received.

In summary, we’ve had a really nice ride at .ca over the last year. We’ve accomplished some great milestones in developing and launching product. We knew that it was going to come with its challenge because change is difficult, yet the intangible benefit to the overall culture has certainly been a very pleasant surprise and a great accomplishment for the entire organization including the Board. Thank you.

KATRINA SATAKI: Thank you very much Dave. Are there any questions from the audience? Don?

DON HOLLANDER: Don Hollander from APTLD. Thank you very much. I was very interested to see the last bit where an exciting place to work is driven by doing exciting things. I know that at the very beginning you said you had a single product and a single price, and you highlighted the fact that you had a single price. Does that mean that you considered having different pricing structures for your names?

DAVE CHISWELL: There's always consideration for different pricing structures, and in the scenario of say the promotion to the [unclear 00:53:20] we do provide discounts. It was a simplistic view of we have a domain that we offer to our channel at a single price, for an annual registration. When we could offer new products through that same channel, you have to take the engine that's used to operating on a \$1.50 wholesale price and adapt it to a different price. That came with some work.

JOEL [DISCINI]: Hi. Joel [Discini], .ph. Very interesting talk. I was wondering when you mentioned single sign-on, you were referring to open-off or open ID as a service? Is that what you were suggesting? Yes. Why would someone in Canada use CIRA for single sign-on when they can use Facebook or Google, as a free single sign-on service? How would you compete with that? Why would someone use you guys for a single sign-on?

DAVE CHISWELL: That's a good question. There's always that element of safety, stability and security, when working with a company that exudes those values, has their servers on the ground that you live, not in the cloud somewhere. When you're working with contact-sensitive environments, primarily people like universities and hospitals where a student would have access to X but a professor would have access to X and Y, or a doctor would have access to one level of patient information and a nurse a different one. That authentication element, I believe, really has

to come from an authority type of organization, and CIRA certainly plays that role inside Canada.

JOEL [DISCINI]: So you would be perceived as safer than Google or Facebook, is that what you're saying, within Canada?

DAVE CHISWELL: I think inside Canada the simple answer is yes. Google has its reputation of using the data that you type into its search engine for whatever purpose, and we're a different entity than that.

JOEL [DISCINI]: So is this service live?

DAVE CHISWELL: No. It's just a glimmer and an idea and it's something that we've investigated a little bit.

JOEL [DISCINI]: There's a very interesting thought process there. Thank you.

DAVE CHISWELL: Thank you.

LESLEY COWLEY: Thanks for the presentation Dave. How supportive are your registrars and your government about this strategy? What have you done to ensure their support, or are there still issues to work on?

DAVE CHISWELL: Excellent question. We have involved the registrars along the way, in the area of services that we're offering to them to make their business easier. They've been slow to adopt it but with a little bit of pressure they do resign to the fact that they'll support .ca. An example of that would be the name-spinning opportunity. From a lock perspective of our 150 registrars that we have, it's been adopted primarily by just the brand protection, corporate client style of registrar. So the adoption number has been low, yet the activity inside those adopted registrars has been high.

In the DNS environment we were very careful to position or manage our DNS service to not compete with the registrar's DNS, and in fact complement it in that it's a secondary set of name servers. Anycast cloud with infrastructure primarily biased towards Canadian data centers, so it's for Canadian companies with Canadian customers. We have servers right across Canada. The initial reaction from the registrar channel when they didn't understand what we were doing was a little negative, or in isolated cases it was negative, but once they understood what we were doing and that we were offering it first and foremost to them, as a service that they can upsell to their corporate environment customers they were very supportive of it.

[HAMAD]: [Hamad Hugh-Wiggin 00:58:24] from Nigeria. In your business presentation you talked about channel partners. Are these [unclear] registrars?

DAVE CHISWELL: Yes. We refer to our registrars as our channel partners, yes.

KATRINA SATAKI: Thank you very much Dave. [Applause] The next presentation will be given by Marcelo from .ar. As we all know, hardly anyone has ever complained about lowering prices, right? When we try to increase fees for domain names, deep inside we feel some fear. In the case of .ar I understand you went from zero to something?

MARCELO MARTINEZ: Hi everybody. My name's Marcelo Martinez. I work for NIC Argentina. We introduced a fee for domains after a long time, in March this year. I'm going to talk a little bit about that. It was kind of a big deal for us.

KATRINA SATAKI: It would be, for anyone I think.

MARCELO MARTINEZ: Yes, of course.

KATRINA SATAKI: While the presentation is uploading, just a short survey here. Who has lowered their domain name fee for example in the last one year? Who

increased the price? Approximately the same. 50/50. Thank you.
Marcelo, the floor is yours.

MARCELO MARTINEZ:

Introducing a fee is a part of the update process we're going through in NIC Argentina. It's one major milestone in our process. I wanted to talk a little about that. When did we start? This process started in 2011. The first thing we wanted to do was build up awareness about .ar domains. What was the thing? What happened? There were a lot of domain holders, but very few people knew how to administrate it, how to delegate it, how to manage these domains. That was the first thing. We built up communication campaigns and things like [unclear 01:01:23].

What we wanted to do was change the user experience. We had an obsolete platform. We had the same platform for almost 20 years, so you can imagine this was not good. The user wasn't satisfied with it, so we changed it, we launched it, and we had good feedback from the user. As I was telling you, we had two major milestones. In August last year we launched our new system. We made an update on our policy. We introduced the username and password login. We built a dashboard where you can administrate your domains. We had the whole validation process, which I'll focus on in a while.

We built up our new dispute resolution system. We had it, but we re-launched it, we renamed it. Then of course in March we introduced a fee for .ar domains. I'm going to talk about the impact that had on our users, our organizations, and of course on our registrations and renewals. First of all, validation. Are you who you say you are? We

didn't have a solid validation process before, so we had a very particular database. For example we had a lot of superheroes that had .ar domains – Superman, Batman, even Bugs Bunny had .ar domains.

We wanted to make sure that the Clark Kents, the Bruce Waynes, we wanted them to take responsibility. We wanted them to be aware of what the domain meant and what having a domain meant. That's why we had a solid registration policy. We cleared our database and we started not from zero but building up almost from zero. Our dispute resolution system, renamed it, we re-launched it. The update in our policy also introduced that any domain is eligible to be disputed, anyone can start the dispute. The thing is that this avoids [unclear 01:03:35] process.

It's much faster, it's much more comfortable, and everyone who feels they have more right to own a domain can talk to us, they can make their claim. Of course when I hear it, when I ask them to present their papers and everything, they can do it all online. It's pretty simple. Zone specification, what does this mean? This had a really big impact. How did this apply in our policy update? .tour.ar, .org.ar. These domains have restrictions – restrictions as to [add] a value to them. For example, .tour.ar, you had to be a company registered in the Ministry of Tourism.

We made an agreement with the Ministry, so if you want to have a .tour.ar domain you have to be subscribed with them. They're going to tell us and of course we're going to check it. If you have a .tour.ar it means you are a validated tourism company. This works two ways actually. Why? Because the domain owner certifies that he's a registered tourism company and anyone who visits Googles and wants

to travel for Argentina for example, they Google up our webpage, and if the string ends in .tour.ar, they know that website is secure, that website is checked, and they are not going to be scammed or anything.

.org. You have to be a non-profit organization to have a .org.ar. This goes the same way. We wanted to create the feeling of content identity in the website. The same goes for .net.ar, and of course the other three you see in the slide at the bottom, they are for government entities. This one I wanted to talk about. This one I wanted to talk about. Introduction of a fee. After five years we finally introduced it. We wanted to catch up. I remember my first ICANN Meeting, Beijing. At the ccNSO Meeting here I was with my colleague, Carlos. He raised his hand and said, “But we don’t charge for domains.”

The room was silent. He turned to us and said, “What? What are you talking about? How many domains do you have?” “Almost three million.” “Have you taken your medication or anything!?” Well, that was pretty fun for my first ICANN Meeting. Impact on our users. First of all, as you can see they are not really happy. After providing our service for that long, introducing our fees wasn’t easy. I’ll talk about the price a little bit. 160 Pesos is around \$19 at the official exchange rate. That’s a price we feel comfortable with. It’s suitable for Argentina. It’s suitable for the region. It’s an average price in the region.

What we wanted to do was turn around the user feeling about the introduction of the fee. Of course we had a new platform. We started appearing in social media, increasing our participation there. We improved our customer care service. We introduced a dispute resolution system. We told them about, “You can do this, you can claim

your domain or the name of your brand or anything.” DNS refreshing, this was really well received. Before we would refresh our DNS once a day, a business day. If you upload your site on a Saturday you have to wait until Monday, and now we’re refreshing our DNS three hours every day. Three hours every day. As I was saying before, it was time to catch up.

