Lesley Cowley:	We will plan to start in about four or five minutes. Thank you.

So good morning everybody, and welcome to the ccNSO meeting. I think we're in the most big venue we have been in for some time, so you're going to have to wave a lot so we can see you from here. We have some new people in the audience for whom it is their first ccNSO meeting.

If you are new to the ccNSO, would you like to raise your hand, so we can make sure we say hello to you, and make you feel welcome. So welcome, and please, we're very friendly, we don't bite, very happy to talk and network with you in the coffee and breaks and lunchtime, so welcome.

So let me just have a quick run through of our work for the day. For this morning, we have Byron speaking in a minute on financial matters, and contributions to ICANN. Then we do on a walk to our meeting with the ICANN Board. Instructions will be provided just before that, so we know where we're going and don't lose too many people on the way.

After our meeting with ICANN Board, we have a coffee break, followed by an update on the strategic plan, and then a question and answer session with our ccNSO ICANN Board nominee. So can I encourage you to think about questions you might like to ask Mike Silber who will be joining us later.

After that we have an IANA update and an update on the geographic regions report before lunch. And then after lunch, we

have the framework of interpretation Working Group update, the IDN session, and we're going to learn about the work of the ASO. We're going to have a DSSA Working Group update; the acronyms will be explained later for people new to the ccNSO. And then we have an update on the Security and Stability Review Team.

So we have a very full day and as per usual, I will be doing my best to keep us to times, so we don't overrun, because otherwise, we will be late for the ccNSO dinner this evening, a very important date in our diary.

So welcome and I look forward to hearing questions and comments from you all today, and let me hand over to Byron for finance matters.

Byron Holland: Thank you very much, Lesley. We've had a last minute switch on computers that are driving the PowerPoint. Can we get that up? Is it up over there? Okay. Then I'm flying behind, and you can tell me if I'm speaking to the wrong thing.

So the goal behind this session is to provide a status update on the activities of the finance Working Group. As you can see there is an agenda behind me, so we'll give a quick overview of the activities to date, take a look at the timeline, just to familiarize everybody with what the overall timeline and work product is supposed to look like.

We've also had some interactions with the new ICANN CFO, Xavier Calvez, so we'll report on that. We have a very high level overview of the contribution models that the Finance Working Group has assessed to date, and it will be a high level overview. Because we've look at eight or nine of them, so I'll just touch on a few of the high points. The documents associated with that review will be published to this community, and we'll have some time to look at them and digest them in detail between here and the next ICANN meeting. So as I go over them, don't worry, you'll have lots of opportunity to read them for yourself and do an in depth review, should you choose.

We're also going to be putting a survey out to the CC community to help give us some guidance on the ICANN services used by this community. We'll have a brief discussion about that and any kind of Q&A that people want to have regarding this survey. And then we'll come back to the timeline, because we may need to make some adjustments based on new information and have a brief overview of that.

So there will be a couple of opportunities to have some interactive dialogue, but in the meantime, I'll get going with the activities to date. So I'm going to assume here everybody can see the timeline.

The group really got going back in May and at the Singapore meeting came up with the primary timeline and discussed potential models that we would examine. And these are contribution models that country code operators, such as ourselves, could use in terms

of figuring out how do we contribute to ICANN from a financial standpoint. So that was the primary goal of the Working Group.

Currently, we use a banded model that has a number of bands based on domains under management, and this Working Group is looking at is that appropriate, what are the other models out there, and how best can we provide a fair contribution to ICANN that will address the needs of quite a broad constituency based represented in this room in terms of how we operate, how we're managed, ownership of the registry, et cetera.

So since Singapore, the Working Group has really looked at, like I say, eight or nine different models and done a preliminary analysis on all of them. We have a fairly big work group, so we had the benefit of being able to divide into sub-teams and parcel out the work, and each sub-team looked at two or three different models.

That's the primary work that we've been doing since Singapore. We've had a couple of conference calls along the way, and this past Sunday, we came together to review those models. For the first time take a look at all of them and have a walk-through of them. This timeline gives you a sense of what we had anticipated being the overall schedule.

Originally, our goal had been to be able to come back to this community and provide some recommendations, approximately a year from now in the October 2012 meeting. And the timeline shown above gives you a sense of the activities that would happen between here and there.

As far as our schedule, the work group schedule, we're currently on track, so I'm happy to report that. A lot of good work was done in the initial review and analysis of the different models. So that's where we're at to date.   So according to this timeline, we're relatively on schedule.

That brings me to the next point in the agenda, which is we have had the opportunity to meet with Xavier, the new CFO of ICANN. And I've had the opportunity to speak with him directly by conference call a month ago, and Lesley and Roelof and I and a couple others had the opportunity to speak to him at some length over the course of the weekend. And I have to say, I'm certainly encouraged by what I hear from him.   He clearly is very technically solid as a CFO, and as an accountant. He is six weeks into the job, so clearly new to the space, however, definitely asking the right questions, listening, and quickly seeming to get a feel for this organization and the space we're in.

And I say that because he comes from a space well outside of this. He's worked in a public company, technology company in the US. He's French originally, and has spent his career really between France and the US. So there's a very good sense of what it takes to run from a financial perspective, large, complex, multi-national organizations that require robust and complex enterprise-wide financial systems. So seemingly, he brings a good skill set to the organization. He appears to be listening closely and understanding what he hears, and I would say that having spoken to him, I'm cautiously optimistic.

That said, he's a new guy with new challenges, trying to figure out where he is, and that is without a doubt going to take some time before he really gets his feet under him, and a clear understanding of the subtleties and layers associated with this organization.

The next item on the agenda is an overview of the contribution models that we looked at. And like I said at the outset, I have no intention right now of going through them in any detail, but I did want to, at a very high level, walk through each of them, just to give you a sense of what they are, and one or two of the key items.

We haven't come to really whittling it down in terms of which ones would be best suited for further review and examination or not. I think each of us in the Working Group probably have a gut feel, but that's really part of the next stage of activities, so we're not going to really make any concrete recommendations at this point, but I'm sure you'll see there are some that are more obvious than others, which is fine. That's part of the work of the Working Group is let's eliminate the ones that are not appropriate and in order to be able to do that in a reasonable way, that still requires some review and analysis.

We'll put them up here, they'll likely be too small to see, but this will give you a sense of the document and the way we laid it out at least. And we looked at the models, giving a quick overview of the model, some of the details of the model, advantages, disadvantages, issues for further analysis. And at this stage this is the basic recommendations, it doesn't make any sense at all should we do further analysis on this.

We looked at a number of different models, benefit-based models, variable registry fee, fixed registry fee, a case by case individual one, revenue neutral, third-party funding, and two different types of banding. Banding being the current model.

So the first one we looked at was effectively the model that we have today, which is voluntary contributions on a self-selected banded basis. And I think we are all familiar with that type of model, given that that's the way we currently contribute to ICANN but fundamentally, it's based on a range of domains under management, and you pick your range, and contribute based on the suggested contribution for that range of which your like peers are doing so as well. Or at least that's the theory.

So the first model we looked was really the model we're engaged in today. The basic advantage is that you know we can perceive and assess the value that we receive today in return for a contribution and we can make a subjective interpretation of it. If it's fair and reasonable, it's voluntary and we can elect to pay or not.

There are some disadvantages of course in any voluntary model; there is always the notion of the free rider syndrome. And that's where people receive the benefits, but since it's voluntary, don't make any contributions. And in any model where voluntary is part of the model, the free rider syndrome of course is always going to be an issue. So that's one of the primary ones. As far as this particular model, it was certainly recommended for further review and to be considered in any of the final potential models.

The next model that we looked at was really a variation on this theme. Thank you very much; Lesley has always taken very good care of me.

The next one, like I said, is a variation on this theme. It's a voluntary contribution banded, but had some notion of waiting. And we looked at this because other organizations in this space like Center use a model like this, and that's where it's banded, but there is an element where those who pay more have more votes for certain elements, typically financial-related. We looked at this because it's a model used by other organizations in our space, I think the initial review, you know it was voluntary. It had the advantages of that. However, given the nature of this organization the initial feedback and analysis was that it was likely not an appropriate model for this particular organization.

And please remember that we will be publishing all these documents, so you'll have an opportunity to review them in detail, because they certainly go into more detail than I'm going to touch upon.

The next model we looked at was the variable level of registration fee. And that fundamentally is the model that is applied to .com. And it's a fee per domain charge, the fee is set in advance, it varies over time, but it's clear and transparent over time what that will look like. And it's strictly a per domain charge. Currently, for example with .com, it's $.18 and it has a range that could rise up to $.25 that's paid to ICANN.

So that's another model that we looked at. It certainly has some advantages in that it's very clear, very simple, has X domains times $.18 and you get your answer in terms of the dollars that need to be paid to ICANN.

There are certainly some disadvantages of that for this particular space. We're not contracted parties, that's a little bit formal, it certainly implies some sort of contract, or a much clearer understand than many of us have with ICANN.

Those who run large registries would see very significant up ticks, depending on the fee, but likely it would be a significant up tick for any of the big registries. You know obviously for example .DE, if they had to pay at this level would see their fee to ICANN rise to over two and a half million dollars, so that's obviously a challenge for some of the bigger registries, but also is an involuntary methodology it probably is not appropriate for a wide swap of registry operators within this community.

As a result, you know there are issues for further discussion on this, but it's likely not a justifiable methodology for this particular part of the organization.

We went on to look at a benefits-based contribution, and the notion behind this is fundamentally that any financial contribution should correlate in some way to the benefits provided to the members of this organization. There is a couple of different ways to look at this.

EN

You know you could have a banding type model, where there is a band for basic services, we probably all agree we need the IANA functions, and we all have received those services, there should be a basic band for that. And then there could be a separate band for other associated services that we receive, depending on what in the menu of services we actually use. So that's another way to look at it.

You know I think in terms of advantages, it's probably easier for those of us who report to some sort of management structure, be it a board or otherwise, it would probably be something that we can justify and make sense to our Board. In this fee band structure, notionally we would pay our fair share of costs, based on the services that we receive.

So from a theoretical construct perspective, this one has an attractive element to it. I think from the practical construct, it would be challenging to calculate and value, you know what exactly is the benefit? Can we all agree on the benefit of a particular activity that ICANN engages in.

So again theoretically, there is some appeal to this model. Practically, there is certainly some challenges as far as the Working Group was concerned, it merits some further investigation, but it does seem to have some limitations around the practical applications and the level of complexity that we would have in trying to ascertain the specific value.

The next one we looked at was a case by case basis. So this is where in each case or each registry a deal is negotiated directly with ICANN. Typically, this wouldn't be considered perhaps a voluntary model. As the name suggests it would be each registry negotiates directly with ICANN in terms of what their deal would be. From an advantages standpoint there is privacy. There would be a respect for individuality. Presumably, ICANN would have the flexibility to have different arrangements with different kinds of CCs, which theoretically may address the different sizes and natures of the various CCs represented in this group. So that certainly has some potential benefits.

Disadvantages potentially wildly unbalanced contributions, mechanisms or schemes. The flip side of privacy of course is the lack of transparency which given the nature of this organization could certainly be an issue, and participation may be challenging to identify. It depends on the structure, but you know if it's not mandatory, it may be difficult to monitor that. So some challenges there.

I think the other one that could be a significant issue of course ICANN in a sense works in a monopolistic environment, so it makes it difficult in the terms of the asymmetry between provider and recipient to services. So you have monopoly issues in this kind of methodology that would need to be addressed or considered. As a result probably lower on the list of possibilities in terms of models.

Another one that we looked at was funded by a third party organization and this is probably a more conceptual exercise than anything else. I think it's the one that the Working Group at the end, said well, that was an interesting discussion but probably not.

And that's where we would try to seek out some third party, if we could create a business model might fund the ccNSO's contribution into ICANN. And that becomes a bit of a challenge but the notion there perhaps is like almost like a secretariat where some organization funds the secretariat to participate in the activities of the overall organization.

So in a sense that was the model we looked at. I think in the end we found that very difficult to understand how we could possibly make that one work.

We did also look at a couple of others. One was a fixed registry level fee, and that's where there would be a set fee, you know a single set fee on an annual basis, paid by a registry. And then perhaps over time some additional transaction fee levied, and if you think of something like a .arrow, that was the model. So again, it merits further investigation, but a fixed fee initially with some ongoing level of transaction fees again if the variable fee like .com doesn't probably work for this organization, then a fixed fee with some variable over time likely is not an appropriate model either. But I think it at least probably requires further analysis and would make the next cut in terms of the Working Groups' activities.

And then the other one is a revenue neutral model. And that's where we would take a good hard look at what exactly this organization and our activities cost ICANN. And that would require as you can imagine a pretty detailed examination of all of the activities engaged in by ICANN that are related to the ccNSO. And needless to say, that requires some assumptions and the assumption being that ICANN can identify those, that ICANN can provide those to us, and that we actually agree on them. And any time you come to cost accounting, there will be a number of subjective assumptions around allocations. And that would mean this whole group would in the end have to come to the conclusion that we agree on those subjective accounting elements.

So I think it definitely bears further review, but as any of you who have been following the work of this Working Group and this general discussion over time dating back to the Wellington meeting and beyond, that may be a challenge. That is a challenge currently.

So it certainly requires further investigation, however, a significant level of complexity associated with that particular one.

So those are the models that we took a look at. The Working Group engaged in a considerable level of effort in terms of the analysis. I've barely scratched the surface on each, but I wanted to give everybody a flavor of what's in the document that you're going to receive and hopefully look at and give some consideration to, and ideally some feedback on.

Are there any questions of clarification, not substance or analysis or recommendation, but just anything in terms of clarification or further understanding?   Just quickly.   Hearing none, okay, I'll move on.

One of the pieces of work that we engaged in as part of the work product of the Working Group was to create a survey because the work of this Working Group is really following a couple of tracks. One is the actual methodology, review and analysis that we've just been discussing, that's sort of one track of activity.

Another track of activity is the actual review of the numbers from ICANN and getting a better financial understanding of what ICANN is suggesting of the costs associated with supporting this organization.   In order to help us further understand this overall issue, we have created a survey that we would like to put out to the entire CC community, this membership as well as beyond, all of the CC operators, to help give us a better sense of the members of this organization in terms of the services they are receiving and their interaction with ICANN.

And that will I think really help in coming to the end goal, which is making a recommendation back to this community, about what the most appropriate model is.   Because we need that, and we need the model review, financial detail from ICANN as well as what are the services that we are actually consuming from ICANN and that will help us winnow down the models and find the most applicable one.

Because I think if each of us looked around this room, and say what is my neighbor receiving in terms of services from ICANN, we wouldn't get very far in terms of having a clear understanding of that. So how do you have an informed discussion or debate when we don't actually know collectively exactly what are the services we're receiving.

So that's what the survey is really trying to get to. I would strongly encourage everybody please to fill out the survey, it's not that long. It shouldn't take too long. It does lead in with a few demographic questions, and I just want to allay any concerns right now that we're going to be singling out anybody. All the data will be masked, it's not meant to identify any particular CC. I just want to make that very clear.

No individual CC's data will be available, it's going to be genericized and amalgamated, but we will be asking how many domains under management do you have, what geographic region are you from, and that will again help us understand the nature of the services required, the size and scope of the registry associated with the services required.

And that will help inform us in selecting what we believe is the best model, that we can then put forward back to the community as a recommendation in the final stage of this endeavor. Are there any questions about this survey, again, ideally from a – since nobody has seen it, from a clarification point of view, as opposed to a substance point of view? Anybody have any issues with that?

So again, I would ask you – I would urge you please, when you get this survey to take the few minutes to fill it out, this issue, the issue in general in terms of ICANN contributions is I'm sure near and dear to most of our hearts, and this will be very helpful in us being able to provide a good work product back to you, and to recommend a meaningful recommendation back to you.

I'm running a little bit ahead of time here, since – just as a reminder this is the agenda, and I only have one more item which is to take a look at the timeline and the path forward, which I'll go back to here.

And this comes back to ICANN and its ability to produce the financial data that we need in order to so a reasonable financial analysis. Like I said, there is a new CFO, and that's a bit of a good news/bad news story.

The good news is he seems like a very competent individual who is asking all the right questions. Of course the bad news is, he's a new guy and it's going to take a new guy some time to ramp up, needless to say in a position that has been vacant for 14 or 15 months, there is a pent-up demand for his attention. And this is but one of the issues on his plate, dealing with the ccNSO's contribution method.

So needless to say, he's a busy guy. As a result the prioritization of providing the kind of data and the work that needs to be done to get to that may not be his top priority at this moment. As a result, we as a Working Group are likely going to have to slow down our

activity, which is unfortunate, because we built I would say a pretty significant momentum. The Working Group has been I would say working very well, having produced the level of the material that we have thus far. But as I said, it's a multiple track activity, and if one of those comes off, then inevitably it slows down the work on the other side. And these two activities are intrinsically linked. One cannot really proceed with the other.

So in discussion with Xavier and senior ICANN staff, it is quite likely at this time we're going to have to slow down the work of the ccNSO, if ICANN can't deliver on their piece of this in short order. So that doesn't mean it is going to slow down, but I certainly want to let this group know that there is that distinct possibility, based on the discussions we've been having about ICANN's ability to produce the detail associated with the actual costs that this organization incurs for ICANN.

The timeline is up there, the goal is still to get to that end state; however, I am definitely concerned about our ability to deliver on that as a result and not receiving the information from ICANN in a timely manner. They're working on it. They're very aware of it. But there isn't a commitment to deliver it to us in the immediate future. And we can't go very much beyond the immediate future before we will have to start to slow down the output of this Working Group.

So that's where we stand. That's the unvarnished truth on where we're at right now. Are there any questions, feedback, concerns?

Please. I guess you have to come all the way down here. Oh, no, roving mike.

Lesley Cowley: Can I just ask anyone to introduce themselves before – Steven.

Steven Deerhake: Steven Deerhake, .as.   Bryon, historically surveys of the type you're proposed run by the regional organizations have had less than statistically significant return, and I was just wondering if you guys were addressing the outreach effort that I think will be required to get some meaningful results back.

And my second question is, will you be publishing the results of that survey or is it simply for internal use of the Working Group and will eventually come out in the Working Group documents?

Byron Holland: Those are good questions, certainly very fair question. In fact in the Working Group meeting on Sunday, we discussed some elements, some of the elements within that question. Certainly in terms of whether we would be able to get a statistically relevant sample. Of course until you get them, it's hard to say. We have done some survey work at the ccNSO level previously, where the results were meaningful. So I certainly have hope that we can get that. I think this issue we all have a material interest in. I would like to think that that would stimulate the interest.

We will be doing outreach and awareness for this issue.   We haven't defined the timeline that we're going to do the survey in, the goal however was to do it between here and the next ICANN meeting.   We will be contacting the regional organizations.   We will be doing outreach, emails, awareness, all of that type of thing. So we certainly hope that we'll get a statistically significant sample size, and we have had good fortune in the previous ccNSO survey we did.

In terms of the results, like I said we won't publish anything specific, but certainly the bulk of the aggregated responses, the intent is to publish that and make it available to community.   Any other questions?   Okay, well, thanks very much and please fill out the survey.

Lesley Cowley: Thank you very much Byron.

[Applause]

Lesley Cowley: So I do know that Byron and others in the Working Group have been spending a lot of time looking at finances and models and that work is appreciated.   Thank you to you and the Working Group members.

So a bit more action in the room. We're going to be heading off to our meeting with the Board shortly. So let me just give you a brief introduction to that. And would the ccNSO council were asked to submit some question topics to the Board, which we did in advance of this meeting, and the council decided we'd like to talk with the Board around ICANN finances and budget, which is really a follow-on from our discussions on exactly the same topic in Singapore.

We also thought particularly based on feedback from ccTLDs that we'd like to talk about conflicts of interest at ICANN and what's called the revolving door policy. So what happens when somebody leaves the Board or a senior position whether there are any restrictions or conditions on what they do next?

And also the topic of CCO succession. So those were the three topics that the ccNSO put forward, and the Board also put forward some topics. And they're looking for the views of the ccNSO on the joint applicant support work, which will be a brief response, because of course that's not something that we have looked at.

They'd like to discuss the framework of interpretation Working Group with us, and they'd like our input for the COO search following on from discussions that have taken place several sessions this week around the criteria that ccNSO members would and nonmembers would like to look for.