We have a long way to go but we’re doing so, so of course with all this the user is happier. I don’t know if we’re on the right side of the slide but we are somewhere in the middle and we’re getting there. The impact on our organization, we had a lot of improvement in our infrastructure. We cleaned our database. As I was telling you, we improved our customer service. We have around 1,500 consults a day and we’re attending all of them. If you send us an email we’ll answer you in no more than 24 hours, sometimes even less, so that was a great achievement.

The DNS [refreshing 01:08:22], now we’re [approaching] a lot of future projects with another view. We’re wanting to implement DNSSEC, we’re wanting to implement IPv6. Our government is a base institution, so we are going to start providing a special service for our government and institutions. Cyber crime. We are starting to have agreements with the Cyber Crime Unit as to work together. That’s a lot of projects we can face now – having a fee, having an independent budget.

Impact on our registration and renewals. Of course we had a decrease. We expected that, but we are better than what we expected. Our forecast was lower than this. We started with around 2.5 million domains, a little more, and the decrease started. Now we’re around 1.5

million, but we are changing the curve. We wan to stabilize this. of course, a year hasn't passed since March, so we're expecting still a downfall, but we want to stabilize this. Before, when it was free, we had a lot of registrations. These numbers are monthly. We had 30,000 registrations per month. That was a lot, and only about 8,000 renewed. That turned around completely. We now have 10,000 registrations per month, so a lot of not-renewed domains. That was expected too.

I want to finish on how we started. We are updating NIC Argentina. This is a process; introducing a fee, introducing a new platform is part of the process. Major milestones, but we are continuing it. The fee is like the highway metaphor. We build the highway, and afterwards we introduce the toll booth. What do we want to do? We want to add value to the .ar domain names, with everything I just spoke about. The zone specification is a clear example. We want the .ar domain to be something different and to be something people can relate to. That's pretty much it. Thank you very much. If you have any questions I'll be happy to answer them.

KATRINA SATAKI: Thank you very much. That was very interesting. We have a question.

ROSALIA: Hi Marcelo. I'm Rosalia from .cr, from Costa Rica. Congratulations on your presentation and all your new projects. I just wanted to learn a little bit more about the dispute resolution process or service that you're providing. Can you expand on it? How does it work and how do your clients have access to that?

MARCELO MARTINEZ: Sure. How does it work? When you look up a domain name, of course if it's not available in the site, you have a button that says, "Dispute" and you can apply for the dispute. Once you apply you have to present all the documents that prove that you have a better right to own that domain – for example if it's your brand registration or anything like that. Our legal team analyze it, if that's okay. We contact the domain owner. We tell them, "Your domain's under dispute. What do you want to do? Do you want to fight back?" for example.

Once the domain owners send us all the documents and say, "No, that's my domain because my brand is something of that sort, my commercial activity is related to the domain name," we gather all that information from both parts – the domain owner and the one that's claiming that domain – and we have a third party, independent from us, that gathers that information and decides what will happen – if one party gets it or the owner keeps it. Afterwards we notify each of the participants with the results.

If they're not comfortable with what happened, the next step is to go to the [original justice 01:12:52]. This is a quicker way to resolve these disputes. This is in summary how it works. The resolution is independent from us. We just manage it. We inform the two parties, and we send them to the third party and then we tell them their results.

KATRINA SATAKI: Thank you. If I understand correctly we have a question in the Adobe Room. We'll start with Patricio?

PATRICIO POBLETE: Patricio Poblete from NIC Chile. I just want to congratulate our colleagues from Argentina on this very difficult transition. The first time I met the people from Argentina I think was in 1997, for the Whitepaper Meeting in Buenos Aires. Then they told me that they were about to begin charging for domain. Over the years that was always the message, and I'm glad that it finally happened, especially because you were setting a very bad example in the neighborhood.

MARCELO MARTINEZ: It took us a while, we know, but we finally did it. So here we are. It took us 25, almost 26 years, but we did it.

KATRINA SATAKI: How does your price compare with your neighbors?

MARCELO MARTINEZ: We are on average. \$19. There are a lot of Latin people here. That's about average. I don't remember the exact figures, but that's about it.

KATRINA SATAKI: Question from the Adobe Room?

STAFF MEMBER: We have two questions from the Adobe Room. The first one is from David McCauley from Verisign. He says, "Marcelo, how much prior notice did .ar give to registrants that a fee would be imposed?"

MARCELO MARTINEZ: About a couple of months before. We had a press conference. We announced we were going to start charging. We didn't say the price. We said, "Around 200 Pesos." That was what we said in the news. That was pretty much it. One month, not two. One month before.

STAFF MEMBER: Okay. Andrew [Azkabar 01:15:15] is wondering, "Moving from free to about \$19, was this .ar sold directly by NIC Argentina, or is NIC Argentina working with a channel of registrars?"

MARCELO MARTINEZ: No, we actually don't work with any registrars. All the domain registrations go through us, and we're not thinking about opening it up to registrars right now, but of course we thought about it, but as I was saying, it all goes through us.

DANIEL EBANKS: Daniel Ebanks, .ky, Cayman Islands. I sit on the Board. We're currently debating exactly what you guys have done. I've left my business card there for you. We really would appreciate getting some time with you, because we are doing exactly everything that you have done. I have one question for you. Obviously you had pushback from the community at home. Was the biggest pushback commercial or individual members of your country? Was the biggest problem of people pushing back against this, was it from the business community, say business associations, or was it private individuals?

MARCELO MARTINEZ: The thing is, besides the angry faces, a lot of people were happy that we started charging, because being free there were a lot of domainers that were running a lot of interesting domain names and it was difficult for anyone who had a project or anything, they couldn't register the domain because it wasn't available. From that side, business and commercial entities were happy about it. 160 Pesos is not that much for a yearly fee, so we didn't have a lot of complaints from that part. Of course, people always think it's better for something to be free, but that's not always the case.

KATRINA SATAKI: Thank you very much. I just want to add that if you're interested, another registry, .ee, Estonia, also introduced fees not a long time ago, so they also can share their experience. Thank you very much Marcelo. Our next presenter is from Serbia and he will talk about code of ethics. Who has a code of ethics in their registries? Anyone? No one in the room. Dušan, The floor is yours.

DUŠAN STOJIČEVIĆ: No one in the room? Okay. I think some of you, like .nz, have some kind of document like a code of ethics. I'm Dušan Stojičević from Serbia. I will give a presentation about the topic that is obviously pretty rare in our cc world. Code of Ethics. I don't want to have a definition or something like that. I don't want to tell you what the Code of Ethics is, and I don't want to talk about the history of the Code of Ethics and how we developed it. I want to talk about the core. I think the first question

that you would ask when I said “Code of Ethics” is why we need it. Why any ccTLD needs this kind of document.

Why do you need a Code of Ethics? Do you think it’s fancy? No. It’s not fancy. I don’t think so. Maybe you think it’s fancy to have a Code of Ethics, but I don’t see it like that. Maybe some of your bosses or governments ask you to do so. No. My government didn’t ask us to do so. Or you think to build one long and serious document would be to be more serious, like one organization. Or you want to use it like some weapon against enemies, if you have enemies. No. There is a need in the development of your organization. You will have a need for this kind of document.

Let’s talk about it. In this kind of document you will have an entire organization culture. You will write every value that you want anybody who is involved in the domain business to respect. With this you will build your trust among society, among your business partners, and so on. With this document you will build your reputation and efficient operation. Don’t mess with this. Don’t think about Code of Ethics as a policy set. This is not a policy. This is a set of values. It’s a major difference between law, morals and ethics. You cannot build this kind of document to punish somebody. You must build another document for punishing anybody.

For example, every cc has a social responsibility. You can see our organization stands against all forms of inappropriate behavior; the misuse of Internet domains, abuse of copyrights and similar rights, abuse of the privacy, and so on. We will pay taxes of course. Back in Brussels, my colleague was presenting a similar presentation about the Code of

Ethics and he got questions about what the result is of adopting a Code of Ethics. A high number of domain names gives you big income if you adopt this, or does it settle all problems with stakeholders? The simple answer is yes and no.

You have no guarantee that a Code of Ethics will influence the number of domains in your cc, or you cannot have a big income when adopting a Code of Ethics, but it's a major break in your organization to build trust, it gives you a possibility for a higher number of domain names. For example, when you put your money in the bank, do you read the Code of Ethics of the bank? No. You chose the bank that you want from among other factors. You don't choose it from only reading the Code of Ethics. But you watch the bank, you watch how the bank is with you, how it deals with your money, and if the bank is dealing with your money with honesty and all the values that you have in the Code of Ethics, that bank earns your trust and you will put the money in that bank.

So thank you for your attention. You will have your lunch soon. If you are interested in more about this topic, I will give you a link for the Code of Ethics. This is not a long document. Only four pages. You can read it. Thanks.

KATRINA SATAKI:

Thank you. Are there any questions? If not then I have a question. How did you communicate your Code of Ethics to your customers, to your registrars? Or did you just publish it?