So those are the topic areas, and hopefully we can have a good conversation around all of those. But for that conversation we

need to move, for which one needs to go up to the top of this room, following Gabby and Kristina who might have flags or umbrellas, I'm not sure. So we go up to the top of this room, right apparently on this same floor, we need to relocate to Room BC12, Room BC-12, and we are due there in five minutes, okay. And then we are straight back here afterwards.

Actually, sorry, we're back to coffee after that. We'll have a coffee after our engagement with the Board, then we'll be back in this room. Thank you.

[break]

Lesley Cowley: So welcome back everybody. This stage of our agenda is on the ICANN strategic plan, for which we have Roelof as the SOP Working Group Chair, and I'm pleased to welcome Kurt and Carol from ICANN who are leading on the strategic plan from an ICANN point of view. So over to you.

Roelof Meijer: Thank you Lesley. Just briefly for those of you who have never been to a session of the SOP Working Group, or who are new to this circus, the Strategic and Operational Planning Working Group is there to coordinate, facilitate and increase the participation of ccTLD managers in the strategic and operational planning process.

So in the compilation of ICANN's strategic plan and the operational plan.

It's quite a large Working Group. These are the members; there is a special page, or several pages on the ccNSO's website. And we are very lucky to have the support from three members of the ICANN staff, Bart, Gabriela and Kristina.

What I just want to go over with you during this session is what happens since our last meeting in Singapore. After that I will give the floor to Kurt and Carol, or Kurt or Carol, both of you, okay, to give us the highlights of the upcoming plan in 2012, 2015 strategic plan. They would very much like to have input from us, so I do hope that you will participate in the discussion on the highlights of that plan. At the end of this session I will give you an overview of the timeline of the SOP's work, because we're going to provide you with input should you want to supply commands to ICANN on the new plan.

So what happened within the SOP since Singapore, we received a letter from Kurt providing us feedback on the comments that we submitted on the present plan, the 2011 and 2014 plan. Although not all of the points we made were taken into account, quite a few of them about, about 13, seven are still under revision, and two points that we submitted we received a reaction that the plan was not amended in that direction, but we're very grateful for that feedback from our submission. And I think it really shows that ICANN has taken our comments into account properly.

For the 2012/2015 plan, the community input period started in July for one month that was without any draft or framework. As SOP we decided not to submit any input for two reasons, we thought that with all the input we have supplied on the previous version, and the input we had supplied on the operational plan, there was ample information for ICANN to attempt a strategic plan to – well, for a better version. Also, we felt that it would be better for ICANN to present its vision in a draft plan, or at least in the framework and allow the community to add to that.

We had a Working Group called in the midst of my summer holidays on the 16th of August, when we decided all this. On the 3rd of October the first draft of the upcoming plan was presented, and immediately after that, the community input period started which runs from the 3rd of October to the 17th of November.

We had a face to face meeting last Sunday on both the operational or both new strategic plan as well as the upcoming operational plan, the plan for 2013, and I'll come back to you on that at the end of this session. If there are no questions on what we've been doing, I would like to hand over to you.

Kurt Pritz: Thank you, so this is somewhat intimidating surroundings. So thanks for spending some time with Carol and I and Bart on this issue. As we spoke to the SOP on strategic planning and how best to garner input, and as we speak to other constituencies and stakeholder groups and supporting organizations, it's kind of an

odd discussion, how to start the conversation. Do we start with a blank sheet of paper? Do we present a deck of slides that indicates here's all the work's that's been done and ask for very specified or specific comment?

So, Roelof, the others and we discussed this quite a bit. So how we want to construct this discussion here, and I think we want to build on it going forward in the future, is that we want to ask some basic questions about the strategic plan and get your input at a high level, right. Because strategic planning is a high level exercise. You know it's the sort of thing where you know you put your feet up on the desk and smoke a cigar and think about how things should be in a perfect world.

While we can't get to that level in this big room, perhaps we could have the input that would be most meaningful to us is that high level sort of input. Because this is ICANN creating a strategy or blueprint for the future. So we're going to frame up a couple questions for you and get what feedback you have to offer and do that in the context of ICANN's mission.

So ICANN's mission as described in the strategic mission is four primary focus areas. You know the stability and security and resiliency mission, encouraging competition and choice for users, ICANN becoming excellent at its core competencies, and finally the ICANN role in the whole internet governance discussion and internet governance model and ecosystem. So we're just going to spend because I want to help you get caught up on your schedule, we'll spend a few minutes on each of the topics.

So first, are the two questions up, Bart?

Bart Boswinkel: Yes, I will or you can do it either way.

Kurt Pritz: Well, let's look at the two questions. So in each of ICANN's four mission areas, you know what are challenges facing us. So when we at ICANN or it's everybody in this room and everybody outside in the hallways and in other meeting rooms, so what are the challenges facing us over the next three years from accomplishing the basic objectives with regard to say stability and security?

And then so what should we do? What actions should we take? What strategy should we take in consideration of response to these challenges? So in this big room, it's tough. And I don't know – anyway I think it's the right level to have the conversation. So if you memorize these two questions, what challenges does ICANN face? To the extent you can bring them to the forefront here, that's great. I recognize that they also require quite a bit of thought to provide meaningful input. And so I would ask you to take these back and comment on them through the SOP, so that the ccNSO can provide more complete feedback.

So what are the challenges and what should our strategy be for each one of these. So the first one is the strategic mission of security and stability, so if we look at that slide for a little bit, we have [August] surroundings but not clever…

So here's this basic if you look at the one-page version of the strategic plan, here are the basic strategies. And if you remember the strategic plan, underneath these are work of ICANN staff, work of the community and projects. But these are the strategic objectives, and this is how we see these evolving from last year's plan to this year's plan in red. If anybody can comment on what challenges does ICANN see in accomplishing these security and stability objectives, and what should we be doing.

Roelof Meijer: So we're trying desperately to get this into an interactive action, so anybody from the room who is missing something from the overview could just give him security and stability? Not really.

It's suggested, Bart has just given me, we had a similar discussion in the SOP, and one of the things that came up is that there was an impression that we were not paying attention, that ICANN would broaden its activities in the field of security and stability too much to areas where maybe the organization wouldn't have a role. So that's definitely something we are going to take up in our comments. I don't know if that solicits any reaction from the room. Yes, Jay, thank you so much.

Jay Daley: Hi Roelof, this is – the usual problem with this is this is marvelous. We all agree with this, but if the interpretation of this is then to spend a great deal of money setting up something that strays far beyond its scope and all that sort of stuff, that's where the problem

comes in. So you know nobody would ever argue with this. This is marvelous. It's the implementation that we're worried about.

Roelof Meijer: Okay, so you're worried about the highlights are going to be translated into the details, the actual activities. Is there anything that you want to draw attention to, or just say okay, if these are your highlights I agree with them, make sure that this kind of an activity or a goal for the coming three years is in your plan.

Jay Daley: Sure. Okay, there's been a lot of change within ICANN recently, particularly in the security area. Previous to that, there was a concern had by a number of people that ICANN was intending to take a leadership role in an already very heavily populated space, and that it would be better off working with the existing participants who had many years of experience, who had their own funding models, who had their own threat analysis, and other things to help deliver these goals.

And it almost felt as though ICANN was deliberately ignoring some of those existing stakeholders and going its own path. Now, that has certainly pulled back, but whether that's pulled back because there have been staff changes, and there isn't the level of resource there, or whether it's pulled back because of strategic is not clear. And I would hope that if the resources are to be built up again, that it would not go back that attitude, but it would be you

know building on the strength of the community that already exists there.

Roelof Meijer: Okay, thank you Jay. Do you want to react to that Kurt?

Kurt Pritz: Yes, so that's a very good comment. I think ICANN sees itself as a technical coordinator you know and that implies some leadership, but that comment, we want to talk about how we work together, so that comment makes it into the plan and is well-defined.

                        Certainly, to take advantage of the expertise and work that's already been done and find the right role for ICANN in that is the right way to do that. So one of the things working on this going forward is that how do we memorialize that in the ccNSO input into the plans so it gets included. Other than us taking it on board verbally here.

Luis Espinosa: Hi, Luis Espinosa from .cr. Talking about DNSSEC, from a point of view DNSSEC is a solution to keep integrity of the DNS. Then since the point of view of strategic objective, I think mention keep the integrity of DNS include DNSSEC and maybe other (inaudible) or other tools. That's my comment about this. Thank you.

Kurt Pritz:	The comment is well taken, when you say other, do you have specific instances in mind?
Luis Espinosa:	Sorry.
Kurt Pritz:	So my understanding of what you said was that not just DNSSEC adoption, but there are other instances besides DNSSEC?
Luis Espinosa:	Yes, I'm not thinking in that right now, but could be certainly find some other solutions to improve the integrity of the DNS. My point is the objective is to improve to achieve the integrity of the DNS. And one of the ways is with DNSSEC, but could be others. And the other thing about DNSSEC is that DNSSEC works when you complain a chain to the user, then it's important to take account of that. Thank you.
Kurt Pritz:	I understand, thank you.
Simon McCalla:	Thanks, hi, Simon McCalla for Nominet. I'm also one of the ccNSO reps on this SSR Review Team. So I thought be useful just to bring some feedback. What is interesting is what we are seeing, and I think it's a really welcome we are seeing some of the

language changing as a result of the interactions that we've been having with ICANN staff. And particularly the first one about maintain and drive DNS availability is a really welcome change to the language from DNS up time. So I just really wanted to say well done for working and constantly evolving this and changing it.

And I wanted to address Jay's point as well. One of our early findings, and I'm hoping we'll be briefing you later this afternoon, is that we're seeing that, although there is some concern about ICANN straying from its remit, actually what we see in practice is that the concerns are less substantive than we what see in the actual documentation.

And actually ICANN did a pretty good job at trying to stay within a close remit, so I just wanted to make that comment.

Kurt Pritz: Thank you.

Roelof Meijer: Anybody else? Okay, maybe just one from me then, Kurt. One of the new strategic objectives on this particular area is, and I quote, improve response to DNS security incidents. Can you maybe explain to the audience a bit more about what you mean by that, and what your intentions are and see if that leads to any interaction with the room?

Kurt Pritz: I don't know if Kim can help me with this one. I know that we've been in contact with registries, and so I know gTLD registries, and I think ccTLDs registries, but let me give you an example of a gTLD registry that is requesting amendments to its agreement to allow it to respond to security incidents, so that we might suspend the terms of a gTLD agreement in certain cases to allow it to either suspend certain names or register certain names to block them. And so what we've been asked by registries to enable them to respond to security incidents so that's one example that comes to mind.

Roelof Meijer: We'll proceed to the next one. Oh, Sabine, sorry. Do you have a mike? I think Gabby is the only who is getting exercise this week.

Sabine Dolderer: I have comment in line actually with what your answer was and I was yesterday in the meeting with the Working Group and then the afternoon on a meeting where it's talking about DNS abuse. And I'm a little bit puzzled about what actually ICANN defines being the DNS and what it defines being DNS security incidents.

Coming from a technical perspective, the DNS for me is actually a protocol where ICANN actually has a role in maintaining some (inaudible) parameters, and what I see at the panel wall is that a lot of things what are associated with DNS security incidents is mainly about content on the website. And I'm not very sure if, and people just mix that up completely. They use it completely abroad,

and I would really urge to make at least the distinction when you're addressing that and not just mingling everything below the umbrella DNS security incidents. Because DNS is obviously a technical protocol which helps the internet running, and there are application on that level, and part of the applications are websites, part of the applications are shops and other things, but that has nothing to do with the DNS and I think it's important that we distinguish these things and when I look at your answer, it's going immediately in that direction, looking for content, illegal whatever content and malware content on websites. And I would really urge not to mingle that down in being the DNS or being security incidents on the DNS.

And additionally, maybe a side discussion with whomever about is ICANN part of a content regulation team in the world, and should they address that? And if there is a yes, we want that happen, maybe ICANN can start to put that in their strategic plans, but not just below umbrella mingled in that's also DNS.

Roelof Meijer: Okay, thank you, Sabine, I think that was a clear point. Do you want to – if you don't want to, it's fine, then we just go onto the next –

Kurt Pritz: You're managing content and not – no, most of it was really clear except for the acoustics. Is this recorded? This session, okay. No, your comment was very clear.

Roelof Meijer: Let's go to next thing.

Kurt Pritz: So thanks very much for that, so let's apply the same set of questions, you know what are the challenges and what are the actions we should take with regard to facilitating competition in the DNS and user choice. And you see there really hasn't been a change in this, but I think the strategic objectives you know are still important and I don't know – so if there are comments on this one. What are the challenges associated with this, and what action should ICANN take? I could tell you the challenges associated with new gTLDs, but that's for another time.

                        But specifically if you look at this, the more difficult ones are ICANN's role in lowering registration abuse. You know there is a lot of discussion here between the role of law enforcement. We talked a little bit about this the other day, that law enforcement agencies are not constituency or stakeholder group formally recognized within ICANN or any formal policy-making body, yet they come to ICANN meetings, there is a session around DNS abuse, that was yesterday, and the law enforcement agencies give advice to the Governmental Advisory Committee and maybe also you.

                        And so I'd like to hear specifically, we're trying to figure out how to deal with that advice that we're getting from law enforcement agencies in the right manner given you know what the ICANN

model is and how it's structured, so if there is any specific comments about that, I'd be really pleased to take that on board, because it's a timely topic.

Roelof Meijer: Yes, Nigel. In sympathy with Gabby or ICANN staff in general, maybe next time we can or after lunch we can move a bit more together so that the distances are reduced.

Sabine Dolderer: Just go up again, because it starts to interfere, Sabine again. Yes, I have a comment on that, and as far as I know law enforcement agencies are usually subject to local government and as far as I understand, I'm not sure that local government, and the local law enforcement agency should interact on ICANN meetings with each other, but government should represent of course the interest of the law enforcement agencies, because that's their job.

So they organize them in their countries, and of course they should raise the issues on ICANN level. I don't think that we should duplicate those efforts. Just my five cents.

Kurt Pritz: While Gabby walks all the way across the room, so what you said is essentially law enforcement agencies are advisors to governments so they give their advice to the GAC who considers it. Is what you said. Yes, right.

Roelof Meijer: Nigel.

Nigel Roberts: Nigel Roberts from Guernsey. I've taken quite some interest in the interaction of registries, our own registry, and in the ICANN process of law enforcement. I took part in the law enforcement Brussels meeting a few months ago.

I have some concerns, I think it's very positive that law enforcement comes to us, the community, the registries and the registrars and say what they want. I have some reservations that the law enforcement is an executive branch agency. And what we've seen on occasions is executive branch agencies like to take shortcuts, if they can take down a domain name simply because they can make an approach to a registrar, without going through due process, that's a matter of concern. It's a matter of concern if they can't take down a website because there is a different jurisdiction to deal with because it takes a year to get requests for cooperation between –

Roelof Meijer: Nigel, may I ask you to try to translate your concerns into recommendations or points that should be put into the strategy?

Nigel Roberts: Perhaps if I could finish, you'd get that. It's kind of difficult when you're interrupted to keep your train of thought. So what I would say that the strategic plan should take account of due process in this method. You can't just simply yank domain names because of content, because there are very serious constitutional, fundamental rights that are at stake.

Roelof Meijer: Okay, thank you. Okay, we're running out of time, so we'll go to the third one?

Kurt Pritz: Corporations. So this has more operational bent than policy, but focuses on making the internal ICANN operations as good as they can be. And so they really focus on internal operations and I think they speak for themselves. You know the refinements here are two; one is really a small one, and that is our continual improvements model is instead of being based on the American design TQM – It's really based on the European design EFQM, but that's really small.

                      And then the other is a topic we see come up from time to time and that is how we can make ICANN meetings more effective and I think the comments I would request here are, especially with respect to meeting evolution, like I said, this is a topic that comes up from time to time, so comments on how the meetings can be more effective are welcome, but how to run a process for examining ICANN meetings in order to determine improvements

would be better. How can we go through this meeting evolution process, so that process itself is effective? Because I think we've tried it in the past. We've made small changes to ICANN meetings but haven't markedly changed them over the last years except in the amount of support and attendance, so they continue to evolve size wise, but not really format or method wise. So if you have any comments about any of this that would be great.

Roelof Meijer: Yes, no comments, so let's just move onto the next one.

Kurt Pritz: Everybody happy with the way the meetings are? Okay, so the last is you this is a typo, but the heading is really a healthy internet governance and ecosystem, and I think that's a change that we developed here last time. I think this one is about the effectiveness of the ICANN policy making, one of the aspects here is the effectiveness of ICANN as a policy making body, and how do we measure our effectiveness. I think that's maybe not for this time, because it's a complex question, but looking forward, how do we all measure the effectiveness of our policy making capability, you know it certainly can't be the quantity of policies generated, or it can't just be the time it takes to generate policy, but there has to be some meaningful metric about that.

So as we go forward, how do we look inward across ICANN and determine how we should measure ourselves as being an effective policy making body, and how then can we improve it if need be,

EN

and I think it's a really important question for ICANN. And I think as an example to take it outside the ccNSO, you know I know in the GNSO, there are certain policy issues that are almost intractable because of the divergence of interests of the parties involved in trying to generate consensus, and so I think it's very important to ICANN to be successful to move forward on some of these issues that we haven't been able to so far, because we haven't been able to reach consensus. So that's sort of an easier example, you know for another supporting organization. So what we want to examine here, in addition to these things is how we can be effective in policy making, but certainly look at the changes in wording here and welcome any comments. We have some time before we have to close. So if we could generate some more comments it would be great. Yes.

Roelof Meijer: Yep, I have two comments, one from Lesley and from Lise –

Bart Boswinkel: And from Jay.

Roelof Meijer: Oh, Jay also, sorry Jay.

Bart Boswinkel: He was the last in line.

Roelof Meijer: Yes, go ahead Jay.

Jay Daley: Thank you. I'm very pleased to see ease of global participation on there. And I think that if that is pursued with some real commitment, we could end up with a very different organization and a very different framework for how the ICANN community works.

It's apparent from talking to my colleagues from other CCs that for me getting a VISA to travel around the world is relatively easy. For others it can take several months' worth of planning, writing letters backwards and forwards and other extraordinary efforts that really reduce the ability of people to participate. I'm also a native English speaker and find it easy for many of these sessions, and that's another thing that other people have difficulty with. And I think that if we really seriously begin to tackle those types of issues, I'm not sure that our current structure necessary stay as it is, it may end up, as I said, something very, very different. And I'd like to know that there's a commitment that would follow this through no matter what the level of change may be.

Kurt Pritz: I didn't hear your second point. I heard about VISAs and facilitating attendance at meetings, but I didn't hear the second point.

Jay Daley: Okay, it's very similar. It was that as a native English speaker, I find it easy to participate, and that's something that is very different for many other people. So the main point is that I would hope that there is a degree of commitment to this that will see it through to the end, no matter how much or radical change that may be for ICANN in the way that it operates.

Roelof Meijer: Thanks Jay, while you're walking up to Lise, I'll give the floor to Lesley.

Kurt Pritz: And if I could just comment on that, so I think when I read this, I think about things like translation or enabling non English speakers to participate more easily or eliminating some of the lingo or language that surrounds ICANN that tends to be a bar, because if you're not inside, you don't understand the acronyms, but I didn't think of the point about VISAs. So to the extent that there are other, when we talk at ICANN, we make a list of these issues to ease participation, but already the two of you have come up with one that we hadn't thought of. So we want to figure out how to engender more of those comments.

Roelof Meijer: I think the most important bit about Jay's intervention was we follow this through, no matter what changes we have to make. He wanted a commitment.

Lesley Cowley: Are you sure? Okay. So I was just going to make the point really linked to our discussions with the Board earlier. The third one then is talking about world class accountability and transparency, and obviously specifically linking to the ATRT recommendations.

I wonder if perhaps that might be a bit broader and also be supplemented by world class corporate governance, and maybe disassociated from ATRT purely, because there seems to be quite a strong interest in better corporate governance of ICANN going forward.

Roelof Meijer: Thanks, Lesley.

Lise Fuhr: Well, Lise Fuhr from .dk. I'm very like Lesley says – I think the accountability and transparency is very important. And I think one way of getting a transparent way of acting even though you can't reach consensus is that ICANN becomes much better at explaining why you choose to go down one path, instead of another one. Because I've made plenty of comments to budget, and I never get any reply on my views, and that would be very nice to have – you can just put it all in one document, it doesn't need to be, you can group the issues that are raised.