DUŠAN STOJIČEVIĆ: Back in May. Before the adoption at the General Assembly I think we had a yearlong debate among all the stakeholders, registrars and everybody who at the time wanted to participate in this. After that we just used the Code of Ethics in day-to-day operation.

KATRINA SATAKI: Can your registrars subscribe to the Code of Ethics and adopt it for themselves? Do you encourage them, or is it really just for your operation?

DUŠAN STOJIČEVIĆ: Yes. We encourage them to use our Code of Ethics, but there is no punishment if they don't.

KATRINA SATAKI: Thank you. Any more questions? If not, thank you very much. We still have half an hour before lunch, so don't give false hopes to the audience. Our next speaker, Hiro, will tell us more about the introduction of IDN labels to perfect your .jp domain names. Even though Hiro is going to talk about .jp and DNS, you won't fall asleep. As you remember the movie... Hiro, we won't let you sleep either.

HIRO HOTTA: Good afternoon. My name's Hiro Hotta from .jp. I'm going to talk about the prefecture type JP domain names, the IDN version. Around two years ago I talked about the prefecture type JP domain name, the introduction of it. I'm talking about the next story of the domain name space. This is the first phase of the prefecture type JP domain name.

Before the launch we consulted with the community about the idea of the introduction of such a domain name.

At that moment there was a typical observation from the users that there would come geographical domains like .tokyo, .osaka and so on, but small prefectures or cities would not have their own gTLDs. The demand from the community was to create domain name spaces for all 47 Japanese prefectures in a neutral and homogenous way. Neutral and homogenous means not to focus on domain names spaces only for big prefectures or cities, as business-oriented registries might do. Prefecture type JP domain name was launched in November 2011. The format is something like Tokyo.jp.

The main purpose is vitalizing or [vigilizing 01:32:15] local activities. The basic policies of the registration is [unclear] third-level domain. Any organization or individual can be a registrant and local presence in the prefecture is not required, as is the case with other .jp domain name spaces. Multiple domain names can be registered by one registrant and be registered and all 47 domain name spaces is managed by us. The space isn't delegated to the local government or some other organization. We manage it. The number of prefecture type JP registrations is going up, and one year after the renewal is goes a little bit reduced, and again it's growing. I think this is the typical number of registrations trend.

The trend of registration, for the trademarks, many national brands register as a prefecture type JP domain name, and 29 levels applied for in all 47 prefectures, in ASCII [unclear 01:33:54]. This means that the 20 strings are applied for all 47 prefectures, and nine IDNs. They [unclear]

names with the nationwide market and company names with branches all over Japan, and prefectures with the largest number of applications was in Tokyo. As you may know, that's the top [unclear 01:34:23] as well.

In .kyoto.jp it's in the 13th [unclear]. The Kyoto is famous for its scenic temples or historic landscape, and [unclear 01:34:50] application, many common nouns were applied for and registered; for example for ASCII [unclear 01:35:00], or magazine.[unclear].jp. [unclear] are the names of the prefecture. For IDNs, beautysalon.[ij].jp or family[outing].jp. The first beauty salon is in Japanese, and so on. First come, first served. The voices. Local branding such as local mascot characters and specialty products can be promoted by prefecture type JP in all 47 prefectures. It's set by advertisement agencies.

Net business [consults 01:35:50], I'd say that with prefecture type JP, local businesses can profile themselves as local and attract attention from the local community. In addition, search engines may empower potential clients into finding them. Registrars say prefecture type JP interacts audiences to IT seminars hosted by local Chambers of Commerce or local government. Nationwide uniqueness of a domain name has been a hurdle to register a good name, even for local use.

This means that the something.jp is a nationwide uniqueness. Nationwide uniqueness is a good thing for some persons or some companies, but it's not good for locally-operated companies. So prefecture type JP is a trigger to create more websites for them, to be more attractive to locals. IDNs in prefecture type JP, we have two types of IDN registration. One is a general use type. It's registered on the

second-level. In total we have 936,000 second-level registrations. Among that, 121,000 are IDNs. For prefecture type, 3,000 among 12,000 are IDNs. This means that 25 per cent of the prefecture type domain names are IDNs, although 13 per cent are the IDNs on second-level domains.

So the next step of prefecture type JP, we are thinking about and we are developing IDN prefecture levels on the second-level. By this service, more IDN flavor in prefecture type JP will enable a higher impression of the domain labels. Local product name followed by prefecture name, where both names are in Japanese string, it would give a better impression than English strings, and higher SEO scores of domain names that embrace exact search queries. This is a service to be launched next month, and the format is something like something.東京.jp. These two characters means Tokyo. For example tower.東京.jp. That's it. Thank you.

KATRINA SATAKI:

Thank you very much Hiro. Any questions from the audience? If not then I have a question, at least one. Firstly, do you differentiate price for IDNs and non-IDNs, ASCII?

HIRO HOTTA:

Yes, there's some difference. IDNs are cheaper than ASCII, because we want to promote the IDN domains.

KATRINA SATAKI: I think that works very well. Another one, for me they all look confusingly similar, but I believe for you the picture is a bit different. Anyway, how do you solve this issue of confusing similarity?

HIRO HOTTA: Confusing similarity for what?

KATRINA SATAKI: For IDNs?

HIRO HOTTA: Usually the strings in Japanese script, we do differentiate all of them. For example, as a domain registration rule, they are treated as different. All of the characters are different. Usually in Japanese newspaper or books, usual readers who are Japanese can differentiate the small difference of the font. We think that it's not a big problem to differentiate the very similar characters. We launched IDNs in 2001 and we haven't had any claims or challenges for that.

KATRINA SATAKI: So there's no single case of somebody complaining about confusing similarity?

HIRO HOTTA: Right.

KATRINA SATAKI: That’s interesting. So you do have these prefectures not in ASCII but in IDN format as well?

HIRO HOTTA: Yes, both.

KATRINA SATAKI: Those who have registered in ASCII, for kyoto.jp, in ASCII and in IDN, they bundle?

HIRO HOTTA: Good question. First they are bundled. something.東京.jp, and something.tokyo.jp. The registrants should be the same for the first registration, but after that the registrant can decide that they transfer one of them to another registrant. That’s the rule.

KATRINA SATAKI: Okay, thank you very much. Any other questions from the audience? If not then I’d like to wrap up this session. Thank you very much Hiro. What we heard today, as I see it, it’s not really news for us that the numbers of domain name registrations is slowly, slowly decreasing. We, as registries, have to look into ways to secure our incomes, and there are different strategies to do that. One is to provide new services and charge for new services, and also to diversify risks. Another way is you can introduce a higher price. Any price. I’m really surprised how you survived before that. There are some other not so traditional processes.

A registry can be more open and try to attract new registrations by for example providing higher standards of ethics or by inviting the community to participate in the development of their ccTLD, and thus stimulating the demand and building the image for your ccTLD. As Patrick showed us today, we all have different frameworks that we operate in, and one size does not fit all ccTLDs. That is the case. There's nothing we can do. We can just come together, share information and learn from each other. Therefore I'm very thankful to all the presenters here today.

Thank you very much. Thank you for sharing. I just want to invite other ccTLDs. Don't be shy. Send us your requests for a presentation slot for the upcoming meetings. The next one is in Marrakech where we'll again have ccTLD news. Even though probably most of our time will be taken up by discussions around and about IANA, we'll still have slots for news from our Members. Not only Members actually. Any ccTLD can give a presentation and anyone is welcome. Thank you very much for participating here. We still have ten minutes but I won't keep you here.

I promised to sing if we have more minutes, but I see that people are leaving the room. Nobody wants to hear me sing. Thank you very much. We reconvene at 2:00 pm with more and more interesting discussions and sessions. See you soon. Thank you very much.

[Tape change ccNSO-members-3-15oct-en]

ROELOF MEIJER:

Are we ready to roll? Okay. good afternoon everybody. Welcome to this afternoon session on the perspectives of the IANA stewardship transition process. I'll just explain the way we're going to work for the next 1.5 hours. We'll have a short introduction by Alissa Cooper, the Chair of the iCG. Then we'll have three Panels – the first with three ccTLDs Managers, the second Panel with three Chairs of ROs and a third Panel with three ccTLD representatives on the CCWG. The ICG is on the way. The CCWG has had a few sessions this week.

I think we've all noticed that so far we've been mainly discussing process, so the objective of this afternoon is to see if we can get into a bit of content among each other. That's why we'll have the three perspectives also from the ccTLD Manager view, the community view, and we'll try and bring those as input into the Working Groups. Byron will be Moderator, so I'll hand over after the introductory remarks by Alissa. I already have a question. Keith?

KEITH DAVIDSON:

Not really a question, but I just thought before we hand the floor to Alissa, it's probably fair to comment at this stage that on the ICG, the two Vice Chairs, Patrick Fältström, who's Chair of the Security Stability Advisory Committee and is well known to us, and Mohamed El Bashir is the other Co Chair and is also well known to us as being a frequent Member in the ccNSO room, representing ccTLDs. Alissa is a stranger to us by comparison to the others. But delightfully she doesn't have six heads and she's not an ogre and so on. I think with that, can we hand over to Alissa for her to introduce herself?