Another thing is it would be nice to have a better website, because it's very difficult to navigate in.

Roelof Meijer: Thank you, Lise. You want to react, Kurt?

Kurt Pritz: No, I understand the comment perfectly. And certainly ICANN we think has made improvements in some areas, but you bring to us the example of budgeting where there is plenty of thoughts given to comments, but there is no area where we explain why we made certain decisions and certain –

Roelof Meijer: Before you give the floor to Sabine, are there any other questions from the room? Okay, so this is the final, Sabine, I hope you can keep it short.

Sabine Dolderer: I have one comment and that is when you talk about increased transparency and the accountability, sometimes, and if I look at the website and if I see all those translations and all those processes, and even if I'm – I'm not an native English speaker, but I'm flooded with information. I think even if I'm an English speaker, it would be hard to read all of them, and (inaudible) I would recommend make less, and make it right. So try to boil things more down to the core instead of addressing each and every issue and each and every single situation. Make less and make it right. And that makes people easier to understand what you're doing, why you're doing it, and maybe why you're moving, also

controversial-ize instead of trying to find an answer for each and every core issue.

Kurt Pritz: So Sabine, I just want to be clear. So did that go to the volume of information and organizing it in a way that makes it more – points those to participating to the right –

Sabine Dolderer: Sometimes in trying to find out if it's worthwhile to take something into account or if it's to an important, not in the scope and therefore not relevant and therefore don't address it in this issue. So if you look at the DNS, it's a hierarchy, you can delegate a lot of authority to the registries, and they are responsible, you don't have to take the responsibility for all of that what they are doing.

Kurt Pritz: So ICANN posts this to it today but it's unimportant, so don't read it, no, I'm just kidding.

Roelof Meijer: Okay, thank you everybody for your participation. Thank you Kurt, and maybe just two general things so that you make sure that we are paying attention to that. We saw that the number of strategic objectives increased from 18 to 24 for a three-year period,

so we urge Kurt and his team to make sure that there was focus and a good setting of priorities.

There has been quite a bit of work on metrics that was one of our recommendations on the previous plan, and we conclude that we're moving forward, but there's still quite a bit of work to do.

As far as the timeline is – is it up? Okay. The deadline for submissions to the strategic plan is the 17th of November. As a Working Group, we will forward our observations to the CC community at the latest three days before the deadline, so that will be on the 14th of November. So ultimately on the 14th of November you will get our email with our observations that you can use if you want to make a submission.

Lesley Cowley: Thank you very much Roelof, Kurt, and Carol and Bart. No doubt our conversations on the strategic plan will continue, so we look forward to hearing the next installment. But we need to move on. But thank you to each of you.

Okay, so for our next item we have a question and answer session with Mike Silber, who is the ccNSO ICANN Board member, and even though he's been on the Board for a while, he has volunteered to re-stand. So we have posted the report regarding Mike's nomination and his willingness to continue to be on the ICANN Board, but we thought it would be very helpful to introduce the Q&A session. I think originally we were wondering if this would be appropriate if we had some competition Mike, but obviously

you don't have competition this time around. But nevertheless important for ccNSO participants to be able to engage with you and find out a bit more.

So I'm waiting for people to formulate some questions, so while you're thinking, maybe we can start with why are you seeking to come back to the Board?

Mike Silber: Lesley, thank you, it's a really interesting question, and also while my home is eight hours flight from here, I am still from the continent, so I suppose it's appropriate to say welcome to Africa, and a pleasure having all of you brave people who've made it this far.

When I mentioned to a couple of friends that I was coming through to this session, the question was, have you been for your psych evaluation and have you failed it, because that must be the reason why you're qualified to serve a second term? You would have to be crazy to go back onto this Board.

Quite possibly I am. For those who don't know me, my name is Mike Silber, I've been involved in ICANN since approximately 1999, when the then administrator of .za was looking for a succession plan and approached the local chapter of the internet society to put together a committee to make a recommendation regarding an appropriate delegation or re-delegation of the ccTLD. And having come across ICANN, I then got involved.

I've been involved to a greater or lesser extent in the ccNSO and elsewhere as the ccNSO appointee to the Nominating Committee on two occasions, as well as within various Working Groups and various structures.

I've served for the last two and a half years approximately as the ccNSO appointee to the Board; in quite difficult circumstances, firstly because the focus has been very much on the gTLDs over the last period.   Secondly, because there was a relatively adversarial relationship between the ccNSO and its other appointee to the Board.

I think the reason why I am willing to take another term is really much because Chris and I work well as a team, and Chris is the other ccNSO appointee has given me firstly a lot of comfort on the Board.   I think Chris and I complement each other quite well. Chris is a diplomat. I am seldom diplomatic. I tend to be a lot more straight forward. We work together well, but it's not just a case of you know two old friends who now want to spend some time together.

It's actually a case of our personalities and our characteristics can often work well together. I'm more blunt, he's more diplomatic. He has more time to devote, and he has the luxury of working for an employer who is this space. I don't work in the DNS space. I work for a network operator whose main focus is building networks and specifically fiber networks across Africa. I mean that my time is a lot more pressed than some others on the Board. At the same time, it means I have the perspective of working in a

commercial organization, the DNS is not my life, it is part of my life, and a very important part, but I feel I bring a balance of looking at other business arrangements and relationships and not only from the focus of the DNS and the DNS business.

And for all of those reasons, I'm willing to stand again and maybe let me add a third one to that. And that is right now there are three Africans on the Board. At the end of this meeting with Katim Touray leaving the Board, there will be two Africans, and I'm the only one who is risen full time in Africa.

I haven't seen any of my other colleagues from the continent who are in a position and possibly have the luxury of an employer who is supportive in part of the amount of time that serving on the Board takes. Yes, I have to take leave to attend some ICANN meetings. My employer gives me a certain number of days off every year to attend meetings, and if I go over that threshold, I cannot take leave to be here. But they are supportive. I haven't seen any of my colleagues from the African continent who have expressed an interest or who have indicated that they simply enjoy a similar luxury with regard to their current positions.

On that basis I feel that it's appropriate, as an African, to serve on the Board, and to represent not just the CCs, but also specifically developing countries in Africa on the Board and to raise those issues.

Lesley Cowley: Thank you, Mike. Jay.

Jay Daley: Hi Mike. I just want to pick up on something that you mentioned in the last meeting, the Joint ccNSO. You basically said that if ccTLDs pay more to ICANN, we can feel happier about that knowing that a portion of that is going to good works.

Now as I stated you know, us as a registry and I think many registries in this room used all the profits we have to go towards social development of the internet. So it rather came across as telling us that we should stop spending money on our own social development, give it to ICANN and some of it might be spent on social development if we're lucky. Are you actually aware how much that we spend on social development, and that's why our contributions to ICANN have to be very finely balanced in that context?

Mike Silber: I'm very aware of how ccNSO members and various CCs around the room spend their surplus. I think you missed my point and given that we're running short of time there, I didn't have a chance to elaborate on it.

What I was suggesting is that there are many programs that ICANN is running that is to some extent overlap the mandate that you're currently running. Some of them are international while yours may be local or regional, but there's a fair amount of overlap. And I was just suggesting that the CCs need to think is it time to change the old construct of we will pay dollars for services

based on a proven amount, or should we not turn around to the CCs and say there are other projects that I can run, so just as an example, the fellowships program that ICANN runs.

If you feel that attending an ICANN meeting has value, and you obviously do, but maybe it's of value to people in your community as well, where instead of for example your ccTLD paying an additional amount to ICANN, they would turn around to ICANN and say, what we're going to do is we're going to tie in with your fellowship program, and we're going to send on person from New Zealand or one person from the South Pacific to each ICANN meeting in conjunction with the ICANN fellowship payment and we consider that to be an additional contribution, but we're keeping it to our country or our region, and we want to work together with you.

Now, I'm not saying that's what you have to do. I'm suggesting that that's a change in construct from the current one which is pay dollars and cents per service received.

Jay Daley: Thank you, but I'm still not convinced you necessarily understand our position. We have a bursary scheme for people within New Zealand to travel to all sorts of conferences, not just ICANN. For the idea, I think Kenya, for Pacific internet forums, for all sorts of things you know, on a regional basis. And that is very much our priority, you know that is our money is made within New Zealand as a local community, and we use it within that region that way.

And so while I understand that, I think you're overestimating the importance of ICANN for us. Social development of the internet is far, far wider than ICANN, and ICANN is actually just a limited part of it.

Mike Silber: Jay, you're missing my point obviously. I get what you're saying. And I do not believe that ICANN is the center of the world. Ideally, I'd like to echo what our Chairman keeps saying which is if we do our job really well, very few people should know about us.

The point that I'm making is that ICANN currently and coming out of certain communities who pay on a contractual basis make the point that the CCs don't contribute. And what I'm saying is your contribution is not just to IANA function, your contribution is far greater, and what we need to do is simply make it more transparent, by for example partnering with ICANN.

Now, if that doesn't work, and that was just one example, then we must maybe look at a different construct is all that I'm saying.

Lesley Cowley: Let me [coerce] this question, because I think clearly there is some mutual understanding that needs to be developed here, and I'm sure that Jay and other registries are happy to continue that conversation with you. But I now have a long cue developing. So we have Roelof, then Byron, then Peter, then Nigel.

EN

Roelof Meijer: Michael what are the items on your list for your second term that would really prevent you from falling asleep if you don't manage to tick them off at the end of your term?

Mike Silber: Roelof, thank you, that's a –

Roelof Meijer: I assume you have a list.

Mike Silber: Yes, I do. The first is obviously the CEO succession. I would really like to know and to feel comfortable that I participated in ICANN getting the sort of the CEO that it deserves.

The second is the move to operational excellence, not just in the IANA function, but also in finance and in other operations. I think for too long we have allowed fuzzy logic, and fuzzy figures to perpetuate within the organization and we've explained it on the basis that we do policy, we don't really do operations here. I think there's got to be excellence in operations, there's got to be excellence in reporting. I think there's been significant movement in that regard, but obviously there is still a fair way to go.

The third thing that I'd like to see is greater occurrence of developing countries' needs but without turning ICANN into a charitable foundation, because again, we're not that either. And it

gets into the argument I was having with Jay where I think we're talking past each other, but agreeing with each other completely at the end of the day.

The last thing is I'd like to see the launch of a gTLD program which is stable and well managed, that it doesn't impact on this community in a negative way. That's not to say that you may not see a slight drop in the number of registrations you see going through your systems, but rather the ultimate stability and security of the internet is not affected by the commercial interests of launching new gTLDs.

Lesley Cowley: Thank you can I encourage repartee of those questions and responses? Thank you.

Byron Holland: Hi Mike. I just want to follow up on some of the comments you made in the last session regarding conflict and revolving door. And I'd like to peel those apart and really just talk about revolving door.

You had a chance to say a few words, but I think we can all appreciate that that's a sensitive topic and the recent departure of Peter has certainly highlighted it, although it was acknowledged that this is a work in process and has been for a while. So it's good to know.

EN

In terms of your personal thoughts and where do you think that policy should go recognizing that it's a community-based organization, that people have to come and go back to paying jobs in the industry, but how do you deal with the perception that left a lot of people scratching their heads, and was less than ideal with Peter's departure? Where do you see it going? What would you like to see happen there?

Mike Silber: Byron, I think an excellent question, and my view is that no one should be allowed to create an environment in order to favor themselves or those within their immediate circle going for it. And then I think that's really what we're talking about. Nobody has an objection to somebody leaving the Board and getting a great job. It's the ability to create an environment when you're on the board which potentially favors you or your commercial interests once you leave.

The first thing that's absolutely required in my view is some sort of sterile period. There's got to a period during which even if you take a new job, you're not allowed to interact with ICANN and the ICANN staff. I think there are too many people, good, clever people who are brought in as consultants very soon after they leave the Board. And maybe they're doing good work. Some of them in fact are doing fantastic work, but it creates an impression that they got that position based on the relationships developed while they were on the Board. There is a perception created in the market that they have an influence or an ability or a potential to influence

which may exceed that which actually exists, but the perception is out there, and that can't be.

So the first thing is there's got to a sterile period once you leave the Board, where you cannot interact with ICANN. I'm not suggesting that Peter should be thrown out of this meeting. But I'm just saying the ability to interact needs to be severed at least for a break. And then I think we need to get into more specific rules in terms of disclosure, in terms of interest, in terms of engagement to make sure that that appropriateness is kept once the sterile period is over and you then start engaging again, that you haven't created any environment to favor yourself.

Lesley Cowley: Okay thank you. So I have Nigel, Peter and then the lady at the top, I'm sorry I don't know your name.

Nigel Roberts: Thank you, let me be the first, perhaps not the first to congratulate you on being elected unopposed. I'd be very surprised if council didn't actually formally pass the relevant resolution.

Question for you, so your appointment is not going to depend on this, how on earth can you represent ccTLD interests on the Board, when as a Board member your primary fiduciary duty is to the ICANN corporation and not the people who put you on the Board?

Mike Silber: I can't represent CC interests on the Board. As you said, the key fiduciary responsibility is to ICANN. I'm not a CC representative on the Board. I'm a CC nominee or appointee. The critical issue though is, I am then in a position to raise the voices that I hear, and a lot of it has to do with getting the feedback from the community as to what's causing them pain. What's worrying them? What's stressing them out, so that I can feed that back to the Board? But ultimately when it comes to decision-making, California law, the corporate law is clear. My duty and responsibility is to ICANN, the corporation, rather than to the community that's nominated me.

Leslie Cowley: Thank you, okay, we have Peter, and then the lady at the back, and if there's anyone who wants to join the cue for a final question. Okay, one more after that. Sorry you have to wave big time, it's very difficult to see clearly from this – I'm sure my eyes are going from this stage. Peter.

Peter Van Roste: Thank you Lesley. First of all, Mike, thank you so much for the role that you've been fulfilling until now. I think your accessibility for this community has been exceptional, especially in the last couple of years.   And your frankness on the Board is quite refreshing during the Q&A exchanges. So everybody knows by now that you don't like leading questions, so I'll probably start with my opinion first, and then ask you the question so there is no confusion on that.

I think ICANN has a very strict and limited role, but from some of the discussions one could assume that you tend to believe that ICANN has in some cases a better opinion of what CCs want than the CCs themselves. Is that a fair representation?

I'm thinking about outreach to different communities, you said if you're talking about the travel sponsorship, some of my members feel much more comfortable handling that money themselves and sending people to an ICANN meeting or to an RTF, whereas in, if I understand you correctly, you think that should be ICANN's role. Is that a fair assessment of where you are?

Mike Silber: Peter, thank you. No, and that's why I'm concerned that I'm being misunderstood. What I'm suggesting is that ICANN believes it has an outreach role and I think it does. What I don't think ICANN recognizes is the fact that the CC community takes an outreach role itself, and what I think should happen is that there should be more communication, so that ICANN is aware that actually you're doing all if its work for it.

So in terms of fellowships to come to meetings, ICANN is not the only organization, and we're just using fellowships to meetings as an example, and I think there is so many more, but ICANN is not the only organization that is paying volunteers or paying the expenses of volunteers to come here to experience it so that they can get more involved and more aware of internet governance issues. The CCs are doing that as well. And I think what should

be happening is the CCs, there should a program where the CCs can say well actually we're contributing to ICANN by having sent 20 people between us to ICANN meetings this year because currently that's not recognized. And I'm just saying it just needs to be formalized so that they're recognized; and I'll take Jay's point.

Coming to an ICANN may not be as important to your community as going to an IGF, but what I'd love to know is that if you're going to an IGF, and if you're sending people there, there would be an engagement in the ICANN community, broader community sessions at the IGF where there was direct participation, where people that you were paying to go to the IGF would able to engage, where ICANN could have an opportunity to engage with that audience.

So no, I don't think ICANN knows better than any community, what that community needs. Possibly with the exception of the commercial registries and registrars who sometimes need to be guided and led because otherwise they're just going to follow for profit motivations and they're not going to consider the impact on the rest of the ecosystem.

If for example law enforcement has some reasonably legitimate and quite reasonable requests, there is a question well some registrars will just ignore them. Well, we know the situation, we live in the country.   If local law enforcement comes with reasonable requests we tend to cooperate, because they live next

EN

door to us, they know where we stay; they can come and arrest us if we ignore them.

Lesley Cowley: Moving on and probably this is the last person in this cue.

Female: Good afternoon, my name is (inaudible) on the .ng. I have a very basic kind of question. I heard you mention that you're based in Africa. And what I wanted to ask was what efforts have you made previously and what efforts do you intend to make in eliciting more feedback from ccTLDs in Africa?

Mike Silber: I think that's an excellent question. I have the luxury of being in not necessarily daily but certainly weekly contact with the Chair of the AFTLD, because I happen to be a director of .za, so I tend to speak to Vika very frequently and I get the informal feedback from him.

I must confess that because I'm based in Africa, I sometimes feel I'm more aware of what's going on, whether that's true or not is possibly a different issue. The other thing is that the African TLD, or ccTLDs are not as well organized as for example as Center. And in the past many times they've let organizations like Center lead and have been willing to follow with minor modifications.

So my initial outreach was through to Center and to others, because they tend to more vocal and more organized, but I think it's a very relevant point. The one thing that I have been trying to do is when I visit countries in my work capacity, when I have time, I've been trying to also meet with CC managers, even if it's just to grab a coffee or a drink afterwards, so that I can actually find out what's happening in that country without needing to arrange a specific trip.

So I've had the opportunity to engage with a couple of CC managers on that basis, just given the amount of travel that I do across Africa within my professional career. However, it's something that I think I do need to do more of, and hopefully as the African ccTLDs get more organized; it will make it even easier rather than having to engage with them individually. It will be possible to engage with them through a grouping or an organization.

Lesley Cowley: So it sounds like you have an invitation to Nigeria. Steven.

Steven Deerhake: I'd like to touch on a topic that was also briefly brought up in the last session, and that is we've had two CEOs in a row now, that have tended to operate their careers within ICANN in absentia with respect to their presence at the actual headquarters of ICANN in Marina del Rey. Paul spent a lot of time operating out of Sydney,

and we know Rod spent a lot of time operating out of Marina del Rey.

Having done that type of management from a distance, I can tell you I don't think it works very well. And I'm wondering if you are committed to seeing that the terms of engagement of the new CEO will include specific requirements that they actually work out of the corporate headquarters of the ICANN organization rather than out of satellite offices, et cetera, et cetera.

Mike Silber: I think an excellent point. I would like to see the CEO's primary base being the Marina del Rey office. We do need to recognize and especially for looking at the internationalization and the question was asked does the CEO have to be a US citizen, and I hope the answer that comes out of it is no. That the person may have a home elsewhere, but I would not like to see a situation as developed with Paul, where maybe one tenth of his time was spent in Marina del Rey, seven tenths of his time was spent on the road, and the other one tenth or two tenths of the time was spent in Sydney.

Ideally the CEO leads from the head office in Marina del Rey, but I do think we need to be a little bit flexible to recognize especially if we're considering candidates from outside of the USA.

Lesley Cowley: Last but by no means least, Paulos.

Paulos Nyirenda: Thank you, Madam Chair. I just follow up on my colleague from .ng, but she asked a large part of my question. Maybe something very specific might be where introduced as one of the three by the ICANN Chair, representing Africa, and the hottest topic this week for this region is .Africa.

I just wanted to get an understanding of your stand on this issue, and what you understand by it.

Mike Silber: Paulos thank you, I think it's a really complex situation, and ideally the Africans would work it out for themselves, so that they can make sure that they get their application in, in time for this round, so before the close of this round.

Understanding the complexities within the continent, I'm doing what I can on the Board to suggest that we need to consider at least some other alternatives or solutions. But at the end of the day, if you look at how the question of regional names was in the Applicant Guidebook, it's set up, you better get 60% in favor and no more than one objection, which means that currently, we may or may not have a situation of people being able to block each other. And to me that's really unfortunate, when I think that this is a gTLD that could actually do some good, and could actually benefit communities who don't see themselves by some colonial past such as in the one particular country only, but also as members of a continent-wide community.

And I'm really hoping that we can find solutions within the parties as well as within the ICANN Board and the ICANN process to make sure that Africa doesn't again miss the opportunity to apply for a .Africa as happened with ASTLD round eight years ago.

Lesley Cowley: Okay, so thank you very much for some questions and for the answers. This is the very first time we've tried this session, so we'd really appreciate your feedback, as to whether it works for you. But in the meantime, can you join me in thanking the people who posed questions and also Mike. Thank you.