ALISSA COOPER:

I don't know if that's the best introduction I may have ever received anywhere. Thank you Keith. I'm Alissa Cooper. I'm the Chair of the ICG. I was appointed to the ICG by the IETF. I've been in the IETF Leadership for about four years, and been a participant in the IETF for some years longer than that. I'm part of the Technical Leadership in the IETF. I work at CISCO. I'm based in the US. This is my second ICANN Meeting. London was my first. As Keith noted, this is not a community that I'm intimately familiar with, although the last four/five months have helped me become much more familiar.

I know that within the cc community you all are quite well informed about the ICG, what it's been up and the transition process overall. I don't really want to go into too many details. I would say that the ccTLD community is an extremely important community in the context of this transition. We're very happy to have all of you following the discussions, contributing new ideas and being a really formative part of the transition plan. As I said in the last session this morning with the GAC, now is the time to get down to work. I think this might be one of the first sessions this week about the transition where I've heard someone say, "That's what we're going to talk about – the substance." So I'm really pleased to hear that.

The transition will not come to pass if we as a community do not all do that work, roll up our sleeves, contribute our own ideas and debate them with each other and develop consensus with our peers around the world. That's really what we, as the ICG, are looking to the rest of the global stakeholders for. The ICG will not be creating a plan or editing any of the substance that we get from the operational communities. We're really just coordinating and liaising with the various other

stakeholders, and we're really looking to you all to develop the actual plan itself.

I know there's been a lot of discussion about the timeline for this transition, and so I just wanted to try to give a little bit of the motivation for the timeline. The NTIA contract with ICANN expires on September 30th of 2015, and when the ICG set out to create the timeline that you're all aware of, we essentially had to work backwards from that date, starting from the premise that we'd like to meet that date. Obviously we know there might be a little bit of flexibility there, but when you start a project it's good to set your goal to be the one that you actually want to meet, so that's what we did.

If you look at the timeline overall you can see that with all of the different periods of consultation and potential consensus-building, not only in this formative stage when we're asking the operational communities to submit proposals to us by January 2015, but also in the phases afterwards when there might be some changes that need to be made, and some consultation back with the communities again. Each of those times involves a consensus process because the process overall is operating on consensus. So we had to build in some months each time to go back to the communities for feedback and input, so the communities can develop consensus.

That's why the dates might seem soon and it might seem like a lot of work that needs to get done now, but we wanted to make sure that at each phase there's time enough for consultation and consensus. The last thing I'll say is that we do have an open session scheduled for tomorrow with the full ICANN community. I think it starts at 10:00 am.

We'll be giving a broader overview about the ICG's work and most of that time will be used for Q&A and discussion with the community. I encourage all of you to attend that session as well. Thanks.

ROELOF MEIJER:

Thank you Alissa. Before I hand over to Byron, let me introduce the three Members of the first Panel to you. It's Jörg Shweiger from .de, Demi Getschko from .br and Eberhard Lisse from .na. I think you're going to start Eberhard? I'll hand over to Byron first.

BYRON HOLLAND:

Welcome everybody to the main Panel of the final afternoon of the ccNSO Meeting. As you can see we have quite a Panel with a significant range of perspectives. We actually have a full room, even though it looks like some of the seats are empty, because we have such a big Panel. Thank you all very much for participating here. We're going to kick it off and really start talking about substance. With that, Eberhard has a brief presentation to kick us off.

Then I'm going to ask the other two Panelists to give you some of your initial thoughts around this issue, in terms of substance – perhaps thinking about what do we need to have, what should be avoided, what are some of the concerns you have on substantive issues around the IANA transition. Try to keep it to five minutes, so we can have some time for Q&A with everybody in the room. Eberhard?

EBERHARD LISSE:

I've got three substantive slides, so I think six minutes is what I'm going to need. As you know me, my topic could have been something completely different. Just a bit of history. The US Government lays claim to the root through an obscure contract. It's called the "Turnout Contract". It ran from 1992 to 1999. Before that time, no contract has even come to our attention that referred to that. There was something about an internode contract at some stage. The contract does not lay claim to the root. It's a ten-year claim at best. It was not made during the contract. Only two years after its expiry it was the first occurrence when it was set why the US Government can actually do something with the root.

So far it hasn't been challenged. I for one haven't challenged it because I didn't really have the opportunity. Some other small ccTLDs or larger ccTLDs have not been so fortunate. I don't want to mention some but we all know which ones I mean. That's the basic thing. If I'm right, a net contract is not the basic foundation, what does the relinquishing of factual control mean? What actual legal relationship exists between ICANN and a ccTLD? There are five or six that have contract. These ones are not mean, but the other ones, what does it mean for them?

There are multistakeholder deliberations, but it's not even binding on the participants, never mind consensus. Consensus is only going to evolve from the participants. Even a ccNSO Member is not in any way required to abide by it because it's not policy. Policy has to be developed through a PDP. Consequences? My view is that basically every ccTLD will have to enter into a contract with ICANN, or ICANN will have to enter with a contract with the ccTLD. There's 250. The model

that ICANN usually would like to have, one model takes all, is not going to work.

ICANN obviously is not interested. In my company the ccTLD Manager wrote a letter to Mr. Chehadé before London. He refused to meet us politely. He fobbed us off to staff members who have never communicated with us. Not surprising, but it will have to change. Now, being a guest in a foreign country I won't presume to comment on politics, but it's fairly obvious that if the next elections in a few weeks change the powers in Congress, none of this is going to happen. That means we still, if we want to transition IANA, we'll have to have contracts. That's basically all that my extremist position is. If I'm right, we're actually wasting our time here.

BYRON HOLLAND:

Thank you Eberhard. I guess that would be the contrarian view. We'll go to Demi now, and again if we could keep it to about five minutes?

DEMI GETSCHKO:

Thank you Byron. I don't have any presentation. Thanks for lending me your ears. I'll try and make it short and possibly without sounding furious. I think that the main question here is to try and make the problem in its right size. I remember the times of '95, '96, when the [Internauda Doc 00:17:43] Committee did some work and I was opening up the door for WIPO, for ITU, and for other players that were outside of the Internet arena at the time. I remember the year of '98. It was a very critical, very tumultuous year for the Internet.

In January we had the discussion between Jon Postel and [Aida Magazina 00:18:10] because of the root transfer and so on. The fact is that this led to the Green Paper and led to a new institution to take over the academics in their initial role, and this gave one to ICANN. It was quite clear at least for me that all this function would be peacefully transferred to ICANN in some way. But in October Postel died, in the same year. One year after that, there was being placed a contract between the Department of Commerce and IANA, regarding exactly the root management or the names database.

We have to keep in mind that probably there are different ways to tell this story, anyway, it's very clear for me that it was a deviation of the real course, and if it had endured for five or six years, okay, it would be okay, but it lasted for 14 years, and this has been a big trouble for all of us. Anyway, in this 14 years of oversight, how many cases have as all had where the oversight was in place to correct some kind of mistake or some kind of bad doing of IANA? I don't remember any. There's not a big fuss of some very critical operational things that we have to replace in some way.

Maybe we can go back to the original ideas and have this in the hands of the multistakeholder community? Or maybe we can just try to fix problems that we find now inside the ICANN – accountability and transparency or whatever you want – but I don't think it's a good idea to politicize this issue and bring a lot of other agenda inside the discussion. We are trying just to replace a kind of oversight that for 14 years didn't really do any active thing, because of the quality of IANA work and so on. My end is that we all try not to make things worse than they are.

Finishing also with Macbeth, “Things bad begun make strong themselves by ill.” We’ll try not to go down this path. Thank you.

BYRON HOLLAND: Thanks Demi. Jörg?

JÖRG SCHWEIGER: Much more of a statement before I come to substance, what you’re calling for. My baseline is basically that for ccTLDs the transition isn’t really such a big deal – not the big deal that we’re making of it. I think that we are over-engineering the process. We’re making things too complex. We’re including topics that do not need to be discussed or addressed right now – namely speaking of ICANN accountability for example and there are others. That said, what do I think is really crucial to the IANA transition?

From a standpoint of a ccTLD Manager, what the transition shouldn’t do is it shouldn’t change or it shouldn’t interrupt the high standards in performing the technical functions – name server changes, for example. So for me, the fundamental requirement is that the technical functions are performed secure, performed stable, highly available according to demanding service level agreements. Interestingly, this is what we’ve already got. Remember that. With the transition coming our way, we could even do better.