Mike Silber: Lesley, thank you, and the one thing I wanted to repeat and some people will know this. I'm always accessible. I try and really follow what's going on in the council mailing list, but certainly if anybody has any specific issue that they want to raise or ask questions, you're more than welcome to get hold of me.

I serve really at your pleasure. And in my view if this community doesn't have confidence any more in me, I would leave at your pleasure as well. Which means that while I don't vote your views on the Board, I vote for the good of the organization, I am as far as I can be responsive to what you're thinking. So let me know what you're thinking. It's the best way for me to be able to pass it further on.

Lesley Cowley:	Thank you Mike. So a complete change of topic now, we're on root zone work flow automation, from Kim from IANA. Thank you.
Kim Davies:	Hi everyone, firstly I'm sure my slides can be seen on the screen, I have no idea from here. Usually, when I present the IANA update to the ccNSO, I focus on a bunch of different issues as part of a broader update, but I thought given that we've just completed probably the biggest project IANA has undertaken and actually completed, it might be good to focus on what we've done and provide a big of explanation as the sole topic, plus I'm happy to answer any other unrelated questions, but this update will just focus on root zone work flow automation.
	So for those that are not familiar what this project was, the idea is that we have a work flow management system. I tracks root changes throughout the entire process. That means that whenever a change to the root zone is submitted by a TLD manager, it's entered into this system. This system processes the change from beginning to end.
	It also automates a number of aspects of the process. In the past, the process was I would say very manual. We did use tools to assist us of course, but the entire processing of the request was done by one of our staff members. Now the entire processing of a request is done by the system. The system automatically does all

the steps that can be automated and will contact staff to do particular steps that are not suitable for automation.

Another aspect of the system is we've integrated our systems with VeriSign systems.   VeriSign also plays a role in root zone management; they're the publisher of the root zone. In the past we used manual interactions with VeriSign in order to communicate information. Now we use an APP based interface to connect the two systems together, that's all fully automated, and there is no human intervention involved.

And then the other piece of the system is a new web interface. And this new web interface is available for TLD managers, it allows TLD managers to log into the system, submit change requests, and monitor the status of ongoing requests.

So the current deployment status is that the system is now fully deployed. All TLD managers have received invitations to use the system, and thus far we have not identified any significant issues. All root changes that we've done through the system since – certainly since we've deployed, have been implemented successfully. And we also had a successful parallel operations phase prior to launch where we also successfully completed quite a few root zone changes.

The way the system launch worked is we performed an extended testing operation since the beginning of the year. What happened then is we processed all the change requests both through the system, privately, as well as maintaining your requests manually

throughout the original method that we used to do them. After doing that for six months and getting confidence that both the system worked as intended, we announced at the last meeting in Singapore, that we're going to go live with the system. The date was set for 21st of July. On that date, we cut over from using the manual process to using the automated process. And everything went as planned.

So what actually happened in July is that firstly, the root zone itself started coming from the system. Until that day, we were using the manually generated root zone, but as of July 21st, the system is now generating the root zone. Also those notifications at ICANN staff would send to TLD managers whether its status updates in an ongoing request, whether it's informing you of any tentacle issues of your request, or whether it's asking for you to confirm a request, in the past, all those notifications were manually crafted by staff. Right now, the system now generates those notifications.

There might be a role for staff to provide certain specific notifications on a custom basis, but generally speaking the system now will be responsible for informing you of status, asking you to take actions and so forth.

One thing we didn't do though on July 21st is open up access to that web interface. And the reason for that is that we wanted to stagger launch over a period of several months. And what we said in Singapore is we'll basically launch between August and this meeting in Dakar. So we started inviting TLD managers to use the system on the 1st of August, we did a batch of about 5% of TLDs.

EN

We got very good feedback initially. We found no known issues. So we actually accelerated the deployment process, so rather than taking it all the way up until this week, by 15th of September, we had actually issued all the invitations to use the system.

The way it worked is TLD managers received an email inviting them to use the system. In that email was a claim URL, you went to that URL; you could then claim the user name and password for your access to the system. You had 30 days to do it; we didn't want to have these invitations lying around and get picked up months or years later by the wrong parties. So to limit that possibility, these invitations were time limited to 30 days.

And of the 474 TLD contacts that existed in the root zone as of August 40% claimed their credentials to use the system, which I think is a very positive result. I will say though that of the 60%, the remainder are of course welcome to use the system as well. You just need to contact the root management department and we can issue you a user name and password.

So just a quick sense of who is using the system. You can see on the first five columns, that's the total number of root zone changes, we've processed in the last four and a half months. Roughly about 50 on average per month with the last column is actually half of October, up until last week. And we've received 74 requests this month to date.

Now, obviously in June and July they all came in by email, because we hadn't issued any access to the system. But you can

see that already by September and October, the majority of requests are now coming in via the web interface. Only a small number are now coming in via email.

So just finally on that point, you know it is a spike in the number of requests just in the last month. While we haven't done a thorough analysis, my sense is a bit of that is people playing with the system, a bit of that is people who have been triggered to do a change, they might have been waiting to do, because they now have access to the system, and also and I'll get to it in a little bit, the system allows you to submit a request and then immediately withdraw it if you wish. So if you withdraw a request, it's still considered a request, even though it never completed. So a few of those are people that launched a request and through the processing of the request decided to back out of it.

So what I'm going to do now is, I know we're limited in time, so I'm going to zip through a very quick demo of how the system works and how you can track with it. So let me just flip over.

So the way you log into the system is you go to RZM.IANA.org, I've lived in America long enough that I don't say R Zed M any more. So you're presented with a user name and password screen, just like any other website. You use the credentials that you've been provided to log into the system. What I'm doing is I'm logging in as actually the IANA user account. IANA is responsible for 13 TLDs like .int, .arpa and the 11 test TLDs. So IANA itself acts as a TLD contact. And this is effectively how we would manage it from that role.

I'll just flag, it's a little slow, I think the reason is the IPv6 connectivity in this conference is quite bad, so it's just a little slower than it should be. But once you log in, the first thing you see is you get to see all the domains under your management, you get to see what role this particular user has. Obviously we have to administrative and technical contacts. Sometimes it's the same party, sometimes it's different. Whatever is associated with your email address is the roles associated in the system.

You can see outstanding requests. And you can see outstanding [GLU] requests which in the interest of time I won't get into details about that, but effectively you get to see the types of requests that are outstanding right here.

So what you would do if you wanted to make a change to one of these domains is you go over here next to a domain and click "review/edit". That brings you up with a new view and it shows you all the current details for a particular domain. You get to see the sponsor organization, administrative contact, technical contact and so forth. You get to see the name servers. If it's DNSSEC signed, you get to see all that information.

Now if you want to submit a change what you do is it's relatively simple, you interact with the system by going into the part you want to change and you hit "edit". So let's say I want to change the administrative contact, I click edit, I then see a form where I can make changes, I'm just going to quickly make a few nonsense changes. I'll say I'm now in the car and I'm now in Senegal.

So I hit save and what it immediately does if I scroll down, is it highlights what my proposed changes are going to look like. Now if I wanted to do more changes I can. So let's say I wanted to do a name server change as well, I can do that by clicking "edit". So I can keep iterating this until I'm happy with what I see. Once I'm satisfied that the change reflects what I want to submit as a request, there is this box at the top that says you've made changes, when you're ready hit "complete", so once I'm satisfied I hit complete up here. Alternatively, if I want to back out and decide all these changes aren't for me, or I was just playing around, you can of course cancel, and it just wipes out any proposed changes you have in the system.

But let's say I wanted to move forward with those changes, I hit "complete", what it will do then is present you with a list of what those changes would entail, so this would actually result in three changes, a change to the address, a change to the country, and a change to the contact name. It allows me to add an email address. So if me as a submitter wants to be kept informed, I can add it in there. The AC and TC will be informed no matter what; this is just an additional email. So if I hit "proceed" it takes me further.

Now if I was doing a name server change, it would actually tell me about any technical issues with the name servers at this time, but because it's just a contact change, it doesn't need to. But what it's telling me now is the request is lodged.   So it's now been successfully entered into the system. I have this ticket number, 498389, and it's actually started processing.

So if we click and go back to the overview of the system, going back into my view, I can see here, here is my request, it is now pending contact confirmation. So now just in the 10 or 15 seconds since I've submitted it, the system has lodged the request, it's begun processing and the administrative and technical contact for that domain have already received emails asking them to confirm the change.

Now as it moves forward, this processing would continue via the normal method. One thing I mentioned withdrawing before. Let's say I don't want to go ahead with that change, I can hit withdraw and that will stop the request. It will just take it out of the system. It's effectively cancelled from your perspective.

But one thing I can do also is I can view the status of the request. So if I go up the request and hit view, at any time, I can see what the request is doing right now, I can see the current status, I can see the particulars of the request, I can see confirmations received. It shows when the admin and tech contact agree you'll see checkmarks next to those two items.   In the event there is a complex change that involves more than two parties, you'll see the entire list of contacts that need to consent. And you get to see who it's waiting on.

And then when it gets further down the request, down the bottom here, you'll get to see the history of the request. It will show all the states throughout the processing which you can check at any time.

So this is the basis of the system. One other thing you can do is view historical requests. Here you can see any completed requests that have been done through the system. Let's look at this one that was completed from June for example. If I view this request, I can see the nature of the request and this change was a DNSSEC change. I see those confirmations were received. But importantly I can see an audit trail of when all the different steps were done in a request. So I can go back and check that at any time.

All right, so I know I'm under time pressure. So I'll just leave the little demonstration at that. I'll say that I think it's a fairly intuitive system, but if you have any questions about how it works, or you need a more detailed demo, I'm certainly happy or my colleagues are happy to show you.

But importantly this is the first step. I mean we have to get a system running, in production that accurately performs the task. But I think from now on, we can certainly evolve the service. So we're very keen to get feedback on how we can improve it. I shared a discussion about this last week – I'm sorry yesterday with ccTLDs, and most of the conversation actually reflected around why we did certain things from a policy perspective.

Now, we're deployed this implementing current policy. Whether current policy can be changed to accommodate new methods of working online, that's a different question, but the way it's laid out is defined by what the current policy requirements are.

All right, so I think for the most part, that's all I wanted to say. In terms of future work, I just encourage feedback on the system, and we'll evolve it based on what you tell us.

Lesley Cowley: Thank you Kim. And remembering the previous urging of the CC community for greater automation and remembering the days when confirmation requests took weeks rather than seconds, this feels like a big step forward. Can I ask is there any brief questions or comments for Kim please. You have to wave big time; it's very – yes, Peter, thank you.

Peter Van Roste: Thank you Kim. Just a question on the 40% you indicated you're quite happy with that. Is there any indication why the other 60% have not responded or are not taking it up?

Kim Davies: By virtue of them not responding, they haven't told me, no, that's not exactly true. Well firstly, I mean there is a certain percentage of TLD contacts that are not valid. So we'll never get 100%. We know that some of the contact details are out of date, so it's very unlikely they'll respond. Also you know we deployed this during peak holiday season, so I suspect some didn't get around to it when they're on vacation, maybe when they got back, they deleted all their emails. I mean I can only speculate. But you know it's open to anyone once they're ready to come ask us for credentials.

Maybe we'll do a second round to prompt the remaining 60% to fetch them. I mean it's not imperative that they do so for the system to work. So whenever they're ready they can contact us, and we'll give them access.

Lesley Cowley: Martin.

Martin Boyle: Martin Boyle from .uk. Just a couple of questions associated with the process. You didn't mention whether – or if you did, it didn't register, how you were communicating with the US government to get their approval of the changes. Are they integrated in the system?

My second question is on publishing of the requests that are in process. Is that actually visible to other parties, or is it only to the requesting party.

And the third one is about scalability with new gTLDs coming on line, do you feel fairly confident that the system is going to be scalable to the demands that will hit the system.

Kim Davies: Great questions. First one, I mean obviously I wasn't going to demonstrate it here, but one piece of the whole system is actually a brand new interface with [NT] tracks. So yes, they're involved in the system. They log in through their own interface. They see a

set of functions that relate to what they do, so when they authorize the request for implementation, they log in, they get to see the particulars. In a manner that's reminiscent of how we presented it to them in the previous manner of working, and they authorize through their own dedicated interface.

In terms of availability of the processing status, that's purely confidential to the TLD manager, we don't expose that, just as we didn't expose it before. I know there's some discussion about more transparency of processing as part of provisions of a future IANA contract, but I think we'll implement whatever the policy decisions are there, but for now, that's not public in any way.

And then finally in terms of scalability, I'm very confident that it can scale beyond any projections we have for new gTLDs right now. In fact, one of the drivers was we didn't want to still be in a manual situation when new gTLDs came, because you know to cater for it without such a system, we basically have to throw a lot of staff at the problem, and we didn't want to do that.

We want our staff within root zone management to focus on the substantial issues that copy automated in particular how we process delegations and re-delegations, you know how we do analysis and so forth. But all the busy work should be done by the system. But yes, we're confident the system will scale, that's what it was designed to do, and we'll obviously improve and adapt it as circumstances arise in the future.

Han Chuan:	Hi team, Han Chuan from .sg. Is there any plans to include the emergencies or changes to your RZM and how that's going to happen?

Kim Davies:	There is no exposed interface to emergency changes via the web. The RZM system has an emergency flag and actually if a request is marked as emergency, it gets signaled in a different way to NTA and VeriSign to implementation. But when you submit a request it doesn't have a tick box or anything like that to say this is an emergency.

The way we currently operate is we give TLD managers a phone number; it's an emergency 24/7 contact. In the event that they consider a request an emergency we ask TLD managers to call us. We will, as ICANN staff, go into the system, we'll mark that flag. But importantly, our emergency response relies on us actually raising the relevant individuals to NTA and VeriSign to make sure they're awake. They know there's an emergency. They get on their computer, they read it.

Our fear about making a tick box on the web interface is that if no one sees it, they won't act as quickly as they might have. So if you use our 24/7 phone number, it will make sure someone is alive, awake and acting on it at that moment, and then we can get it done much faster. So yes and no. It caters for emergencies. It does have internal methodology of handling emergencies, but our

emergency response plan relies on TLD managers calling us and activating us to perform an emergency request.

Byron Holland: Byron Holland from .ca. Actually I just want to ask you a question to make sure Gabby got her full fitness quotient for the day. My question to you is you've implemented a new system. There is a lot more automation. I just wanted to get your thoughts on the security of it, and maybe in particular any opportunity for social engineering, once you go to a more automated environment, and just what your thoughts are. Are you confident with what you've done to ensure the security of a new system?

Kim Davies: Sure. In terms of getting access to the system, we've relied more or less on what we have right now, which is mail authenticity. So the way in the past we authenticated change requests was via email. So we have email contact. So how we've initially issued credentials to the system for.

What we'd like to move to as one of the very first things we implement in a future revision is some kind of two factual authentications. In fact, baked into the system already is support for two different technologies, the support for PDP, and the support for secure ID tokens. Secure ID tokens are what we use internally within ICANN for a bunch of thing already, and the notion was that we could issue any TLD manager that wants to opt

into two factual authentications to use one of those mechanisms to secure access to the interface.

The reason we didn't deploy it in the first version was simple. We didn't want to have any additional features that might delay roll out of the first version. But now that it's out there, I think we want to move forward with some kind of two factual authentications. But I think this is a work in progress and we'd certainly like to have feedback from the TLD community as to what you would like to see in terms of access control to such a system that would work for you.

I'll just caveat with one consideration which is that there is such a wide variety of TLD managers and expertise and on average a TLD makes one change a year. The risk is if we make it too complex, if everyone is required to have some kind of secret key that they keep, I would say that there's a good chance that when the time comes they actually need to make a change and perhaps quite urgently, they have lost it, or don't know where it is, or it's with some staff member that's no longer with the organization, and there's a tradeoff there.

I mean additional security, more access control is no good if when push comes to shove you ignore it, and you just push it through anyway. So there's a tradeoff there for every TLD manager about find more security throughout the internal procedures in place to make sure the right people in the organization have access to that, and that I keep it maintained and up to date, so when I do need to make a change, I have it available to me.

Lesley Cowley: Okay, can you join me in thanking Kim for that update.

[Applause]

Lesley Cowley: So as most of you would have noticed we've had some re-seating here, and David has very kindly offered to move the geographic regions update until after lunch, rather than squeeze that into the time we have left.

And in the meantime, we have Mathieu from .fr who have very kindly sponsored the lunch to give us an update on a year at AFNIC.

Mathieu Weill: Thank you very much Lesley. Hello everyone, the room is really intimidating but it's fortunate because I'm standing between you and lunch that you're quite far away, so I feel the pressure a little less than it was if we were in a cramped meeting room. So while you're comfortably seated, I'm going to get you through a year at AFNIC and explain a little bit more why we really wanted to sponsor lunch today. Because here in this meeting in Dakar, we feel as we are one of the French speaking ccTLDs that we had a good opportunity to share what we're doing with other French speaking ccTLDs.

So for those of you who have been following our updates, last year about the same time we felt basically that the house was crumbling. We had a little accident in court basically the legal framework was deemed unconstitutional by the constitutional council in France. So it was like losing the foundations of your home.

But it takes a little more than that to take us down, and the court had set a deadline on July 1st, 2011, so we knew we had little time to rebuild. And essentially we are now in a much better position. We've been working a lot since then. I mean when I was confronted with the idea of doing an outlook of what we did in just one year, well that's all on one slide, that's the good news.

We've moved our premises, our infrastructure to a new data center, open registrations to assign zones at the second level, which was an interesting project, we had a new legal framework that was passed in March, which I must say I would not have bet on, given the usual delays to pass a new legal framework in France, but it was passed, and I have to admit that the government played a significant role in this, and was very helpful. But this new legal framework brought a number of new challenges.

We had to release a number of reserved names including city names, we have 36,000 city names in France, and they were reserved, so we had to reserve them, a number of generic names you have here on the center of the picture on the center is that cloud of the most requested names and fortunately there were more generic names like internet or email. But we also had some

interesting requests for some more sensitive names such as crimes – crime names or drug names that we had to deal with in the new legal framework.

We also had because we were changing legal framework to suspend our dispute resolute process. They are still suspended as we speak but should be a matter of days before we re-launch them. We've now have a system where the dispute resolution processes must be approved by the ministry before they are enforced. So we've put forward the proposal for a new system, and it should be approved – at least it is approved but it should be published in the coming days.

In the meantime, just like many of you, we celebrated our 25 years by quite a nice party thrown in the Eiffel Tower, so it was quite interesting. We also released a new logo which is on this slide show, and changed our website completely. So as you can see, people have been busy within AFNIC. Some say they've been too busy, but that's the rebuilt of the house was I think quite full.

And as if we had only this on our mind, we were also trying to build new houses all around. We are opening .fr and .re, the two ccTLDs that are currently open for registrations early December to all European organizations and individuals. We're also launching four other French ccTLDs. This is a consequence of the new legal framework of the same date. That's going to a busy winter as well. And we're planning on launching IDNs first semester next year.

We are also very active in the new gTLD arena in France; a lot of education, but also of course a lot of sales and marketing because we are providing back in registry services. And we are increasing our support to emerging countries through College International and I would like to seize the opportunity maybe to ask in the room all those members from the College International to raise their hands. I see Alex here, well that's five or six.

We have actually seized the opportunity of this meeting in Dakar to gather our members from the College International in the meeting and sharing the different meetings in the ICANN conference and sharing updates and reports about the meetings. This is a good occasion for education. And I just wanted because we've been discussing a lot about actually capacity building since this morning, I was surprised to give you a few figures about what we're doing. We have 33 members including 14 directly involved in ccTLD management. Of course we have a strong African presence. I could have said we have a strong French speaking presence.

What they've done ever since 1998 is training, we have over 400 people who were trained in programs that we have run ourselves or we have run with partners. We have recently translated the famous training programs NSRC that are -- actually a session was held not far from here this week, so they were translated in French to be more accessible for a certain part of African population. We grant fellowships, that's not a key part of our mission, but we do, and

that's not only for ICANN meetings. And we have also developed a registry software jointly with a few of our members.

This is an example of the recent training, you can see in the picture on the bottom right, that there was the policy guys and there was the trainer. Now I let you guess who the engineer was in this picture. And we've also helped this year rebuild the Ivory Coast registry that had been badly damaged by the civil war that was taking on in the country.

So what are the next steps for this College International? We hope to provide more support, more trainings, more developments to our registry software, and because of the new gTLD products coming out next year, we will significantly increase our offense for next year in order for projects that are consistent with our values to be supported and we very, very strongly hope that this fund is not used in ICANN fees. So that's it. I think that's enough. You've had a long morning, and I can take questions if there are, otherwise, I think Gabby has the tickets and can take over.

Lesley Cowley: So please can you join me in thanking Mathieu and .fr for lunch?

[Applause]

Lesley Cowley:	So we now have lunch. We have a limited number of tickets, so like domain names, they will need to be on a first come, first serve basis. A quick count is I think we have about one more person in the room than we have tickets. So your promise for lunch would be appreciated provided you can get a ticket. Tickets will be given out at the bottom door just to my right here.
	And lunch is in the Meridian Hotel I believe in the room that is for breakfast for those of you who are staying at that hotel. It's in the main big central Atrium area. And please can you join back again at two o'clock. Thank you.
[break]	
Lesley Cowley:	Okay, welcome back to the people who have managed to make it back, and we're going to start this afternoons session with an update from the Framework of Interpretation Working Group. The long suffering Dave has been shunted to the session after this one because of a prior engagement, but over to Becky. Thank you.
Becky Burr:	Thank you. The Framework of Interpretation Working Group has been working incredibly hard before and after Singapore, but since Singapore we have had nine, no less than nine meetings, some of them more than two hours, and we are making good progress. It's a very complex set of issues.

We have a Working Group that is large and diverse and I'm going to turn this over to – you're going to do the presentation right, or we can do it…I was going to let you do it since you memorized it.

Bernard Turcotte: Hello everyone. This will be our short update on the FOIWG, honestly it's the FOI Working Group; please don't use that acronym otherwise.

What we'll be dealing with today, the scope of the Framework of Interpretation, the processes surrounding that, the topics which the Framework of Interpretation Working Group will be looking at, activities since Singapore, the revised charter and then we get into some of the topics - Terminology, Valid Manager, AC and TC, Consent, Significantly Interested Parties and Meeting of the Working Group in Dakar.

The scope of the framework just as a reminder is to look at applicable policy and guidelines. And that means RFC 1591 and GAC principles 2005. Framework for interpretation is for adding color and depth to existing policy and guidelines.

Not in scope – changing applicable policy or guidelines or creating new policies or guidelines; the IANA Functions contract, including contract implementation issues or procedures.

Process for topics – how we deal with the topics we're going to be looking at. The Working Group prepares draft set of interpretations for a topic in an interim report. This is what's

presently been published for public consultation for "Consent". The Working Group undertakes a public consultation of the draft set of interpretations.

The Working Group reviews comments and input from the public consultation. The Working Group then prepares a final report of interpretation for a topic. The GAC and the ccNSO support for the final report – both communities have to support the report.

Submission of the report to the Board by the chair of the ccNSO once it has been approved by both communities will include a confirmation of support by GAC and the ccNSO and a report with the recommendations based on the interpretations. Are there any questions on the process for dealing with topics? Okay, Becky?

Becky Burr: While we are doing this on a topic by topic basis we have already noticed that there are sometimes where later work comes back to inform previous work. So these are interim reports that we're putting up not anything set in stone.

Bernard Turcotte: So, the topics we initially have gotten to at this point includes "consent for delegation and re-delegation requests", "support for delegation and re-delegations from significantly interested parties", or what's been referred to as the "local internet community" also, "recommendations   for   unconsented   re-delegations",

"comprehensive glossary", and "recommendations for IANA reports on delegation and re-delegations".

Activities since Singapore – the Working Group met by teleconference nine times since the Singapore meeting; has updated its charter and work plan; has published a progress report on its activities since Singapore, this presentation is based on that; has published a public consultation on consent; is currently working on the topic of "significantly interested parties".

The charter of the Working Group was updated to confirm the full participation on the GAC in the Working Group and the URL is up there. The presentation will be made available on the ccNSO website. I'm right about that Gabby, right? Thank you Gabby.

The objective to develop a comprehensive glossary of terms used in the context of delegations and re-delegation of ccTLDs was really the core of the terminology topic. The Working Group concluded that it would be more effective to evolve the glossary in parallel with other work. The terminology topic has been moved to the end of the schedule, which really doesn't change to many things for us.

"Consent" topic – the objective was to develop guidelines as to how IANA should obtain and document consent from the proposed manager for a ccTLD delegation and from the proposed and incumbent managers for a re-delegation; so very specific. "Consent" is about those two parties – the proposed manager and the incumbent manager in the case of a re-delegation.

The Working Group completed its initial work on the "consent" topic in September and results are included in the interim report, which is currently the subject of a public consultation.   The announcement is here, it's all over the various websites.

Input and comments on the interim report are taken into consideration by the participants in the Working Group. Based on input and comments the Working Group will prepare a final report. The final report on "consent" will be published prior to the Costa Rica meeting.

At the Costa Rica meeting the Working Group will seek support from the GAC and the ccNSO on recommendations and on obtaining and documenting "consent".   Any questions on "consent"? We're doing good. We're on a roll. Okay, come on they're not falling asleep and it's after lunch.

[background conversation]

Bernard Turcotte: So that's new. Valid manager, AC and TC topic – no need for this topic. The Working Group has proposed that only the manager approve the delegation and that only the incumbent and proposed managers approve the re-delegation. So having completed the consent topic as it was defined there was no longer a need for this topic.

And given that the "Valid Manager, AC and TC" topic was scheduled to run in parallel with the "Significantly Interested Parties" there was no change to the schedule, it was simply removed. "Significantly Interested Parties, or SIP I was told by several people in ICANN this was an awful acronym. And we said, "Yes, this is ICANN".

The objective is to develop guidelines as to how IANA should obtain and document support for delegations and re-delegations from significantly interested parties as defined in RFC 1591. It's expected that the Working Group will complete its initial work on this topic and publish an interim paper prior to the Costa Rica meeting.

The Dakar meeting, we've had an initial go at it on Sunday, we had a lot of people show up except our friends from the GAC, which were busy in the GAC of course. And we will be having another significant meeting on these topics on Thursday October 27th from one till four and I believe it's in this room.

Becky Burr: No, it's [Salon Ver].

Bernard Turcotte: [Salon Ver], oh sorry, yes it's written there. In the [Salon Ver] which is near where the GAC is meeting. On the agenda – review update to terminology; review documents from the last meeting; review input from consent of the public consultation if there is any;

significantly interested parties, and the schedule of meetings that will take us to Costa Rica.

A standard listing of URL's and various things and back over to you ma'am.

Becky Burr: I don't know how many of you were able to come to the meeting with the Board this morning, but even though we didn't talk about this it's clear that there's a great deal of interest in the topic among the Board members and they're taking this work very seriously.

So we hope all of you will get the chance to look at the interim report on "consent" that's up there and make sure we get your input so we can reflect it in the final work product. Does anybody have any questions on any aspect of the work? Other comments from other members of the Working Group? As I said it's an extremely hard-working Working Group, this is not for the faint of heart.

Kristina Nordstrom: Hi. Keith is typing in the Adobe room that there is a typo in his email address and he just wants to make sure it's clear. It should be "Keith" without the extra "I".

Lesley Cowley: If there are no other questions I'd just like to say thank you very much to Keith and to all of the team. I'm a lurker on the list for

this one and I'm often amazed at the volume of traffic, so I know a lot of people are spending a lot of time reading those emails. So thank you.

Female: Yeah, just one observation. It is actually a really interesting experience with a Working Group where there's a lot of work getting done in between on little emails and little tangents getting addressed.

Lesley Cowley: And that should mean David Archbold will be approaching the stage. I'm sorry, we had a bit of an overrun with some Board this morning, but through our normal planning act of judging by about 15 minutes. Okay, so while David is finding his presentation let me just introduce, this is the Geographic Regions Working Group report. You'll recall that we've had several updates on this Working Group whilst it's been in progress and a report has now been issued.

There's nothing up there. Technical help might be needed. Don't say it.

David Archbold: Good afternoon everybody. It's been a good ICANN for me so far. My laptop was working perfectly happily until we moved down to speak to the Board this morning and when I came back my laptop had died. So I now feel as if my right arm has been cut off.

I don't intend going into a lot of background detail on ICANN regions. Hopefully most of you will have heard that from me on many, many occasions. We're now at the stage of the final report having been published, draft report, so I would like to quickly run through the findings and recommendations of that report and then highlight some of the things that the ccNSO might like to think about and give feedback on.

So the findings – that the general principle of geographic diversity is valuable and should be preserved; that you've also got to think about functional, cultural and language diversity, and not just diversity but also commonality. We really looked quite closely at the possibility of changing the number of regions, but came to the firm conclusion that that was going to cause so much financial and organizational issues that it really wasn't worth the candle.

We also found after long investigation that there is no single independent authoritative list of countries and regions that ICANN can adopt. So we had to recommend that ICANN does its own thing and it should adopt and maintain its own formal, traditional, top-down regional structure for use with the ICANN Board appointments and by those SOs and ACs that want to use it.

But we've also recommended that ICANN recognize and support a less formal structure, which is dynamic and bottom-up, perhaps called "special interest groups", we haven't come up with a good name, that build upon common interests. For example, Small Island states, the Arab states of the Caribbean islands.

So looking first of all at the formal top-down structure, we're recommending that ICANN use as a base what is currently the Regional Internet Registry structure, just as a starting point, because it's better than what we've got now.

That will cause a number of countries, probably round about 60 to move from their present regions. And we believe that any of these countries it is required to move should have the opportunity to say "Thanks but no thanks. We're going to stay precisely where we are."

But we're also recommending that the Board consider a more general way to self-select with the agreement of their government, but perhaps not for the first few years. And then looking at SOs and ACs, making it available for use by them, if they wish. But that they should have the flexibility to adopt an alternative method for insuring geographic and cultural diversity, subject to Board oversight.

I talked about the move, this is the current structure. In the middle you see for example Africa as currently 54 members and if it were to move to the same as the Regional Internet Registries structure it would still have 54 members; so no change. Asia/Pacific would move from 73 and drop down to 58. Europe stays at 78 but a different 78. Latin America/Caribbean goes from 33 to 29 and North America increases from 8 to 27.

Now if somebody needs to know, I can give you examples of what those are, but in the interest of time I'm going to move on to talk

about the benefits of the RIR structure, and that's that the regions would remain at five. So we'd already said we couldn't afford to move, so that's a good start.

It also aligns the makeup of the regions with the technical infrastructure of the numbering resource allocation system, and that seems somewhat logical and defensible.   As I said, a total of 62 countries and territories would move to new regions, but many of these are territories just being correctly assigned, if you like, to their proper geographic region, rather than being put with the region of their mother country.

It also moves several Middle Eastern and Central Asian countries from the AP region into the EU region. This would have the benefit of reducing the geographical spread of Asia/Pacific. And many of the countries anyway consider themselves more orientated towards Europe then Asia. Bear in mind that each country, we recommend, will have the option of staying in its present region if they so wish.

Much of the English and French speaking Caribbean would move into the North American region from LAC and from the EU in the case of some of the territories. And most have a closer language, cultural and travel links with North America than they do with LAC. And as has been requested quite firmly by Africa, there will be no change to the African region.

And this alignment of Regional Internet Registry structure and ICANN regional structure should encourage some participation as

EN

joint meetings should be meatier.   The disadvantages, this wouldn't create an Arab region, which has been requested quite strongly.   The Caribbean countries would be split between two regions, partly on geography, partly on language.

And some countries may not wish to change regions and some other countries may not with their territories be in a different region to themselves.   But we think by putting in the dynamic bottom-up special interest groups we can mitigate against some of those disadvantages.

We're suggesting that these groups may be temporary or longer term; not part of ICANN's decision making structure, but can lobby for support by the official representatives.   We're suggesting they may require a minimum number of members before ICANN recognition is granted, otherwise each individual country could have its own special interest group.

And the amount of support from ICANN would obviously be subject to finances available, but we believe primarily directed at helping with communication between members; so helping with mailing lists, perhaps some website pages, and ideally some telecom services.

So by using these and by giving countries the choice of remaining in their present region if they don't wish to move, we think we can resolve many of the disadvantages.   Moving quickly to the last slide, thoughts for the ccNSO to consider – first of all the report

requires, if you like, comment from each of the SOs and ACs before it goes to the Board.

So it will be accompanied by your views either saying "Yes we think it's marvelous" or "We have reservations about A, B, C, and D". So we're looking if you like for a formal response that will accompany the report.

Beyond that, assuming that it is accepted by the Board, we believe there is a need for each SO and AC to review the bylaws that refer to the geographical diversity provisions. Remember, and this is where one of the problems is, the Board provisions refer to people, but the ccNSO provisions refer to countries. And that has caused some problems in the past so we might need to, at the very least, reword some of the issues.

Our proposals say that the ACs and SOs can either retain the formal structure perhaps as they have done in the past and as ccNSO has got the five existing constituencies for the election of members of council, and you can perfectly free to retain that or you can look at alternative methods for insuring geographic diversity.

ccNSO currently recognizes only one organization per region. I would ask the question "Why" and "Do you still need observer status"? I raise that because how would you deal with special interest groups. And lastly, do IDNs make any difference?

And at that point I will close down, but I'm happy to answer questions if you've got any.

Lesley Cowley: So just a quick question, it's currently a draft report, what is the timeline for it becoming a final report?

David Archbold: I knew you were going to ask me that and that's on my laptop. We've said, I think, we can wait for comments till about the end of December.

Lesley Cowley: Okay, so any other comments for David? Mathieu?

Mathieu Weill: Thank you David. I remember some of the discussions we had in the ccNSO before the Working Group went to the Board level and I must admit and confess I haven't been following quite closely the interim report, and I apologize for that.

                        My understanding is that you are proposing that we take the RIR model, the Regional Internet Registry model as default and enable people to switch back to the current model. Why not the opposite? Wouldn't it be more simple to handle that you start from the existing and enable people to switch?

David Archbold: It's just a numbers game really. Our feeling has been that the Regional Internet Registry model is closer to what more people

would want and have said that they want then the present one. So it's a numbers game.   For example, the Regional Internet Registry's model has all dependent territories within the geographic region rather than the region of their mother country.

And the majority of the territories have indicated that that's what they would prefer. I take that as one example. But it could work either way, it's just which will involve the minimal number of decisions.

Lesley Cowley: Thank you. Byron?

Byron Holland: Hi, thanks. Byron from .ca. I can tell you I'm very pleased to have the Caribbean come into our region. I hope we get to have a lot of meetings down there, particularly in the winter.   So, excellent work.

My real question is when I look at your presentation there seems to be a lot of flexibility built in and a lot of opportunity for folks to pick and choose where they want to go. Is that level of flexibility not inevitably going to lead to a real patchwork environment with some deciding to move to RIR type regions, some remaining the same and ending up with just, I hate to say it, a hodgepodge mix, question number one.

The other is on the special interest groups. If the Middle East has expressed this strong position do you think that inevitably, based

on a special interest group position there that they will not just go on their merry way in that direction? And if so, should we think about enabling it earlier than later?

David Archbold: We've tried to give and recognize sovereign rights of each individual territory and country, but we haven't said that you can keep on changing. It was a one-off decision whether to move to the RIR model or stay where you are, once only. The Board should then think about giving a self-selection option.

I didn't give all the breakdown in here, but we have suggested that it not be for the first five years, to let the system settle down; that it can only be once in ten years, etc., etc. We've tried to put in flexibility but not let constant churn as the telecom business talks about.

As far as "is it a hodgepodge that you end up with", does it matter as long as everybody knows where they are? That's the difference. If you go toady and try and find out what region country "A" is in, you can go to the UN Statistics Department, you can look at that and you've got a 40% chance of being wrong because we don't comply with that.

Or you can go and try and find it on the ICANN website. And the only place I've been able to find it is in some of the paperwork for the 2003 meeting in Montreal, and I don't think most people can find that.

Lesley Cowley: So we have Roelof and does anyone else have a question on this because we need to wrap up? Okay.

Roelof Meijer: Thank you David. I have to confess that I will probably always have difficulties in grasping the concept of countries deciding to move to another region as opposed to people maybe, I think there were a few stories about that. On a more serious note, I don't think I will ever understand the need of ICANN to redesign the world and I can't really think that it's going to solve a problem.

Do you have any information on the amount of countries, or territories for that matter that will decide to stay where they are or to move back from where you move them to where they were?

David Archbold: No.

Roelof Meijer: So there's no guarantee that what you propose is going to solve the problem that originally was behind the start of this project?

David Archbold: The main problem, well there were two problems behind this project. One was there was no legal basis or authority for the present organization within ICANN at all.   And secondly, a

number of countries wish to move or believe they were not in the correct region. So this gives the opportunity for those to be corrected if that's what he country wants.

Roelof Meijer: Without the certainty that they will actually do so in the end of course.

David Archbold: Surely.

Lesley Cowley: Okay, we're going to have to close this one here. Later on in the week the council will need to decide on a drafting group to provide a ccNSO response to the draft report. So if anyone, whether you be members or non-members is interested in participating in that group, we will be seeking volunteers. If you could let Bart or Gabby or myself know that would be very much appreciated. So thank you David.

So we're going move on now to our IDN session and Young Eum has offered very kindly to chair this session. So, over to Young.

Young Eum Lee: Thank you Lesley. We were supposed to have an hour for this but I'm assuming that you're expecting us to condense the presentations and of course, Chris is more than able to do that. He

can make it as long as he wants and he can make it as short as he wants.

So we have the report of the two IDN PDP Working Groups; Working Group One and Working Group Two and Chris is the chair of Working Group One and he will be presenting.

Chris Disspain: I'm exactly half way between the microphone and the computer which is not going to work. Hold on. Thank you. Afternoon everybody. I have seldom been in a room with 80, I've just counted, with 85 people in this room right now and it feels empty. It's quite amazing. I'll try and do my best to be as good as President [Wad] was the other day, but perhaps not quite as long.

I'm going to talk to you about one a particular issue, which the sub-IDN Working Group has been working on to solve one particular problem. So the sub-Working Group was asked to provide guidelines to improve predictability in respect to the confusingly similar evaluation process.

If you remember, when you apply for an IDN in the Fast Track one of the tests that you have to go through is, is it confusingly similar and that's part of the process and clearly it will be part of the full policy when we sign off on that. So the sub-Working Group has focused on a number of issues. It hasn't finished its work yet, but we have come to a conclusion with respect to one particular thing.

EN

It's relevant an application for IDN ccTLDs and so therefore we think we should tell you about it and see if you are prepared, the ccNSO is prepared to agree. So the current rules, the overarching requirement is to preserve the security and stability of the DNS and there are technical string and confusing similarity requirements.

And a string, an IDN ccTLD string needs to be for a country or territory that's listed on ISO 3166. It needs to be a meaningful representation of the name of the country or territory. It needs to be in an official language in the territory and in a non-Latin script. And it needs to meet the technical requirements and may not be confusingly similar.

Under the current rules two or more strings that are identical or are so confusingly similar that for reasons of stability and security they cannot co-exist in the DNS are not allowed. And you also have to avoid the risk of string confusion with any possible future two-letter codes. So, there are a number of two-letter combinations in ASCII that have not yet been issued by ISO, they may never be, but on the other hand they may well be depending on the names of new countries.

So those have to be protected as well, even though they're currently not used. The risk of confusing similarity is very high in the IDN scripts of Cyrillic and Greek, and the reason for that is because Cyrillic and Greek and Latin alphabets share a number of almost identical or identical letters.

In some cases, the string that's requested is only confusingly similar with itself. In other words, it's confusingly similar with a string; the string requested in Cyrillic is confusingly similar with the ASCII string from the same country. So it's confusingly similar with itself.

Under the current guidelines that is not acceptable. So even though that the confusing similarity is inside the country or the territory it's not acceptable. So the sub-Working Group has thought this through, spoken to the technical community, spoken to the people who run the technical evaluation panel and basically are recommending that where the confusing similarity is with itself, is within the same territory, then that should be acceptable subject to certain requirements.

So let's take a really specific example – the thing that this refers to right now is the application by the European Union, or European Commission depending on which bit of the European edifice has applied, for European Union in Greek and European Union in Bulgarian; and both of those are official language, no problem there.