As there is no rubberstamping of the US Government, what we could do is just implement seamless digital processes leading to predictable results. It is nice to know for example when your DNS record is being published in the root zone. We just don’t have that now. We could

design it later. To wrap up the first part, I think crucial is that the technical functions must be secured, priority number one. Personally I do believe that those technical functions could be transferred easily. In fact, it isn't even an urgent need that they should be transferred, as there are current players, namely ICANN and Verisign, doing their job quite well.

Secondly, I'm willing to admit that for sure there's a bit more to the transition than just the technical parts. For sure we do have to deal with delegations and re-delegations, or transfer as I'm supposed to say right now. As to this, I think we're in need of a body to handle those delegations, transfers, and a body to change policies or even define new policies. But this is where I think the FOI provides us with a sound guidelines. I think what we as ccTLD Managers should be easy to achieve in the course of the transition is that the distinction between gTLDs and ccTLDs is not being blurred – meaning policy decisions for a cc have always to be taken care of within the respective country. That is crucial for me, and I hope that's crucial for you as well.

Finally, I think to accommodate separations of power, and once again direct it more towards gTLDs, we might need to think about an additional body providing oversight, review, or even redress capabilities for the policy body. My model for the naming part of the transition would just be a three-fold – a technical body, a policy body and an oversight body.

BYRON HOLLAND:

Thank you Jörg. That was very helpful. I think some very good specific examples of things you'd like to see, and perhaps some suggestions on

things you don't think at least need to be included at this point. Maybe Demi, could I turn to you and ask a similar question? Having just heard some of the things Jörg has specifically identified as required, or maybe not required, in a sense what's your bottom-line. What are the key elements that you think must be included in this discussion, in the end output, whatever form that takes, and what are the things that you think at the very least don't need to be included now, or perhaps shouldn't be at all.

DEMI GETSCHKO:

I think that from the ccTLD point of view, we have an interface to IANA that has to be preserved and has to be [unclear 00:26:30] made [barrel] all the time. We cannot lose this interface. It's important that we have a direct interface to the IANA operational body that deals with our parameters and with our data. Then I agree totally with Jörg that in this part we have to preserve this. It's quite an operational thing. We have the policy things and other different aspects that are not directly related or not tied to IANA. This is things like delegation and re-delegation. They are moved to another sphere and we have to take care of what this sphere will be.

Finally, if we ask for some update in a database regarding your TLD, and this update is not done in correct time or right away, you have to have a way to make some kind of recourse. Speaking very simply, because of our nature and our relation to IANA, I suppose these are the main points. Of course, IETF has another interface to IANA and ICANN has another interface because of the new gTLDs programs and so on, but looking only to the cc's, I think we have to preserve our good interface

to the database and try to be cautious about the policy of delegations and so on.

BYRON HOLLAND: Thanks Demi. Eberhard, I'm going to come to you.

EBERHARD LISSE: Thank you. For me it's basically if IANA or ICANN agrees to the FOI Working Group principles of no more hostile re-delegation unless there is substantial misconduct, that's all I basically require. Still though, I don't necessarily mind speaking for others. We will probably have to have an agreement. We have to have contracts. This negotiation is of no legal force and ICANN basically set this up for itself. It sets up its own structures, it dictates or it has the agenda, it controls the agenda, it controls basically the topic, and in the end nobody can speak for any of the ccTLDs, other than the ccTLD Managers.

From my own ccTLD Manager we require the FOI Working Group principles. If that's agreeable then we can sign easily. But we're not bound by any of this discussion. You can discuss as much as you want. I don't care.

BYRON HOLLAND: Okay, well, I guess we can all go home then. Yes, so I wanted to give everyone the opportunity to give their initial thoughts on what we need, or in that case what is not required. I also just want to throw it open, because in a sense what I heard from you two, from Demi and Jörg, was that it was mainly around the technical operational interface. There's a

bit of shrug of the shoulders on accountability, to some degree. It was more about stable, secure, reliable, predictable, and continue on with the level of service that we have right now. Roughly speaking, to paraphrase what I heard there.

Then Eberhard interestingly said nothing about those kinds of components, the operational level, and it was all about a re-delegation or transfer. That's what I heard. Do you want to clarify that?

EBERHARD LISSE:

We have so few requests of name server changes that whether it takes a day or five days – it usually takes a day or two, and it works well within a timeframe that we work – we don't really have a reason to criticize IANA at the moment for its technical capability. I don't know what the bigger ccTLDs have in their context, but it isn't broken. As far as I'm concerned, it isn't broken, so I don't really see a need to fix it.

BYRON HOLLAND:

Thanks. Jörg?

JÖRG SCHWEIGER:

Agreed 100 per cent. I just wanted some clarification from Eberhard what he had in mind with contracts and who should we be contracting with – we as a ccTLD. Should we get a contract with a technical operator, or with ICANN, with a policy body? I'm just not sure what you mean.

EBERHARD LISSE: The ccTLD Manager must get a contract with the IANA Function Manager, which at this point in time is ICANN, and if the contract expires and the plan comes through that ICANN wants, it will be ICANN. If ICANN will not be the IANA Function Manager then another entity will do and we'll have to enter into a contract with them, or a contract would have to [be have to go with 00:31:44].

JÖRG SCHWEIGER: What's wrong with a contract with the technical operator, where you're signing or underpinning service level agreements?

EBERHARD LISSE: There's nothing wrong with that.

BYRON HOLLAND: Okay. Anybody else want to jump in here? Either with a question for the Panel or a comment? I would pose the same questions to everybody in the audience, which is when you think about the substance of this issue, what are the things that we must have, in whatever the new relationship is with IANA? What are the things that would concern you, to be avoided, and also what are issues that just give you concern? Nigel?

NIGEL HICKSON: I'm going to phrase it as a question. What do you think of this: the comment I would make is this. ICANN is at an existential tipping point in its history, so this debate is not about whether we trust ICANN/IANA, as we kind of do right now, or not, as was the case ten years ago – it's

about building a structure, and maybe even you could call it a constitution, that could be relied on in the event that things go wrong for future generations – ten years down the road, even longer. I’m very privileged not to have lived under an authoritarian regime, but I know many of my colleagues have.

What I feel is important is that in any structure that we build there is a separation of powers and the rule of law – two very, very important concepts, and the respect for fundamental rights. I’d like to ask the question of anybody on the Panel who wants to answer this: how do you see that being built into the system that we appear to be building on the fly right now?

BYRON HOLLAND:

Anybody want to take a stab at that one? Jörg?

JÖRG SCHWEIGER:

I’ll try to give it a go. I think the Net Mundial principles have been accepted widely, and I would surely base any solution on those principles. One thing I understood you’ve been calling for, I wouldn’t agree to. If there would be a problem with any totalitarian regime, whatever policy we might build, it won’t fix the situation in that country. So if we do have diverse models of how we should build that system, we can’t accommodate a solution for a specific situation in a certain country that is enduring such a regime. It’s just not working.

NIGEL HICKSON: Just a point of clarification – the totalitarian regime I was talking about wasn't an individual country, it was ICANN, or a potential future ICANN.

BYRON HOLLAND: Anybody else? Can I draw anybody else on? Right here we have the Chair of the ICG, our ICG reps, our CCWG. What do you want them to hear? What do you want them to take away? What must we have? What must we avoid?

MATHIEU WEILL: Thank you. Mathieu Weill from .fr. I think one topic that is going to be key for us ccTLDs is in the inter-relations between the two tracks, there might be discussions about redress mechanisms for IANA decisions. These are technical decisions, transfers or revocations. Redress mechanisms for the wider ICANN decisions. Certainly in the second case, all stakeholders will want to get involved or have a say.

The question for us ccTLDs is, is there a specific redress mechanisms for IANA that only involves the most directly affected parties that we are, maybe the governments are as well, or do we have a single redress mechanism with the various ICANN stakeholders, and – to put it in a provocative manner – do we allow ALAC to have a say about this redress mechanism? I think that's one issue that will have to be dealt with in the various groups, whatever the names, and that we need to be careful on.

BYRON HOLLAND: Thanks Mathieu. That's a great point. Anybody else? We've got another minute or two for our initial Panel. One thing I'll throw out to

the Panelists is that the operational side has been critical. We talked about – and I’ll translate to the stability of it and the predictability of it – Jörg, I think you actually made the comment about, “The operators are doing fine.” Do we want the actual operators to remain the same through the transition, at least for the time being? Or shall we throw that open too – the actual operators? Jay?

JAY DALEY:

The perspective I come from for this is one of risk. It’s one of what happens if... One of the good things about safeguards is that you hope you never have to use them. One of the most foolish things I think that we can ever do is to take away a safeguard saying, “Well, we’ve never used it.” Because it was the very fact of its existence that meant quite often that we didn’t have to use it. I would like to know that a proper risk analysis is undertaken that looks at what can go wrong, and a new system is designed that copes with those risks.

The thing that scares me most is hearing what I would regard as some people burying their heads in the sand saying, “We won’t need this particular safeguard because it just won’t happen.” It might. It might be a very low possibility, but we need to protect against some of those things, because there is no going back. If ICANN becomes completely unaccountable or controls its own accountability, there literally is no going back.