The strings have been found to be meaningful, but they are each confusingly similar with the other. And so therefore, they would, under the current guidelines be refused. So the proposal is that we change the guidelines, which we're quite entitled to do, to say that "where a string is confusingly similar with itself with an equivalent string for the same territory within that territory, it should be allowed subject to a number of things".

And those things are that on the delegation of the IDN ccTLD, the manager agrees that the registry for all two or three of those ccTLDs will be the same always. And that names will be reserved in each of the versions of the ccTLD. So every name that exists currently in .eu would be reserved in .eu in Greek and .eu in Bulgaria.

Now you might think that that doesn't matter in the event that you are not going to mix your strings because as long as you don't mix your strings then it's fine because Latin stays in .eu, Greek stays in .eu in Greek and Bulgarian stays in .eu in Bulgarian. And our best practice guideline is, as I recall, is that we shouldn't have one script .another script, but that's only a guideline and it's up to each country or territory to decide for themselves what they would like to do.

So for that reason, and to avoid any confusion, they will be required to block all existing names across all three, in the case of the eu, across all three. This has been discussed at some length with EURid and they are comfortable that that A – it's perfectly acceptable, B – that they can do it, and C – that it makes sense.

It's been discussed with people like Patrik Fältström and a number of others from the technical evaluation committee and they agree that subject to those conditions it should be allowable to where the confusing similarity is within the same country, within the same ccTLD.

So, I'm very happy to take any questions and see if I can explain if anyone doesn't understand. Peter? Gabby, you should have running gear on I think.

Peter Van Roste: Thanks Chris. Just a question actually on the acceptance of forever tying those two TLDs together; is that something that will be communicated to IANA for instance, is it…

Chris Disspain: Sorry, can you say that bit again?

Peter Van Roste: One of the conditions in this solution is that the manager accepts that both the TLDs will be tied together forever. Will that be new criterion for delegation, re-delegation through the IANA process and how is that going to be documented or flagged?

Chris Disspain: My understanding is that that's a contractual obligation and fortunately in the current circumstances of the EU they are required to sign a contract with ICANN in any event on their side. In respect to the possibility of it happening in other territories, quite frankly, I would suggest that the same rules should apply. If you want this then you should be prepared to contractually commit.

Now you might not be prepared to contractually commit to anything else as a ccTLD, but given that this is critical from the point of view of security and stability then you need to do that. But certainly in the case of the EU it's not a challenge because they already have contractual obligations. Anyone else? Yes Kristina?

Kristina Nordstrom: Yes, I have an anonymous participant.

Chris Disspain: Anonymous!? Always great questions from "anonymous".

Kristina Nordstrom: And the person is wondering what about the case when an IDN ccTLD is confusingly similar with another ASCII combination? Would there be an exception in certain cases?

Chris Disspain: No. It doesn't matter. The only thing that this applies to is if it is confusingly similar with itself. So it has absolutely no effect whatsoever on any other sort of confusing similarity. So if you take the Greek letter epsilon, that's the equivalent to the Latin "E" or rather visually equivalent to the Latin "E", an application for epsilon, epsilon would not be acceptable because it looks like "EE" and even though "EE" has not yet been registered, issued rather by ISO, that needs to be protected.

However, an application for epsilon, epsilon, epsilon, right now would be okay, but it might cease to be okay if an existing gTLD "EEE" existed, it would be a problem.   That probably hasn't answered the question but.   Thanks Bernie.   I'll take that as feedback and input, thank you.   Anyone else?

Okay, so basically the idea is that if at some point the council is willing to pass the resolution to the effect that the guidelines should be changed and then we can consign this problem to the "done" basket and hopefully by the time we get to Costa Rica I'll be able to come back and consign another couple of problems to the "done" basket.   Young Eum.

Young Eum Lee: So the plan of the working IDN PDP Working Group One is just to make sure that this adjustment is reflected in the final report.

Bart Boswinkel: As you may have noticed, this Working Group was tasked to improve the predictability of the whole process as well.   And this Working Group has been working on a couple of things; one of them is the improvement of process in a far broader and it's been addressing other issues as well.   Only the time is not right yet to start presenting it and it's been done both with a view of the Fast Track process and there's input in the overall policy.   So that's the ongoing work.   But this issue came out and it can be treated isolated.

Young Eum Lee: So you still have to deal with the variant issues?

Bart Boswinkel: Yes.

Young Eum Lee: Okay, thank you very much Chris. We now have the report of
                      IDN PDP Working Group Two, which has just released a final
                      draft report and is taking comments until December. And I give
                      you Hiro.

Hiro Hotta: Thank you Young Eum. I'm going to brief about the IDN ccPDP
                      Working Group Two, which is dealing with how to solve the
                      situation when IDN ccTLDs are coming to ccNSO. So at this
                      moment just several days ago we posted the draft document for
                      public comment. So maybe many or some of you have already
                      written.   I will briefly talk about what we did, or what
                      recommendations, draft recommendations are on the document.

                      This is the cover page of the public comment. These are the
                      members of Working Group Two. I'm going through the abstract
                      page, which is on the page of the public comment announcement.
                      So this is the IDN ccPDP Working Group Two draft final report
                      and the public comment period is from October 22nd to December

15th. And there are important links shown on the page and how to submit your comment to the public comment forum.

[background conversation]

Hiro Hotta: Sorry about that color, it's the yellow signal for the document. Sorry about that. I want to continue my explanation. The content of the document, section one – the purpose of the IDN ccPDP Working Group Two is to report on and identify feasible recommendations for the inclusion of IDN ccTLDs in the ccNSO within the framework of the IDN ccPDP.

To date the WG has identified the following clusters of issues and topic area's: these are the areas. I will talk about briefly for each of the topic area.   As in the ccNSO meeting in Singapore we discussed about this issue intensively and after that meeting the Working Group two discussed, through the conference call and on the mailing list. So this is the interim result of the Working Group two.

First; recommendation on membership definition. The Working Group recommends that the definition in Article IX section 4.1, which is for the membership definition, should be updated to maintain the one-to-one correspondence between the IANA Root Zone Database and membership in the ccNSO. Which means that, for example, China has .cn and .[tchingora] IDN, both two

15th. And there are important links shown on the page and how to submit your comment to the public comment forum.

[background conversation]

Hiro Hotta: Sorry about that color, it's the yellow signal for the document. Sorry about that. I want to continue my explanation. The content of the document, section one – the purpose of the IDN ccPDP Working Group Two is to report on and identify feasible recommendations for the inclusion of IDN ccTLDs in the ccNSO within the framework of the IDN ccPDP.

To date the WG has identified the following clusters of issues and topic area's: these are the areas. I will talk about briefly for each of the topic area.   As in the ccNSO meeting in Singapore we discussed about this issue intensively and after that meeting the Working Group two discussed, through the conference call and on the mailing list. So this is the interim result of the Working Group two.

First; recommendation on membership definition. The Working Group recommends that the definition in Article IX section 4.1, which is for the membership definition, should be updated to maintain the one-to-one correspondence between the IANA Root Zone Database and membership in the ccNSO. Which means that, for example, China has .cn and .[tchingora] IDN, both two

ccTLDs, so they both can be members of ccNSO. This means like that.

And recommendation on eligibility and nomination of councilors - no changes in bylaws needed. This means that all of the members, which means all of the ASCII managers and IDN managers, all of them are eligible to be selected as councilor or they can nominate the councilors to the election.   And the third one there is recommendation on initiation of ccPDP.

In order to maintain the envisioned balance and taking into account the leading principles, the Working Group recommends that all members of the ccNSO, either ASCII or IDN, should be entitled to call for the creation of an Issue Report. These members need to be from different territories. The current minimum of 10 members to request the creation of an Issue Report should be maintained.

So, as you see, the eligibility and nomination, which is just a nominate or second, they don't decide anything final, and for the initiation of ccTLD, this is again just initiation; not decide the result of the PDP. So in making decisions the first start and then finalize what is right. So for the initiation all of the members can have a voice to that. But the recommendation in the draft report, current document is for council member selection and members vote for PDP.

The majority of the Working Group members is of the view that with the inclusion of IDN ccTLD in the ccNSO, the voting in the ccNSO should be based on the principle of one vote per territory,

not one vote per member. One vote per territory should be applied. This is a majority view, but some of us, the minority of the Working Group members is of the view that the voting should be based on the principle of "one member, one vote". We cannot get unanimous decision on this, so at this moment that result is like this.

And recommendation for one vote per territory with multiple members. So, if we take the decision to the "one vote per territory" we have to decide how such territory vote. If there are two or more ccTLD managers in a territory who have become members of the ccNSO, for purposes of voting in the ccNSO an emissary for the voting, the emissary that territory has to be appointed by all members from that territory. So it's a matter of decision of the member in the local matter, in the territory how to designate such an emissary.

We can think about that situation. The emissary has not been appointed for some time, or for a long time. The incumbent member of the ccNSO from that territory is deemed to vote for that territory, until such time the ccNSO Council is informed by all members from that territory of the appointment of an emissary for the territory.

And recommendation on quorum – if we decide how to count the vote it's very straightforward. Assuming that one vote per territory is the preferred principle, the current quorum rule should be maintained. Albeit the relevant sections in the bylaws need to be adjusted to reflect this principle.

And recommendation on changes to the scope of the ccPDP, which is describing Annex C, no changes needed to the Annex C of the bylaws. It has nothing to do with the IDN ccTLD. So, at this stage, the Working Group seeks your comments and input on the following. Should alternative solutions be included to resolve an issue identified? Or do you support the proposed solution, why? Would you prefer an alternative solution, and why?

The public comment period will end in December 15th. So after closure of the public comment period the Working Group will prepare, submit its final report to the issue manager to be included in the IDN ccPDP final report.

Background was already explained.   And yes, it's very a housekeeping matter. I think that's all what's included in the draft final report. Okay, so any comments, opinions, questions?

Male: I'll take the liberty of the microphone being right next to me. Just to clarify and question, you mentioned that China would be eligible for two memberships by virtue of having two domains, but the actually have three because of variants. So under this proposal would it be considered three or two?

Hiro Hotta: I'm not sure I'm correct, so correct me if I'm wrong.

Male:	At this stage the Working Group did not consider variants because that's not part of the final report yet, or it's not considered by the IDN PDP as well in order to move forward. And the was the decision that we made when we got into it from Working Group one, not to wait for the conclusion of the variants but move forward. This Working Group could move forward as well. If there is a need to revisit it, it will revisit it.
Hiro Hotta:	I was about to say we haven't decided yet. I'm sorry, .cn has two IDN ccTLDs, they have variants. So if they are considered to be one TLD, so there should be one member, but they are considered to be two ccTLDs, they should be considered to be two. So maybe in this report the IANA entry and the membership is one to one we said, but maybe it should be changed according to the IDN ccTLD.
Male:	Sorry to come back to you, but that's actually my concern, because as staff we want to make sure that some inadvertent change to the layout of the website doesn't indirectly alter your policies. So knowing whether it's one label per entry or whether we merge them as we display them is important, it's very useful for us. Thanks.
Hiro Hotta:	Thank you.

Female: I actually have one question and one comment. My one question is that you said there were members that did not agree with your recommendation, how many members dissented?   That is my question.   And my comment is so this means that your timeline that you had published online has been changed. So now we will be, the council will be expected to vote on the final report in March, not during this session right?

Bart Boswinkel: With regard to the…the Working Group worked very hard and tried to come up with consensus position, but as the report stated, a minority of the Working Group members did not agree with the majority and the other way around. So that's why it's reflected in the draft final report and it's more a matter of moving forward and awaiting comments to see where the ccTLD community wants to take this, including the IDN ccTLDs themselves, although they can't be members. Otherwise it will be presented this way in the final report as well.

Hong Xue: Thank you. There's an interesting question that has been raised about how many ccTLDs china has. Well in the territory of China. Probably many of us have been aware that ICANN is now doing a VIP issue, a variant issues project that is about variant character management across ccTLDs and gTLDs. It seems the process is going on so there's no final solution that's been presented. But we can see six language communities has presented their report and

they're now published on the ICANN website. A final report will be released hopefully by the end of this conference.

Before the conclusion of this process, we don't know the final policy solution on variant issues. So actually, the IDN ccTLD delegated right now is still very much an ad hoc basis. So in the China case, there's a [.jongoi] in traditional characters and a [.jongoi] in simplified character and they're delegated as two strings, two TLDs. So if you count the number there's actually three.

But my question is not about a number, it's about a proposal presented by this Working Group that's very interesting. It basically means that it's one vote one territory. So even though there's ccTLDs theoretically for China, at ccNSO China is only one vote. That's very interesting but think about the other issues. Now we're talking about contribution by ccTLD to ICANN and the matching contribution, the financial contribution with the services acquired from ICANN.

If three TLDs from the same territory means that there should be three times of financial contributions, but the voting is still one within that territory?   Am I understanding the issue correctly? Thank you.

Bart Boswinkel: Sorry, Hong no, you don't. That's the simple answer. The more elaborate answer is the ccTLDs who are members of the ccNSO may or may not pay any fees to ICANN; that's irrelevant of their

membership of the ccNSO. There is no tie between membership of the ccNSO and financial contributions to ICANN. And if you look at say in the application form for the ccNSO, it is also stated very clearly saying "There may be a fee in future, but currently it is zero".

Lesley Cowley: And this is a controversial subject. So "any fee in future", if it's anything more than zero, would need to be agreed by the ccNSO members in council.

Hiro Hotta: My personal feeling, speaking of .china, although technically they are three TLD strings but we call it as two; one is ASCII and one is ASCII. Also we're regarded as [appended] and they are generally as the same one. But speaking of the voting rights to come, the question is still that is the ccNSO membership based or territory based?

The question is yes answered. So if we are taking ccNSO as a member base, what about the IDN ccTLDs? Should they still entitle to membership waive their voting right or just ccNSO has a territory based organization? Looks like if we are going to go down further to this path, the membership has to be reconsidered.

Bart Boswinkel: If you look at the count and say the way that it is currently presented and as Hiro presented it, in principle it is not territory

based with one exception, when it comes to very few instances of formal voting. In that case there is, because it is very complex if you do it through another system and that's being analyzed in the final report. If you go to another system you might end up with say, in China it's say the bundle is run, if you would apply for all of them as a ccNSO member, you would have four votes.

The same would apply for India where you would have four votes. In the case of say India, and it would be run by…or in the case of Egypt where the IDN ccTLD and the ccTLD are run by independent organizations, or different organizations. They still would have two votes, well in countries like in Europe, say like Nominet for instance, they still would have one vote. And if you look at the way ccNSO was structured at its start, there was no consideration of IDN ccTLDs at all.

So the voting at the time was based on one member per vote without considering there might be multiple cc's; whether it's IDN ccTLDs or ccTLDs in one country. So that whole fabric, that whole structure of voting will be affected. If you look at all the other elements in what the Working Group discussed and where there is an impact of IDN ccTLDs or the inclusion of IDN ccTLDs in the ccNSO, there is no difference. So it doesn't matter whether you have applied for membership for two of your IDN ccTLDs or just one, or you don't apply. There is no difference.

The only difference which will be made is for the formal voting; the rest is all the same.

Young Eum Lee: Gabby is really getting worked out.   Demi will have the last comment.

Demi: Just some short comments. When a territory applies for an IDN the basis for the application is the application coming from some territory. The whole table of cc's is based in territory. I suppose this is a major difference between cc's and g's. G's are based in institutions, in corporations, in commercial initiatives. The cc's are based in the table 3166 in the ISO table. All reference, all the ways we have to distinguish between what are a cc and what are not a cc is because we are based on a territory.

I suppose this is a basic rule to maintain. If we open this rule to institutions in general, first of all it would be very difficult to distinguish what is a cc and what is a g, because of course there would be gIDNs and ccIDNs and so.. My major argument towards this proposal is we have to keep the distinction between cc's and g's and in my view this distinction is based mainly in the table 3166 that defines a territory as the entity that can ask for a cc or IDN cc.

Young Eum Lee: Okay, thank you Demi. That will be the last comment. Oh, Bart would like to respond.

Bart Boswinkel:	Just wanted to say the Working Group has been discussing this for a couple of months and I just advise you, and request you, please read it carefully before making any judgments whatsoever and then move forward. It's a very, very complex area. Thank you.
Young Eum Lee:	Okay, thank you. This will be the end of the IDN session.
Lesley Cowley:	Can you join me in thanking Young Eum, Hiro and Bart and everyone involved with this work, thank you? Okay, we're going to break for coffee or for tea now until a half past three when if I can invite you back, we have a delegation from the ASO coming to talk to us at half past three. Thank you.
Male:	Again, if you're a CEO of an RIR – Axle – if you would like to come down this way that would be great.
Lesley Cowley:	Okay, we're going to start in three minutes. Okay, good afternoon and welcome back everybody. You'll have noticed we have a new crew on the stage, delighted to welcome the ASO and RIR community. Louie asked me at the chairs meeting what questions the ccNSO would like to ask the Address Supporting Organization and I have to admit I couldn't remember being asked questions relating to the ASO, so we thought a good place to start would be

an update from you on what you're doing, what issues are facing at the moment. So, over to you.

Louis Lee: Thank you Lesley, we welcome the chance to engage with the ccNSO and hope that this is productive for you and perhaps continue on the next time around. So, as Lesley said, my name is Louis Lee, I'm the chair of the ASO Address Council. You can find me all week usually with a hat on, but I'll take it off just because we're inside and such. And with me on stage, along with Lesley, are the members of the RIR community that form the ASO function and the NRO Organization.

If I may ask Tomohiro-san to start his introduction that would be great.

Male: Hi hello, my name is (inaudible) from AfNIC; it's so nice to meet you. Thank you.

Wilfried Woeber: Just continuing on, my name is Wilfried Woeber, I am one of the three representatives on the Address Council for the RIPE NCC service region, so this is Europe and the bigger area around it.

Walubengo Nyongesa: Walubengo Nyongesa of AfriNIC.

Axel Pawlik: Axel Pawlik, National Director of the RIPE NCC, pleases to be
                        here.

Scott Bradner: Scott Bradner, ARIN Board.

Paul Anderson: Paul Anderson, ARIN Board and also a member of the CIRA
                        Board.

Kenny Huang: Kenny Huang, Executive Council of APNIC.

Louie Lee: Wonderful.   And amongst you is (inaudible).   He is a AFNIC
                        representative on the ASO Address Council.   And also sprinkled
                        amongst you are staff from various RIRs. If you don't have one of
                        these with you now, please raise your hand so you can get one.
                        Okay, one down here.   Get the opposite corner from where you
                        guys are. Okay.

                        First part of this will go over what the ASO is about.   Alright,
                        we're not going to do the slideshow version here. What the ASO
                        is about, and I will zoom this too so you can see the whole slide.
                        There we are.   Go over the policy development process in our
                        regions and also for the global PDP and some questions, answers,

and how to participate and we can touch on some of the issues that we're dealing with. And hopefully we can talk about what things would be interesting to you.

Alright, the ASO MoU signed October 21, 2004 was an agreement between ICANN and the then NRO, which is the Numbering Resource Organization. The NRO fulfills a role of the ASO. And much of this material, the details of it actually are already in the pamphlet. So I don't actually need to read everything through here for you okay. The details are in here and you may go through it at your leisure.

But the important thing is that the NRO Number Council fulfills a role of ASO Address Council and our policy development process is defined within the MoU. The Global Number Policy, policies are defined within the scope of the agreement as internet number resource policies that have agreement of all the RIRs according to our policy development processes in ICANN. Now this global policy is global in that it requires specific action and outcome on the part of IANA to be acted upon.

The Address Council is comprised of 15 elected and appointed members from the five regions. So we have certain specific responsibilities and duties which you can see up there. The principles in our PDP, open forum – we have an open mailing list and open meetings. We're transparent in that our PDP is documented, policies and meeting are also documented. The most important thing, bottom-up consensus based policies.

Various roles include the community, consensus evaluator, Board and staff. The basic steps of our PDP, as you see here, these are the common steps between each five RIRs.   There are minor differences in the way they're implemented, but the important things is that the community would be submitting the proposal; there's discussion both at the mailing list and open policy meeting; consensus is evaluated, and then we go through last call before adoption and implementation.

Now beyond that, global policies are policies that have gone through the PDP of all five regions and after adoption, it's sent to the ASO Address Council, which would do a review of the proposal, make sure that there's common agreement and there's adequate considerations. After it's past through review it will pass onto the ICANN Board for adoption.

Now if the ICANN Board finds that there's an issue for implementation of other issues they feel are big enough, they need to not adopt at that time. They can send that policy back to the ASO for review and to send back down to the RIRs. Now when the Board adopts it, IANA will implement.   To date there are nine global policy proposals, of which six were adopted and implemented.   One is still under discussion and two were abandoned. You can see these policies on the website shown.

Quick review – global proposal is a policy proposal about the IANA and the RIRs. The regional proposals are policies about the RIRs and their own customers.   I can take questions at this point, right after I show how to participate here.   You can watch our

website for news about the global policy proposals and actual global policies. You can participate in the discussions in your own regions, the mailing lists are open.

Actually, you don't even have to stay within your region. If you see activity in another region that you're interested in and you wish to participate, please do so, there are no membership requirements. You do not have to reside within the region to participate. You can attend the RIR meetings either in person or remote. Alright, and at this point I can take some questions.

Lesley Cowley: Gabby, do you have a mic for Jay? SO while that's happening, how many of you registry managers are engaged in your RIR, might be a good question.

Jay Daley: Hi Louie. Jay Daley from .nz. While the policy process for RIRs is very open, in my experience the majority of people who participate are LIRs, which is in direct contrast to the domain name world where there is extensive participation from the registrant community and that. Do the RIRs have any plans to deliberately widen the policy consultation and bring in far more of the people who are affected by the decisions as end users rather than just as LIRs?

Louie Lee: Thank you for that question. As the question relates to activity within specific regions, if I may direct the question to the CO's.

Male: If I get your question correctly, I think the RIR PDP process is already very open, open for even end users to participate. They are not exclusively for operators to participate. So which part of the process, can you precise…

Jay Daley: Sorry yes, I'm well aware that they're open. From my experience though the majority of people who participate are LIRs, there is limited participation from people who are not LIRs. And my question was will you be doing anything to actively encourage participation from people who are not LIRs.

Axel Pawlik: Okay, so I get it. Yes, people who are more active are LIR because they are direct recipient of our allocation. But yes, we in particular from AFNIC region, we do training on Number Resource Management and our PDP in different countries. And those trainings are not for LIR, mainly they are attended by non-LIR, which is a way of getting attention for other people who are not directly related to the operation, network operation, to know how policies are – how they affect them today.

                    Because very specifically in Africa we have the issue of [knots] where mainly people, end users have difficulty for instance

accessing public IP addresses just because the operators tell them they cannot sell IP to them at the very high cost. So we try to use our training activities to raise the awareness that you can go to your President if you are not happy with the policy, then join our policy development process to do it.

So yes, it is open, but we in each RIR know we are doing effort to bring end users. The big issue is that generally end users feel a little bit impressed by the technicality of discussion that happens in our policy discussion, but that is because yeah, the policy is about numbers and numbers are about routing and then routing is about the way internet works. So it's a challenge for us, but we are trying to address that. But I will let my other colleagues to…

Wilfried Woeber: Yeah, basically what Axel said. Speaking for the RIPE NCC, we are not particularly focusing on end users. What we do is similar to what AFNIC does to do some training. We do lots of training of course for our members, the local internet registries, the LIRS, but also increasingly for others. We try to get out, and that's maybe answering your question to some degree, going out to universities and colleges where we can. Seeing that we are funded by the operators community, they want us to do things that are of great benefit and use to them, to the LIRs.

So that is a limited bandwidth available that we can stand on,. But we do what we can. I have a couple of invitations to go for instance to universities in the UK and to speak there. But again,

there are so many of them through all of our service region I'm not sure that that is entirely efficient. But then yes, our meetings are open. We participate, all are invited to participate by email and remotely; things like that.

A colleague of mine said once when one of our attempts to reach out to the say business community, talk to CEOs and the like, failed miserably because nobody wanted to show up to a free lunch even. But he said "they are not interested in us. They think we are something like the plumbing – it works and then that's fine. If it doesn't work then they come and talk to us." And maybe to some degree that's true for the end user as well. "The internet works and I don't know the details of how it works, as long as it works."

Scott Bradner: Speaking for ARIN, our meetings are open and we encourage remote participation. The primary attendees are internet service providers, since that's the way ARIN works is with internet service providers directly. But we do have significant, or significant in terms of effect, participation by law enforcement and sometimes governmental representatives. But no, we don't have much in the way of business community or DNS, but we are aggressively open. We invite rather than insist.

Louie Lee: And if I may offer an insight for APNIC, I do know that they have an extensive outreach program with education and training. And you see my email address out there, I'll be happy to get you in

contact with the appropriate folks within APNIC to either get you answers or even provide training within your region.   And Wilfried.

Wilfried Woeber: I'd like to add a little bit to Axle's explanation for the RIPE NCC service region for our area. Looking at the overall activities in the community we call the RIPE community, which is not just policy development, which is broader than that, I was just compiling a list of components or contributors to that and this starts on one end with people from the European Commission as sort of representatives sometimes for some parts of the citizens in Europe. I consciously say "some parts of", but that's a political thing.

Then we regularly have activities and contributions by academia, by individual universities talking with respect to for example, we had from the Polish University of Technology talking to the issue of various character sets and internationalization of infrastructure. We are having the IT industry present on a regular basis and we also have a very active anti-abuse community, which is definitely not aligning with the local registry community; that's an old technical activity.

And we usually have some sort of media coverage so when there is a meeting, when there is interesting stuff going on you can actually read articles in the trade press in our region.   So I don't know whether this is sort of touching on your question and whether this is giving you a little bit of background.

Lesley Cowley: Anymore questions or comments? No? Ah, Mathieu, there's always Mathieu.

Mathieu Weill: Thank you. My name is Mathieu Weill and I'm the CEO of AFNIC, the manager of .fr registry. I'd like to thank you for engaging in this meeting and coming to our meeting and introducing a little bit more about RIR – I can't say it in English, now worries. My question actually is to all of you about what you think the ccNSO could bring to you and basically what you expect from us in the coming future and how we can help you.

Louie Lee: Thank you very much for that. That's actually one of the topics we're thinking that we could work on is where can we have collaboration and help each other. Another topic perhaps could be, I noticed earlier today you're Working Group on aligning your organization to be like the RIR service regions. So I may offer your help in any questions you may have about how that's forming, what are the thinking's behind the boundaries and how that's been working out for us; either to me or better yet to the CEOs of the RIRs.

                        I think maybe – I can't think of it off the top…Oh, Scott.

Scott Bradner:	We do have some common issues or concepts. We both have to worry about how we can get accurate contact information for the people that we assigned or work with and this is an ongoing issue at the tradeoff between privacy and accuracy and completeness.
	In both cases law enforcement needs to be able to contact the right people at the right time and they get kind of pissy if they think they can't or they think we're standing in the way, which is one of the reasons why we have law enforcement participation within the ARIN Public Policy meetings, is that they want to be very sure that we are collecting the information they believe that they need in order to do their job.
	So there's certainly a great deal of overlap in the information side. There's not so much overlap in the other part, we're different layers of the structure. Domain names were designed as a way to make it so people didn't have to remember IP addresses and we reinforce that with iPV6; nobody is going to remember that long number. And also domain names were designed to be longer term than IP addresses. So you could change the IP addresses on a server quickly without affecting the users.
	So there is a purposeful disconnect, a purposeful layering between the two in terms of technology.
Lesley Cowley:	Thank you. And that does highlight that maybe we have a common interest in sharing experiences around data accuracy and

also potentially law enforcement that we could explore further. Byron.

Byron Holland: Hi, Byron Holland from .ca. Just wondering if you have any thoughts or comment position on the potential for monetization of the address space and if there is a common feeling among the group or if each of you are going down different roads?

Scott Bradner: All the RIRs have been discussing this quite a bit and all the RIRs have one type or another of, what ARIN calls directed transfer, where parties outside of the purview of ARIN can make some kind of deal to transfer address space, and if that involves money that's all good for somebody. The policy is that address space, within the ARIN region and in most of the other regions, that address space can be transferred to somebody who can demonstrate the need for that address space rather than somebody who is speculation on it or something. You have to demonstrate that you're actually going to use it.

There have been some quite high profile transfers of address space for money. The highest profile one was a Nortel bankruptcy case where Microsoft bought 666,000 addresses for I think $11.25 an address; that's an interesting number by the way, 666,000 if you happen to be into numerology. But in the end, that transfer was done completely within ARINs policies. Microsoft demonstrated

their need for that address space within the one year policy requirement.

We expect, certainly expect to see more of this. We are in last call for a policy within the ARIN region which will enable transfers between RIRs so that somebody in the APNIC region could get address space from a source in the ARIN region for example. And I think this will be a common thing through most of the RIRs within the next few months to a year.

Axel Pawlik: I didn't get your question the first round. Basically talking about transfers of addresses, we have talked about it for a long time within the RIPE NCC and the now strong opinion on that is we don't have an opinion on that. Transfers are okay as long as the transfer is registered in the registry; that is important. The correctness, as Scott said, the correctness of the registry is the priority here.

And apart from that, yes we have a transfer policy, but yes, as long as we know about it it's fine. Whatever the circumstances are I'm not really concerned about it apart from that if the receiving party is demonstrating need then that's absolutely fine.

Male: Yeah I think it's the same principle for all of us RIR in terms of demonstrated need for the use of addresses; the transfer aspect is something different. Some regions have a clear policy about that

and in the AFNIC we don't even have a policy for transfer and that's also a picture of how our region, the status of our region in terms of available address for transfer alone, because the community has not seen the need a this time to have a proper transfer policy.

But as we are getting close to the exertion of our pool certainly we will see a policy on how to handle a transfer precisely. But it will be around justified need given time of transferring that registration as it is for all the other areas. Thanks.

Lesley Cowley: Okay, if there's no further questions, thank you. Jay, last one.

Jay Daley: As you've come all this way and all together I thought it would be fair enough to ask a difficult question for you. You're probably aware of Proposition 100 in APNIC, which is a proposal for IP address blocks on a national basis in iPV6. Now, one of the reasons given or wanting that is the way that the pre-RIR iPV4 allocations have stayed outside of the RIR system and there is a perception from many developing economies that that is an unfair set of allocations.

The ASO, well as far as I understand the RIRs have always felt no need to tackle those. A – because it was hard and B – because we're moving to iPV6, why would we bother with iPV4. Now, while I understand that from a practical reason, here we have very

clear evidence that the perception issues caused by those pre-RIR allocations is now bleeding into iPV6 and may undermine our iPV6 efforts. So is it about time that the ASO started looking at those pre-RIR allocations?

Scott Bradner: Most of those, in historic imbalance in the polite term of diplomacy is in the ARIN region. Certainly the early allocations were done without the assumption that the internet was going to become a global phenomenon and so therefore the needs based requirement was not part of the initial allocations. So I wanted to say that and I'll come back to that. But while there is a, some people might have a perception that this problems exists in V6, in reality it does not.

If you look at the actual statistics of the allocations in V6 they are quite well distributed. APNIC is actually assigned more than, I think – is that more than RIPE? It's close, but more than ARIN and that's certainly that case. So the perception is being exploited even though it's not real. And it's not quite clear how one can fight an exploitation when the underlying premise is incorrect, which it is with V6.

It's certainly there in V4; it's an ongoing discussion. As you see in the brochure here there is a global policy under discussion which would have any returned address space be handed back to the IANA for equal distribution amongst the RIRs; that's under discussion. But as with your question earlier about the directed

transfers and sale of address space, it's not that likely we're going to see a lot of returned address space to the RIRs. Because if you have a bunch of address space are you going to come give it to us for nothing or are you going to try and sell it?

And one of the things that we're trying to do to make it so that the distribution will be fair is to institute the inter-RIR transfer policies that I mentioned earlier so that if there is a shortage, perceived shortage in some business in APNIC or in RIPE and there is a source within the traditional ARIN space, the LEGACY space in ARIN, then it can be transferred and alleviate some of that pressure.

But it's going to be the tradeoff between the value, the perceived value of the address space and the cost of moving to V6; and adoption of any new technology is that tradeoff, the cost of staying with what you've got compared to the cost of moving. And we'll have to see how that tradeoff works.

Lesley Cowley: Okay. Thank you very much to the ASO and the RIRs for the update. I think we've identified some issues of interest and some further information we can work on, so thank you very much. Okay, Jörg, you're on next. Thank you. Okay, so thank you very much guys. So next we have an update from the DSSA Working Group following which we will move rapidly on to the WHOIS session, an update from the SSRT and then to end the day,

NomCom. So that's the schedule which I am still trying to get us to follow, leading up to then dinner later on. Jörg.

Jörg Schweiger: …co-chairing the DSSA for the ccNSO and I'm about to give you an update what we've currently been doing and achieving in this Working Group. Hopefully you're prepared for it as the agenda of these meetings still is quoting something different. Let's see how we move on. Next slide please.

[background conversation]

Jörg Schweiger: Do you see a different slide right now, just to make sure? Is it toggling? Okay, thanks. So just a very quick reminder of what the DSSA is all about. Basically following the statement made by Rod Beckstrom in Nairobi that the DNS is in severe danger this Working Group was being set up with a clear goal to – highlighted in blue – better understand the security and stability of the domain name system. And that is done by this Working Group in a collaborative effort, not only by the ccNSO but by more or less all SOs and ACs in all of the organizations within the ICANN.

What I'm trying to do right now with the audience over here is to give you an update on our progress, secondly to raise awareness for the Working Group and what we've been doing and finally, if we do have tie, solicit your input or receive your input offline.

What we've been doing so far is that we basically launched the Working Group. We have been able to identify a list of threats and vulnerabilities and we are about, let's say, 70% complete with that work.   After that, we'll analyze the identified threats and vulnerabilities and finally deliver you guys with a report.

So this is basically what we've been doing until this very point in time. Probably you just take your time and read a little bit through this paper – no, not all that. I'm not trying to make you read all that. What I was basically heading for was just to give you an impression of the sheer and vast material we have been uncovering to encourage you to visit our website where you can find loads of threats that have been listed and there's an explanation to each and every threat, to each and every vulnerability.

And even more, if you want to go more into detail, there are references to RFC and so forth, so everybody who is not into the topic right now, well may very well just dive into the Wiki and make your way through into DNS stability and security.

A little bit more detail over here right now what we've been doing with the identified threats, we've been categorizing them into different categories, three to be precise. That is threats to the underlying infrastructure; threats that are directly headed to the DNS, and last that are indirectly headed to the DNS.

One thing that came across while we were trying to digest the sheer material was that loads of the threats we have been able to identify might not be in scope with the Working Group. So what

we finally did is we're trying to scope what's in and what's out. And the basic rule said to scope was that we as the Working Group are concerned with "the DNS"; so that is really things that are threatening the system itself. And those threats who have a relevant impact to ICANNs role in for sure is defined like we are looking on impacts that somehow affect root level or top level domains.

If you take a look at this slide you'll see what we've been scoping so far and listing so far. Over here the threats to the underlying infrastructure are given. And what we do feel as a Working Group, but this is set for discussion for you, is that for sure a system failure is clearly in scope of the Working Group, that governmental interventions are subject to this Working Group, that any physical events are subject of this Working Group, and for sure fragmentation of the root.

We are not so sure whether business failure for example is really in scope given by the definition that I showed a little slide before. So, any hint, any meeting, hunch from you would be really helpful. Is for example something like a registry failure really something the Working Group should look at? Clearly what we think out of scope would be depletion iPV6 pool. Now more to threats that are direct attacks concerning DNS – we feel that (inaudible) text for sure as well as packet interceptions sure are in scope of the Working Group. We feel concerned about reflector texts as well and for sure we want to look at cache poisoning issues. Not so

sure we are about any IDN attacks; do they really impact the DNS itself.

We clearly feel that something like "foot printing", "authenticated denial of domain names", and "malicious or even unintentional alteration of contact information" is clearly out of scope. And finally, that might be something of a surprise over here, we think that with respect to indirect attacks, we think that email server hopping under iPV6 might be under our consideration just because of the load that might be imposed in the DNS and we do feel that clearly our scope is any issues that's got to do and deal with registration abuse; be it front running, cybersquatting and so forth.

Finally, some vulnerabilities, not really to discuss right now as this is the very first stage of what we have been classifying so far. Once again categories build, so we are looking at operational issues, we are looking at registry failure and continuity and we are looking not only at technique but at managerial choices and issues as well. And right now, the group is feeling that all of these do have an impact on the DNS and that they are concerned with impacts on the root level or ccTLD or TLD level in general.

So, this is basically what we have been doing. Once again, I would really like to encourage you to take a look at the Wiki because there's really loads of material over there. And I would love to get some feedback concerning whether, especially the scoping we have been proposing fits what your experiences are. So, questions, comments very welcome.

Lesley Cowley: Okay, thank you Jörg. So, comments on scope, activities, where does business failure sit or questions? Roelof?

Roelof Meijer: Hello, Roelof Meijer, .nl. Jörg, I hope I didn't miss it, but did you clarify what the scope of government interventions is in this particular sense?

Jörg Schweiger: Yeah there have been some lines with respect to blocking for example or inventions, so that was on…let me go back to that slide over there. The second green line, governmental interventions – so there's loads of criteria have been given under that line that can even be exploded even more; so this is just a summary and down there you'll find loads more materials that might go in the direction you've just been mentioning.

Roelof Meijer: And with "seizure" you mean seizure of the cc and "blocking" is blocking of a certain TLD?

Jörg Schweiger: For example.

Roelof Meijer: Oh, okay. Thank you.

Lesley Cowley: Thank you. Any further questions or comments? No? Okay, we look forward to further updates, it's a big piece of work and we're very much aware of that. So we will be seeing you again I think. Thank you Jörg.

Okay, if I could invite the team for the next session, which is the WHOIS session. Fernando I believe is chairing and we have presentations from Jay, Nacho and Mathieu I think possibly. Okay. Finding the stairs to this stage is bizarre so I've never been on a stage like this before and probably wouldn't wish to do so again. So apologies for the time delay while people find their way to the stage.

Fernando Espana: Okay, good afternoon. For those of you that don't know me my name is Fernando Espana, I am here representing .us and today we're going to be having a session on WHOIS and we have three presenters. Who is going to go first? You're going first? Okay. So we've got Jay Daley from .nz, Nacho Amadoz from puntCAT, and Mathieu from .fr. So I think Jay is going to be going first if we…and you're going second? Okay.

Jay Daley: Thank you. There is a long history of effort to discuss replacing WHOIS, going back to 1995, probably going back to 1648 if we look hard enough. There have been some technical initiatives,

some RFCs, which have looked at new variants of WHOIS. The most important of those was in 2004 with the development of the IRIS protocol, which had one or two implementations but never really gained any traction.

The Security, Stability Advisory Committee had had a lot to say about WHOIS. They made some recommendations back in 2002, then some more in 2007, then 2008 and 2011. And it would be fair to say that they are probably escalating the strength of their concerns about WHOIS as they make their recommendations.

So what's wrong with WHOIS? This is a generally accepted set of things that's wrong with WHOIS, not my view; it's taken from many of these different documents, although I do agree with it. The first of these is that there is no standardization of data, which includes what data should actually be presented in WHOIS, how the data is represented. And that gives us two problems. It inhibits computer readability and hinders comparison of outputs. Also there is no standardization of protocol features, such as advanced queries or error messages.

Another big piece that's missing is internationalization. And the Internationalization of Registration Data Working Group has been looking at this. So there is no way that a WHOIS server can tell the client the character set of the response they will receive. So it makes it difficult for a client to know how to interpret a response and display it correctly if it's going to have anything other than the US ASCII character set. There's no way to allow the client to say "I support a different character set, please provide it to me".

In the gTLD WHOIS specification it's not possible to have non-US characters on any of the data. Now many of the ccTLDs allow non-US data and some of them have a way around some of these client issues. .dk uses a special command line parameter. .no does as well and .jp does as well. But these are not standard and other WHOIS servers, if you attempt to use any of these parameters with them will not return an answer. So it's not safe just to try them out on any other server unfortunately, despite these being very clever solutions.

The other two things wrong with WHOIS are access control. In the ccTLD registry world IP addresses management is common, in particular rate limiting and "blocking lists" and "allow lists", but there's no standard notification of a block and no standard way of telling people what your policy will be. And finally, there is no authentication standard. Many people do have some form of access to bulk sensitive data, or advanced search features, and generally provide that through an entirely separate application for people. And similarly for availability checkers often provide it through different applications.