BYRON HOLLAND: Essentially you're thinking of black swan type events? Extremely low probability, extremely high impact, and in this case negative impact. Demi?

DEMI GETSCHKO: Maybe I'm repeating myself, but I think we are a very special group of people, or people of institutions, because we have a direct interface with IANA. We need this interface so as to keep the data correct in the root. I agree with Eberhard that this is a quite infrequent thing but it's a very critical one. If you cannot change some parameter you have to change, in some time. Maybe it will be out of the working situation. The immediate thing is to preserve this kind of good way to take care of our own parameters and data. I agree that if something was very wrong, in a very rare occasion, we have to have a way to record that.

You have to have a level of records. This will be ICANN, but I'm not sure how it would be in the future. Maybe we have to make stronger ways to, in the very improbably case of having to recall, you have an instance to correct the wrongdoing.

BYRON HOLLAND: Thanks Demi.

PATRICIO POBLETE: Patricio Poblete from NIC Chile. Initially I found Jörg's argument appealing that perhaps this process has been over-engineered. It's sometimes my feeling too about discussions about how discussions are going to be held for deciding what discussions are going to look like –

but it is true that the day-to-day working of the IANA is almost a no-brainer. One would expect that any entity with minimal competence should be able to do it right, and in case it didn't, certainly there should be a mechanism to fix that.

But I don't view that as the hard problem, because if IANA was messing up consistently with our changes to the database, I think nobody would oppose to a change of operator. What's more complicated is a different thing, which is that IANA currently not only does that narrow technical function, but it also generates reports for changes of ccTLD Managers. In the future, even with FOI, that will be a complicated problem, because there are judgments to be made. If there is someone that's been accused of substantial misconduct, that's a judgment and people might disagree with whether there is misconduct and whether that is substantial.

Those are going to be complicated decisions. If we feel that that's not being done right, that's the case we really want – a mechanism that will be a sort of Damocles hanging on the head of IANA to make sure that that critical function is done right. I think we need to design that right now, because later it could be too late.

BYRON HOLLAND:

Thanks. I think we're probably just about out of time on this. Maybe I'll get a show of hands on a couple of the issues that we've heard. This is not a vote. It's a straw poll. We're not going to be held to it. Just out of interest, within the room, does a robust redress mechanism need to be part of the IANA oversight transition process? Put your hands up for yes.

Fairly unanimous support. Any red cards? Doesn't matter? So in terms of a straw poll there's a relatively hard fact.

The other one I threw out but we didn't pick up on, the actual operator themselves. As we go through an oversight transition process, which is one change, the operator themselves – should we maintain the same operator, at least for some period? Or does that not matter? The question is, is it important to have the stability of the same operator, at least for a period of time during the transition? Yes or no? Yes, it's important to have that as a stability factor? Medium support – doesn't really matter? Okay. That's interesting. Last question.

Should we or should we not, as individual cc's, all have a contract with the IANA operator, as part of the outcome of this process, whatever the overall outcome looks like? Yes, we should have contracts? Okay. Don't care one way or the other? A couple, handful. Absolutely no contract with IANA or the operator of that service, absolutely not? Don't want to have a contract? Okay. I would say the general thing there is that there's a lack of consensus opinion on that. Thank you very much. Roelof?

ROELOF MEIJER:

Thank you Byron. Maybe as a clarification, me sitting here as Chair is part of an evil plan to shut me up and not come up with any stupid ideas, but since we have the CWI here Byron, and one of the objectives we have is to feed positions or ideas into them, when you talked about redress system, do you mean the whole IANA function, or were you specifically referring to IANA actions on ccTLDs? Delegations, re-delegations and revocations?

BYRON HOLLAND: I was picking up on Mathieu’s particular point, but it was the latter – that it was specific to... I’m only talking about in the cc community. Maybe it should be broader, but my question was for us specifically.

ROELOF MEIJER: Okay. I ask that question because I hope that we’re all aware that in the RFC there is already mentioned some kind of a group for that. It’s never been implemented. I think we know why – because at the end of the sentences dealing with this group, it says, “The recommendations of this group are binding,” which means that a particular group is going to take a decision over a revocation, a delegation or a re-delegation of a ccTLD. That’s why it never came there I think. We have to bear that in mind when we go along this path. It might be a planning killer.

Thank you Byron. Like is said during my introduction, we’ll now go to the second Panel that will give us some views on the community perspective. I have Eduardo Santoyo from LACTLD, Peter Vegote from CENTR and Keith, as one of our ccNSO Councilors. Back to you, Byron.

BYRON HOLLAND: Thank you Roelof. The idea here overall was to hear from some specific Managers and then move to more general community managers. Now, realizing that all are involved as a specific cc, but from the position of your RO or your ccNSO overall perspective, Keith, that’s the hat I want you to wear for this particular discussion. Right out of the gate, wearing your community hat, what have you heard this group saying? Is there anything that has really struck you, that you’ve taken away from the last 20-30 minutes of conversation? Peter?

PETER VERGOTE: Thank you Byron. I've taken away three things, three elements. Miraculously it's our old elements that I had, that were in the top of my mind, before I came to this Panel. First of all, it's the stability of the technical operations. It's having policy and pure technical function, having it separated, and it's essential to have a redress or an appeals mechanism so that in case something doesn't run according to the expected process then it can be looked into and potentially cured.

BYRON HOLLAND: Thanks Peter. Eduardo, I'm going to nuance the question a little bit here. Is what you've heard here consistent with what you're hearing from your own LACTLD community? Is it roughly similar, and are there any differences?

EDUARDO SOYOTO: As [unclear 00:50:59] in ICANN Meetings I lost my voice after the music night. I don't know why. First of all it's important to mention that it's really difficult to capture the concerns or the ideas of the cc community. We have been doing a lot of effort within the LACTLD with trying to get the Members involved, trying to get them participating with their opinions, expressing their concerns, or even saying something about what the implication is for them or what should be said in the scope of the transition of the functions of the IANA.

We have done several efforts on that. We use, in a very strong way, our mailing lists. We did a webinar. We tried to inform them more and tried to get them participating on these debates, but it's not easy. I guess

that probably one of the main points that I have to mention here is that we need to discover the path to get them on, in order to [unclear 00:52:38] the participation of every or most of the ccTLDs on this debate, because it's really important.

As we mentioned here, it's probably not just a technical interoperation between the cc's and the IANA. It's more than that. We shall mention [unclear 00:53:01]. If there are some reports, with some adjustments, with some positions, it has to be clear how those reports have been prepared or who the judge is in this case, making the adjustments. Also, as Peter mentioned before, having mechanisms to appeal, having mechanisms to have more resources, in order to [unclear 00:53:34] the relations of the cc community with IANA is important.

I don't want to point more topics of this, more than repeat again that we need to find a way to [unclear 00:53:52] the participation of more ccTLDs on this debate. We are doing a lot of effort without too much success, I have to confess, but we need to continue with the effort.

BYRON HOLLAND:

Thanks Eduardo. I think that's probably a challenge many of the organizations are experiencing. Keith, is what you've heard thus far, in the last 30-40 minutes, consistent with what you're hearing generally in the ccNSO community overall? Are there any cracks of light between what we've heard thus far and what you're hearing overall? Again, I could nuance the question a little bit and say since you're from APTLD region, any color you could add for us from that perspective too?

KEITH DAVIDSON:

Thanks Byron. A couple of points of clarification. I'm not really participating in the APTLD or Asia Pacific region anymore, other than within ICANN, so I can only really speak from a somewhat personal perspective. Also, I'm not in day-to-day contact with .nz necessarily either, but perhaps focusing on your question, and thinking about some of the comments from the room today, I think it's really important that we remember that the work that the Delegation Redefinition Working Group did highlighted the fact that around a third of the decisions made by IANA or by the ICANN Board through the IANA process on delegations and re-delegations, since ICANN's inception, were based on non-existent policy, long stretches of connection to policy and so on.

So with a steward disappearing, the question in my mind is how much further can policy be stretched, or completely missed. The most critical of all functions in IANA's being is a redelegation or a cancellation of a ccTLD. I think Patricio hinted at this a little bit, that the issues are real. We had zero trust in ICANN in the early days, but we shouldn't have a high level of trust in ICANN to get these things right. The aspects of natural justice that have been talked about are resonating strongly with me. The FOI, I'm really pleased that the community is buying the framework and taking ownership of it.

It's certainly no longer the Working Group's prerogative, but the issue that arises in my mind is that it doesn't solve anything unless it has the complete support of the GAC and the Board, so what is our strategy if the framework is not able to progress through ICANN and remains a ccNSO-only document? A PDP that would conclude before the IANA transition is probably impossible. So I do have some live fears that we are not really considering things. A number of people have said to me,

“These things shouldn’t be worried about because they’re not in the contract.” It’s in the hope that it’s not in the contract, rather than it not being in the contract. So I do urge people who feel that these things are not mentioned, and the contract is just technical specifications, to go and read the contract.

The whole issues of delegations and re-delegations, and the policies applicable to them, and the IANA staff capability of being involved in policy discussions or being removed from the capability of discussing, are all there in the contract that’s there now. It will transition to something. I think perhaps in some ways we haven’t quite fully removed our heads from the sand, and we’re hopeful that we can continue to trust ICANN and so on. I’ll recount Jay’s comments that safeguards are there for a reason, and that’s why we have them – in the hope that we’ll never have to use them. With that, thank you.

BYRON HOLLAND:

Thanks Keith. Peter, maybe I can come back to you and actually pick up on some of what Eduardo was talking about. In terms of outreach, I know CENTR’s been quite proactive in terms of how you’re soliciting input and feedback on this subject. Can you maybe share with the room the tactics that you’re using to try to gain the insights of your individual members, and come to some kind of conclusion or output into the process? What are you doing? What tactics? Can you tell us about anything you think is successful or hasn’t been working?

PETER VERGOTE:

Thanks Byron. No. I'm not going to inform you, because I'm pretty certain that here in a couple of weeks we'll have a miraculous solution and we'll hold the credits for ourselves. [Laughs] Now, it's a difficult exercise, to reach out through your Members and try and get all the puzzles of the jigsaw together – especially because there is a commitment that regional organizations were supposed not only to reach out to their own Members, but also to those ccTLDs that are not part of ccNSO or part of a RO.

So clearly, getting in touch with those is even more difficult, and we have to use the means that are available to try to collect our thoughts. That's true of old mailing lists that have been revived. I'm not certain whether we'll get much input from those ccTLDs, in all honesty. I think the exercise is already difficult enough, to try to collect the necessary information from our own numbers. Now, what we decided to do, because ROs are not living on an island, it's better to try to unite our efforts in order to get results that are usable for all, for the whole cc community.

It's with particular joy that I can say that the four ROs have taken an initiative in sending out a similar survey to all of their Members, so there will not be a CENTR survey addressing certain questions, a LACTLD or an APTLD or AFTLD survey with a different set of questions. So we are going to have to work with a unified survey across the board, and we hope that that will provide at least a number of elements that we can put on the table and that we can use to build an advice or strategy suggestion or whatever.

That way, we'll have to [wait 01:02:15] what comes out, and whether it's usable and even with the information that's going to come out, it will take a lot of iteration in order to have it stable and substantive enough to come up with something that could be strategic advice.

BYRON HOLLAND: Thanks Peter. That's actually a great idea. Hopefully you'll get enough feedback that it can be statistically relevant. Great idea to send a similar survey to everybody. Keith, you had a comment?

KEITH DAVIDSON: Really, as much as anything, a plus one for, for some reason the regional TLDs are including some of the ICG Members in the formulation of the survey questions, which is happening as we speak. It does look like it's going to be a very useful part of the process of outreach, to the edges of our community. I think one of my real fears is that a group of ccTLDs could come at the absolute 11th hour and say, "We were not properly consulted or involved in this," and actually stand in the way of the transition.

I think the survey actually performs a valuable first part of the process. I think our database of seeking to get contacts for all ccTLD Managers is also useful, but I don't think that we can stop at that point. I think we actually need resources, either through the ROs or within the ccNSO itself, to actually get on the phone and speak to almost every ccTLD Manager, to make sure they're aware of the issues – what those issues are, what their feedback is. If it comes to the 11th hour we can then say,

“Here are the exhaustive steps we took, and we don’t believe it’s appropriate that this group should stand in the way of the transition.”

I think we owe that not just to ourselves, as a community, but to the entire IETF protocol space, RIRs and so on. This should not fall over because we’ve neglected to reach those last members of our community.

BYRON HOLLAND:

Thank you Keith. I think our time is drawing to a close on this one. Are there any final comments or even suggestions for the leaders of the ROs who are actually trying to do some of this, in terms of tactics or channels or ideas? Before we move to the final Panel, are there any further thoughts in terms of what must be in this agreement?

DON HOLLANDER:

Don Hollander from APTLD. Just to address the issue that Keith raised, the Boards of the ROs met on Monday, as they usually do at an ICANN Meeting, and it was clear that the ROs are reaching out. We are actually calling non-members on the telephone, trying to reach them that way. We’re sending emails to them and sending physical postal letters to them, just to try to make sure that every ccTLD Manager is aware and has the opportunity to participate.

BYRON HOLLAND:

Thanks Don. You know, what I think might be an interesting opportunity is if you document those efforts – all of the various efforts that are happening – and then we can share them on the CWG for this tack,

which is the Coordination Working Group between all of the various groups that are addressing this issue. That’s the kind of thing I think would be very helpful to share among all of those entities. If I could ask perhaps if you document those and are able to share them, that would be very useful for the bigger picture. Thank you very much. Roelof, back to you.

ROELOF MEIJER: Thank you Byron. We will move over to the third Panel. Like I said during my introduction, ccTLD representatives of the CCWG. The idea of this last part of this session is that we see what their take is from this discussion, but that we also hear from them on what else they might need from us. We have Lise Fuhr, Martin Boyle and Mary Uduma.

BYRON HOLLAND: Thank you. My first question is, what have you heard today? What threads, what useful pieces of information have you heard, that will be informing you on your role in your respective Working Groups? Lise?

LISE FUHR: Thank you Byron. I heard a very strong statement of, “There’s no going back. Rather too many safeguards than too few.” I think of course this is the scary picture, but I also heard that, “Cc’s are different to gTLDs,” but these are the more nationalistic things about this. There is a wish of separation in a way. There is someone who wants functional, someone who wants structural separation, but I also heard that the separation of power and the rule of law is important. We want the politics taken out of IANA. It’s very important that IANA is only implementing what’s been

agreed upon from someone else, so they're not making their own policies.

Most important of all I think is that the technology needs to be stable and secure, and that is not to be put under pressure by this transition. We need the IANA function to be stable, but if the stewardship transition should have an oversight outside of ICANN or inside, it's to be discussed. I tend to hear mostly that it should be outside, and then I hear people who think that IANA has absolutely no role in this, and that everyone needs a contract with IANA. Personally, I tend to say every ccTLD should not have a contract, but we shall see what the survey says. That was the overview of my takings.

BYRON HOLLAND:

Thank you. Martin?

MARTIN BOYLE:

Thanks Byron. Lise just whispered, "Oh, I forgot the redress," so consider that said on her behalf. I'd actually like to do this in two bits, because I'd like to say what I've heard and I'd also like to flag up what I didn't hear and was a little surprised not to hear. I think what I heard was that the essential balance sheet for IANA's function for its provision of the service is actually reasonably good at the moment, and many people I heard essentially say, "It mustn't be allowed to slip back from that. That is the baseline."

I heard a lot of discussion about contracts and not contracts, and I'd like to come back to that point when we start talking about taking forward and what we might need to know as we get further down the track. I

echo Lise on the separation of function and policy, but I'd also then add onto that the rule of law issue, and in particular in my mind that is associated with whose law, which I would then associate with the comments that were made, that I think I would summarize as being, "ccTLDs are not gTLDs," and, "One size does not fit all." Two slogans that I think are dear to many of us in this community.

Certainly I think there are some big issues there that we need to worry about, and I'd also flag in the terms of decisions that these are often judgments, the policy base is weak, and the decisions are complicated. Therefore you need some mechanism that will fix. Things I was surprised not to hear were essentially about the accountability and transparency of the process. This was all very much an "us and them" relationship, and that seemed to me that we might actually end up being perhaps picked off one-by-one, when the totalitarian regime that Nigel referred to, takes over.

I was also quite surprised not to hear anything about adaptability and development in response to developing needs, the improvements that you might need to continually put in place as we move on. I was also a little bit surprised not to hear anything very much about locality of decisions – in other words the authority being national, serving the local community. The other thing I was a bit surprised not to hear was anything about that this is probably not a single solution. I think we're going to have to have diversity in the solution, just for the ccTLDs.

We heard a lot of reasons why things are different, but that one wasn't. the last point I'd make about the thing I didn't hear was something that actually did a regular check. Are they carrying on giving a proper

service? How do you put that into place to make sure that you are continually driving the quality of the service upwards? Thank you.

BYRON HOLLAND:

Thanks Martin. That was very helpful. I think here in the US they call that push-pulling, but that hopefully has given a lot of people in this room more to think about as they work through this issue for themselves. Thanks. Mary?

MARY UDUMA:

Thank you. My Co-Panelists have made my work very easy. They've said basically everything that I noted as well, except the risk analysis issues. Somebody raised an issue on risk analysis – the lowest risk and the highest risk. That in a part is that there should be the high standard maintained – high standard of the technical function to be maintained. Also I heard the separation of technical function, policy and oversight. I thought there would have been stress on the oversight – who does the oversight. Should it be the cc?

Not all of us [unclear 01:16:05] the IANA function. Or this is the NSO? Or which other body would oversee it? In here, [unclear 01:16:16] strongly what we're looking at. Having a mixed bag of operations in my region, some of the cc's in my region it's purely government that's controlling it. So would this government subject itself to another government, or to multistakeholderism? That's a question that we need to look at. Or there's [unclear 01:16:42] government, a few are private sector. Most are non-governmental organizations and associations. Those are issues that we nobody raised – where the government is

entirely in charge of the TLD business. I think we've not... I didn't hear that.

Then I heard that we are still divided on whether we should sign a contract or not. I heard about structure – what type of structure are we looking at, in the separation power as well. I think because of the peculiarity of the community, because we have the national or sovereignty [unclear 01:17:53] we need to also put that into perspective when we are developing our proposal. Finally, the fall back position, should IANA fall or something happened where IANA isn't able to perform the function again, who takes over? I think we should also think about that. I'm not saying it's going to happen, it's just Mathieu said. Not the government, but if it fails, what would be our fall back position?

What of predictability of the action of IANA? Can we predict that if we send in our proposal or request for re-delegation, it will happen within a specific time? I think that is another thing we should also look at. I think I've covered everything. The rule of law. Is it the law of Nigeria or the law of UK? That's a complication for us in the community, because whether we like it or not, I think we are really different from the g, although some of the cc Managers are [unclear 01:19:35] that separation. Those are complications that are in there.

In our region we tried to hold a webinar. Maybe that's what we should also think about in other regions – try to get cc's around our region, in our region, to hold webinars. We've done one, though the turnout was not too impressive, but at least we've started. In addition to what's being done, I think we should also hold that webinar for all the regions –

for the cc's to be able to talk and tell those of us in the Working Group what they actually want. Thank you.

BYRON HOLLAND: All right. I'm very encouraged. You guys passed. You all passed. That was a very wholesome summary. I thought that was a pretty good and very complete summary of things we did talk about, as well as things we should probably be thinking about. Is there anything else that you think that they should hear in this first face-to-face session that we have with our Working Group Members or ICG Members? Did they actually miss anything, anything more we just want to leave with them? Nigel?

NIGEL HICKSON: Just very quickly, and a point of clarification, I've heard a number of the speakers talk about rule of law, which is something that I mentioned earlier, and a number of other speakers have as well. It doesn't necessarily refer to national law. What I mean by that is the general concept whereby the IANA doesn't make things up as they go along and do what they feel like, but they follow the laid-down law, which in this case could be ccNSO policy rather than actual hard law in a country. It's a higher concept rule of law that somebody else – separation of powers – makes the rules, and they just execute them.

BYRON HOLLAND: Mary, go ahead.

MARY UDUMA: Yes, but you know the peculiarity of this community, as I said. If you think about the rule of law, even if you are talking about the separation of powers within the IANA function. But when it comes to operations, what we require in our individuals countries, the rule of law also comes into play. I think we should also think about that. We have the frame models of operation, as many of us are here, in different regions. So I think that question of our own region, having government to be the registry, I think we should think about that.

BYRON HOLLAND: Thanks. Maybe I'll pose another question as we wind down the last few minutes. How do you see taking this information and the information you received through other channels over the course of time, how are you actually going to deliver this into your respective Working Groups? How are you going to be efficient and effective in getting these message and the others that come, into the mix?

LISE FUHR: Okay, well, I'm lucky to have Vika and Staffan here. They're a part of the Working Group. I think we are five cc Members, and we work quite closely together on your issues here. We will bring it into the next meeting we'll have tomorrow. We'll have a phone call and we'll discuss these matters at that phone call, and then we'll bring it onto the group, preferably in a solution that's been discussed with you guys before. We'll try and mingle these wishes into the group working with the five people, and then comes back to you guys.

I think it's very important that we do that continuously – so we keep you updated on email lists. I think the survey will feed into this too. We'll try and use email for you, and we're talking to the ccNSO group and the RO Managers too. Then we'll use the ccTLD world list. We'll see how it goes, and if anyone feels that they're left out, please contact us and say, "Guys, what are you doing? It's awfully quiet from your side." We'll be there.

BYRON HOLLAND:

I appreciate the notion of the back and forth. It's not just one-way of from the floor to you, but it's also very much from you five back to us. Martin, Mary, from the ICG perspective?

MARTIN BOYLE:

I'd like to start off by saying that the CWG's role is a rather different role to the role of the CCWG in that we ourselves are not supposed to be developing the proposals that are coming forward, but perhaps more to play the role of critical friend or cross-examiner, depending on what's come our way. Therefore I think the important thing through the next few months for us is for us to be following very carefully, very closely, what is happening in the CCWG.

Why do we need to do that? We need to understand why it is they're coming up with certain conclusions, but we also need to be fairly convinced that we're seeing a consensus development process, and that it's an open and fair process, and that we're not going to have somebody coming along at the 11th hour saying, "I kept on saying this but they ignored me." That means I think that we do need to stay very much in

touch with the CWG Members, and as we're doing that, I think we can probably help them by feeding into them the questions that we might feel need to be answered, need to be resolved.

In particular, as I said earlier, this idea of, "Are you being properly inclusive?" and that links to my thing about the diversity of the ccTLDs, and are you now putting a bias into the process? Then the two other ones really for me, both of which Lise's referred to, one is the outreach and yes, very important and I do see that as being a very important part of all the ICG Members' role. The other side of the outreach, the openness, to the people that come along and say, "Nobody's listening to us," or we need to get over some of our ideas and help them in that process of getting engaged. Thank you.

MARY UDUMA:

Thank you. Martin has said it all. I think the good thing is that we are also participants in the CCWG, and this will be a guide of all we've had today, and it's good that this process is being done this way and at least getting everybody engaged, getting everyone understanding the process as we go along. We'll be there in both Working Groups, and at least the ideas that are not well managed would also guide in some way. The experience we're getting from the ICG would also help us in the CWG. We're taking away this as a note. It's like a checklist for us, to be able to see whether the community's coming up with all these that we've raised today. Thank you.

BYRON HOLLAND: Thanks. One of the things I hear coming through loud and clear is the notion about reaching communication and soliciting views, etcetera, and it would be good to have a little friendly competition with the ICG and the CCWG in that anybody who went to the first meeting would have seen it was like an old-school Internet meeting. There were people sitting on the floor, standing room only. It's when I saw [Lyn Santamoor 01:29:33] cross-legged on the floor typing away. I was like, "Wow, this is like an old-school Internet event right here." Anyway, thank you very much to all the Panelists. I'm going to hand it back to Roelof for a recap.

ROELOF MIEJER: Thank you Byron. The three CCWG pretty well wrapped it up. I think there are some things that have been said that we cannot repeat enough. We'll start with one that they completely missed, and I hope that's not a sign. That is that the ccTLD Managers' Panel came out with "do not overcomplicate matters". I think Jörg said, "Do not over-engineer," and as an engineer I think that's a contradiction, but I think the message was clear. Let's not introduce subjects into the discussion that do not belong there.

Protected presence. High quality performance of the IANA function. Protected distinction between gTLDs and ccTLDs. Somehow insert the FOI Working Groups recommendations into the process, although this cannot be done by the PDP. I think there was an agreement on that. The timelines won't coincide. Several Panelists mentioned separation of oversight from execution; functional or structural policy from execution, policy from oversight. I think that's a matter to be discussed further, but there seems to be a call for separation of certain functions.

A redress mechanism, in what form, is not yet clear, but something that can counter IANA decisions if everything goes wrong. I think it was the emergency measures that you never use, but you should still have just in case. I think there are a few “orphan subjects”. Martin brought in that he missed accountability and transparency of the whole process. I think that nobody on the panel would disagree with that. Risk analysis, before we actually come up with a proposal, was mentioned. What I caught from the ROs is that there is this tendency or this urge to solicit input.

They’re going to run a questionnaire. I think we should all participate in that. More communication, more outreach, and I think that wraps it up as far as I think that we should continue with this. I don’t know, Byron, if I can also make a suggestion? It’s quite an exhaustive list of subjects, I’m sure that during our next meeting we will have a discussion hopefully on a draft proposal or something. Maybe we could bring this in as a checklist, to see if the things that we now feel are important, if they’re actively being taken care of in the proposal? That’s just a suggestion from the Chair. Did I miss anything, my dear Panelists? I didn’t.

BYRON HOLLAND: While we’re talking about it, maybe I could ask you to just send myself and Bart and Alan an email with your list? We will incorporate it and feed it back.

ROELOF MEIJER: Yes, no problem. I think that as a Chair, let me thank the Panelists for your contribution, everyone in the room for your contribution to the discussion. Byron, thank you very much. Although I probably shouldn’t

say it, I think we now have a coffee break. I'm going to hand over to the Chair of the day. Thank you all.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]