Now, we're actually talking about very different services within the WHOIS terminology. We have "public lookup of the public register details" – this is what most people think the WHOIS is. But the discussions that take place with other constituents or stakeholders, including law enforcement and the intellectual property community, sort of have a different set of needs from just that public lookup.

EN

We know that there has often been a push from law enforcement and the intellectual property community for us to do everything possible to ensure that the public lookup of the public register is 100% accurate and that anybody who gives false information is shot at dawn. Now, that as we all know is impractical to achieve and there needs to be a differentiation of service for people to provide that.

So the second service is controlled access to a public record register with enhanced search facilities, often offered as part of a dispute process to certain accredited people.   Then there's controlled access to a public register for availability checks, where only limited data needs to be provided, and so often provided from a very different system from WHOIS. And then finally there is controlled access to a private register, such as for example for law enforcement or others.

Now, I'm not suggesting that these need to be implemented by everybody in any way. Just that when you look at the feature set that people talk about quite often they mix these different uses together and it's important to separate them out.   Okay, some terminology taken from the latest SSAC report, I hope you're all paying attention here.

We now talk about "domain name registration data", or DNRD, which is the data supplied by registrants. We then talk about the DNRD Directory Service, which is the way of looking at that data, which is the service that WHOIS provides. Then we talk about the DNRD-DS Data. So the domain name registration data directory

service data, which is the subset of registration data that WHOIS gives you access to.

So, the registration data that we actually wish to make public through WHOIS. And then finally we have the domain name registration data access protocol, DNRD-AP, the technical protocol to access the service. Much of the problem has been that the work that has happened before has only ever looked at the bottom one of these and not looked at the other three, and it's where the other three are used that the problems have lain.

So, there are two sets of work going on: the Internationalized Registration Data Working Group has its final report out now. They're meeting on Thursday this week and they make three recommendations; for the ICANN community to define the domain name registration data; for the GNSO and SSAC to discuss a common language and script that we may expect all registrations to be presented in as well as presented in their own local language and script. I've been strongly arguing against that, but it's one of the things that are out to consult about.

And then the ICANN community to redefine the domain name registration data access protocol, or the WHOIS protocol as we know it. Then there is the IETF WEIRDS Group, it's not really a formal group yet within the IETF, which is looking at replacing the domain name registration data access protocol, or the WHOIS protocol. This is currently very much driven by the RIRs and their experience at how they do things and has very little domain name input. So, any questions?

Jörg Schweiger: Jörg Schweiger from DENIC .de. Hi Jay, thanks for presenting
                         that. Just one question you may have probably already expected
                         and that is we saw some other efforts to get over the drawbacks f
                         WHOIS and that for surely what I'm quoting right now is IRIS.
                         So, why are we not focusing on making the last bits towards IRIS
                         and that's going to become the perfect protocol? And what makes
                         it so sure that if there is really something else to do and a
                         completely different architecture has to be made, how come we are
                         so sure that we're going to get it done really very good and better
                         than IRSI this time?

Jay Daley: IRIS attempted to create a single service that did the same thing as
                         all of these four services here. And that's one of the reasons that
                         nobody liked it, because nobody really knew what it was and how
                         it should be used.   The intention now is to create a single
                         technology that can be used to deliver different services that are
                         clearly offered and managed as entirely different services with a
                         different set of customers, a different intention behind them.

                         And optionally, so that people can choose which ones of those to
                         offer. If we were to use IRIS, it would mean expecting us to offer
                         all four of those services through one interface all mixed together.
                         And that's effectively why it's entirely inappropriate for what
                         really is the problem we need to solve.

Fernando Espana: Any other questions for Jay? No? Okay, I think now we're going to move on to our second presentation, which is Mathieu.

Mathieu Weill: Alright I'm not going to introduce myself again. good to be back on stage. It's been a long day, but I think the WHOIS issue really deserves a discussion so I hope we can have a lot of interaction on this. I will not be on the technical or service side here but rather sharing a use case, actually a policy case, which is the policy that was set up by AFNIC through a bottom-up multi-stakeholder process five years ago about what we call, we do not call it the WHOIS Policy, it's Data Access Policy and it's called in French, but I think for our own sakes I will sum it up as WHOIS.

So what is this policy? The policy can be summed up in three points. The data, any data, name, first name, last name, phone numbers, emails are not displayed in the public WHOIS for individual registrants. Accept if those registrants specifically ask for it. AFNIC sets up two things to provide, to enable any affected party to contact the registrant. One is an online web form, very simple. It is basically a black box and it's just relaying emails to the admin contact.

And the second, third point on this slide is that right owners or any affected party may request disclosure of the registrant data to AFNIC and this request is subject to checks that are performed by AFNIC, our legal department. So that's really the summary of this policy. And that's what is a very famous domain name, please

don't all go to this famous website because my hosting contract does not really provision for a /. effect, but it's actually a great website; it's French and English. So you can try it.

But basically, I'm a private person. I register my own name. you have all the technical details, but the registrant data, [titule] is French, and the admin contact, all you get is "this is not available". And you have actually below this form, below this link to the contact form I was mentioning. And you have all the details for the technical contact. So this is really the policy, one example with the policy.

So why do we do this? This was set up in 2006 at the time when .fr was opening to individual registrants. So you have to realize that contrary to a number of other top level domains, individual registrants did not have access to registrations before. So the policy that was set up for many of you in the late 1990's or early 2000's with a sort of low level of awareness about WHOIS privacy issues. We had a very different context.

We have a legal framework that makes an explicit reference to the Privacy Act, the French Privacy Act in the directives. And when we engaged in discussions with the National Privacy Authority before we set up this policy, we received a very nice letter that was basically saying it would be disproportionate to show the registrants data in the public WHOIS. So we were basically under instruction to find a system that was balanced that would not contradict this legal framework.

How did that impact the registry?   I think that's one of the questions that we have very often is, "How do you deal with this." "This is unusual, how do you deal with it?"   So a few facts – in 2006 we had half a million domain names.   We now have 2.2 million.   About 35% of these 2 million plus are individual registrants.   So we're talking about really several hundreds of thousands of domain names whose contact details are not provided.

And we get data disclosure requests, but as you can see, they're not an overwhelming number.   We have about 300 a year.   It's not even raising with the gross of the registry.   And we manage to process them in very limited time I'd say, three days.   And I can assure you we don't have 20 people working on this; this is only part of the legal departments tasks. Most of them are granted because we have made sure that you have to fill a form to request the data is crucial, and it's extremely explicit about when you will be refused or granted so that people are informed up front before they even submit their request.

The admin contact form, the web online form, the use is just extremely low.   You see that we have this year about 100 – the web form that is used 100 times a month; that's extremely low.   Of course there's no guarantee that you get response from the registrants, so most of the right holders prefer going through the heavier process of the data disclosure.

So, what's are take on this?   Well hell did not break loose.   We are living quite well. I think right holders have been accustomed to it. Of course they would rather have direct access to the data, but I

think we have now demonstrated that they can live with it. From the private registrant point of view it's clear that it's reinforced trust into our models and policies. They are aware of the benefit of registering .fr and getting the data protected.

They're especially sensitive to eh limited risk of unsolicited communications, I mean SPAM is one of the main issues. But we also have a number of cases where there have been some "freedom of expression" aspects into registering the domain name and making sure they are not immediately identified by anybody, including journalists. Our customer feedback suggested we also have a positive impact on data accuracy. We do need further research on this, but the impression we have is that there is a scarcity of absolute contact details in our records, at least a higher rate of accuracy.

And the impact on expenses, before we set this up everyone was saying "This is not scaling. You'll never manage it", has remained really marginal and only part of the task of the legal department. And that's it for my presentation and I'm willing to take questions obviously.

Pavel Tuma: Pavel Tuma, .cz. What were the most common reasons of refusals to disclose the information when requested?

EN

Mathieu Weill: Ah, good question.   Some of the right holders would request disclosure because of the content of the website. So they were unhappy with the content instead of with the domain name itself. That was one type of refusal we have quite often.   Of course we also have refusals for insufficient proof of right over the domain name, or the similarity.   Those are the most frequent cases, but if you need more statistics on that I can put you in touch with our legal department.

Male: Okay, thanks.

Mathieu Weill: Roelof I think I'm ready now.

Roelof Meijer: Why are you all laughing?   I'm just trying to keep everybody awake with this. I'm amazed by the very limited number of requests you get.   Do law enforcement authorities have a separate access to your data?

Mathieu Weill: Yes, we're using the same process for our law enforcement authorities with slight differences; including the fact they are not actually relying on our policy to request data disclosure, but on their own powers.   They have some existing powers of ability to request from companies or organizations disclosure of some data,

including the tax authorities for instance are one of our big customers. Competition authorities as well. Customs. They go through the same process internally, but they would not count as using the policy even without the policy we have to provide them with this data in the French legal framework.

Roelof Meijer: But for each query about a single domain name you have to fill in a form?

Mathieu Weill: Yes. They can provide a list, but they cannot provide say, "I want all the domain names that start with an "A"" or whatever, that's not allowed.

Roelof Meijer: No. Another question. We introduced a few years ago a WHOIS that doesn't show any personal, well data that could be considered personal data if the registrant was a private entity, but we don't make the distinction, accept for the name of the registrant. And we did that so that a registrant could verify through our WHOIS if the domain name was registered in his or her name. Do you have any possibility for the registrant to do so, and if not, do you get complaints about the fact that you don't?

Mathieu Weill:	That was one of the issues we had upfront on the policy. We have not set up and specific system for that and we're relying on the registrars. And we sometimes get complaints or requests. Basically we handle them on the basis of our customer support team trying to get some form of identification from the customer, usually we collect some data that is not displayed or that is really private that would not be accessible to anyone and then say "Okay, yes you are the registrant" or "No".

That's something we can do, but it's quite rare we have those requests.   But I'd be very interested to know how often that happens that people really check this.

Roelof Meijer:	Yeah we don't know. It's difficult to find out. Thank you. What do I do with the mic?

Fernando Espana:	While we get to the other side, Mathieu I had a question. The section where you don't show the registrant or the admin contact, is that the same on Port 43?

Mathieu Weill:	It is the same on Port 43 except I think our engineers found it funny that it's always "Mr. Anonymous" that is shown, but yes, it's the same on Port 43. The only difference between our web interface and Port 43, apart from layout of course, is the rate limiting still are different. But that's all. The registrars themselves

have an interface where for their own customers they get full access, but only for their own registrants.

Male: Sorry. So I guess to follow up his question, the registrant can check with their registrar to see if they really own the name? Okay.

Eddy Kayihura: Hello, my name is Eddy and I'm from Rwanda. I just wanted to know on the admin contact form, you ask anyone wants information will talk to you, but you don't disclose the admin contact information and you forward it on their behalf? And how does the communication back works, do they still pass through you or do they talk to them correctly?

Mathieu Weill: You have to fill in your email address and basically when we design the outgoing email to the registrant, we'll put a "reply to" to your own email address. So all the registrant has to do is reply to the email and it goes straight to you and we're not aware of what you're talking about. But that's the choice of the registrants to disclose his email address by replying to you.

Eddy Kayihura: Okay.

Fernando Espana:	Thank you Mathieu. I think we're going to move onto our next presenter, Nacho, from puntCAT.
Nacho Amadoz:	Is it in? Okay. Well my apologies up front for all of those of you who have been hearing .cat moan about the WHOIS process for all these long three years that we've been going through. My presentation will be quite short because our model is based on what AFNIC did, so I do not need to explain what are we doing or what are we aiming at because Mathieu already explained it.

I'm going to focus basically on what has it taken to go through all the way. We are not done yet. I've been talking with the ICANN staff respond to all of this today, and we still have two or three good months ahead. But at least the thing is already published on the ICANN website, has been delivered.

Our aim was changing the WHOIS policies. It's quite simple. There were three factors – respect due to user, and as Mathieu said, we need to give the users the possibility to opt of the disclosure of their data. It's their right to be able to do so and we believe that we have to do so following the recommendations of the Article 26 Working Party, which is the gathering of the directors of the data protection agencies in Europe and the recommendations of the GAC.

In order to do so we needed to adjust the ICANN agreement with the data protection laws. The contract that we have with ICANN just reflects the classic thick WHOIS output, so we needed to

engage in a process with ICANN in order to be able to renegotiate the contract according to the European Data Protection laws. And there's an ultimate objective, which is to avoid the fines we could get from the data protection authority which they could get up to 300,000 Euros, which is not bad, for a small registry that could mean bankruptcy. So that was also a good objective.

Our current WHOIS outputs – you all are familiar with this. You see the data, name, last name, address, email address, blah, blah, blah. Our models, well AFNICs and CIRA, so it looks quite easy. We just wanted to get these models, bring them to ICANN, let them know two other European gTLDs have already gone through these changes. We want to follow what is becoming a trend in the registries that want to be responsible with the handling of the data, so it had to be easy, but it was not, it still is not.

There are several circumstances that have been quite difficult for us. The paradigms and the legal documents and the mix of everything and trying to find a balance among all the interests at stake; they led us to some thoughts that I believe are what's more important in this presentation.

The paradigms, the first one, is how entities in the European Union deal with data protection and how it is dealt by people in the United States.   You have a single directive in Europe and you have regulations made by to certain areas in the United States, so we have the directive as a principle and that enshrines data protection as a right that should be applied in every circumstance; whereas in the other case, it's not like that.

When you come to the directive, the directive as such has to be transposed to every national jurisdiction by a national law. And although the spirit of the directive has to be there and has to be more or less the same, there might be some differences in how every law is written and applied, and moreover, how every data protection agency would feel about certain things such as the internet, and that can be dangerous.

And again, law versus contract. This is something that has been pointed out by many people whenever we have explained our case, and that is no contract can take you to break your national law. Yes, good, okay. Tell ICANN that you are unilaterally changing the contract of a small TLD that has just 50,000 domain name registrations; it's not a good idea. It's much better to try to engage in a process, at least that's what we thought. Three years later, I don't know if we still think the same, but it's the proper way to deal with it.

cc's versus g's are two different beasts, as has been said. cc's are regarded as a national asset and g's are an industry agent. Well yes it could be, but when it comes to protection of this rights of the individual users, I believe that it doesn't matter if you're a cc or a g, you have to be able to engage in negotiations with the data protection agency and they must regard you as a valid counterpart and a counterpart that is working with them to offer some education about what users should be doing with their data on the internet.

And again, if you cc's have to change your statutes, you may have to go through consultations with governments and maybe your relationships with governments are not good or they are…okay, I don't want to get into that because I don't know about that. You know it far better than me. But I guess it's better than trying to get ICANAN sitting with you and trying to change such a thing for such a small registry as us.

The DPA, the data protection agency versus the gTLD, which is our approach to whatever we have been finding in our way, trying to learn by experience, and in this regard, our participation in organizations such as CENTRE has been very helpful because the people are very willing to share what has happened to them with us so we can prepare and anticipate any problems that they've been going through in the past.

So we learn by doing these things, whereas the DPA ha a regulatory approach, they have a finance system and if you are on the internet try to get in touch with them before they decide that the users of TLDs should not be having their data available to everybody. That's what we did. Again, another question is the territoriality versus no border. You all have faced situations such as this in the past.

We are based in a certain territory, yes. Most of our customers are in a certain, yes. But we are a gTLD and that means that we are not a territorial TLD, so it is not the same approach. And the penalties versus negotiations I think I've already talked about that. There's a last thing, which probably is quite obvious, lawyer

versus the techie, law versus the code. And if you go more in-depth, legislation versus EPP and it ends up being a problem versus problem, because you have to sit together and try to understand what the other party, which basically you have no idea.

When we talked to our techies they said "Well your approach is quite inept". Okay, "Thank you guys. Tell me how to get to the fulfillment of the policy we have to do, what do we have to do?" "Well we have to do these and the EPP..." "Yes but the registrars have to be involved, try to make it easier." "Well if they don't understand what to do then it's their problem." "Yes okay guys, try to be a little more understanding please."

Legal documents, that's a regulation. The directive, which is Spain is the Data Protection Law under these letters and the development. There's no WHOIS reference, so you have to make an interpretation task about whether you are using very sensitive data, not sensitive data, whether the data you are asking is appropriate or not; it's very difficult to get to an easy or a clear cut interpretation because probably different DPAs have different approaches.

Our agreements with ICANN and that is perhaps the point that has been delaying the whole process for three years. You have to change the agreements, yes. There's also the agreement between the registrant and the registry, but that comes later. What you have to change is the agreement between ICANN and the registry.

And this has to be done through the registry services evaluation process. A process that it appears to have been quite crowded lately because it's been taking a while, it's been taking a while for the legal team to review what we were saying; for the registry liaison staff to understand what we are saying. And I'm not complaining about the ones we have now because they are really making an effort to understand the situation and to help us go ahead.

But we have had to deal with three different registry, chief registry liaison people and that doesn't help. Because they all had the documents, they all had the rationale. We sat with them but yes, if another person comes into this thing you have to sit again and talk about it again and he has to go through the legal review again. Well, I don't know what it is, but it's taking quite a while.

The Article 29 Data Protection Working Party, this is our base. They have an opinion and they sent a letter to the ICANN Board and it was quite clear. It should in any case be possible for individuals to register domain names without their personal details appearing on a publicly available register. They are not an enforcing agency. They have a consultative role. But I understand that being that they are the directors of the TPA, this counts. And the letter is also quite clear.

So I don't see why it takes two months to legally review, by the ICANN legal team, our proposal, especially if you have what I said before, two previous gTLD registries from Europe that have done the changes. And there's the GAC principles regarding WHOIS,

recognizes that they're also legitimate concerns about conflicts with national laws, so it appears it's quite clear.

So we went to our DPA – okay, I'm hurrying – we basically told them what we were doing, what we wanted to do and they said "Okay, changes will result in a more respectful situation." "Well thank you guys but it would have been better to have a resolution where you would have said 'You must change this'".

The current state of affairs – the DPA is a resolution that is binding enough, but we don't know. From the Article 29 Working Group we have endorsement, but not official. They cannot officially do this endorsement. But we provided the information to ICANN. The ICANN staff understood and agreed. The registry request is delivered and now it has to get to the Board once we change the language of our agreement.

And the last slide, some thoughts – calling the GAC - anybody out there, would you guys please help us in this. We still don't know. From the part of the registry liaison staff, many thanks to Francisco and Karla because they've been really very helpful. And the DPA, the first reaction, how do you say this "WHOIS" thingy looks like, well three years after we got the result; and the constant menace of trademark lawyers flying over ICANN. That is something that as we are quite small they have not yet put their eyes on us. And that's all, thank you very much.

Fernando Espana:	Thank you Nacho. I know we're right on 5:00 so if there's any questions for Nacho…I think there's no questions. So thank you Jay, Mathieu and Nacho for your presentations and I think we're moving on to the next session. Thank you.
Lesley Cowley:	Thank you Fernando, thank you team. Okay, so the next item on our agenda is the report back from the Affirmation of Review Teams, the SSRT, Simon and Jeff are joining us I believe and I think we're also expecting Alejandro, but I haven't seen him in the room yet, unless he's somewhere below the stage. But if you'd like to join us now.

This session was originally intended as an update also from the WHOIS Review Team but they have been in contact to say whilst they'd love to meet with us they are focusing on finishing their report this week, which they are committed to releasing on the 30th of November. So with that in mind, they have deferred coming to see us until they have finished that report and will be joining us in Costa Rica.

They did say that they would like me to pass on however, thanks to the ccTLDs who've shared comments and anonym-ized survey data relating to the WHOIS. And if there are any additional thoughts from ccTLD colleagues for the WHOIS Review, they would be very happy to receive them either this week or via email.

Okay, so greetings to the Security and Stability Review Team, and over to you.

Simon McCalla:	Thank you Lesley. Thank you everybody for having us briefly. I want to just run through and give you a very quick update on where we are with respect to the SSR RT2 Review Team. I hope you can see I've just got a brief history of where we are. We were formed back in the fall, autumn of 2010. We had our first face to face meeting in Cartagena, which was very useful and some of the team members are here with me up on the stage.

We then met again in San Francisco where we really started to break down the work. We created a formation of the sort of sub-team structure that allowed us to work at both the governance of ICANNs SSR responsibilities, the implementation of the SSR plan, and then taking a look at how ICANN manages and identifies risks and threats and how it deals with those.

We then met again in Singapore where we were able to sit down and take a look at the amount of work that had been achieved. And it then allowed us to focus in, once we'd taken a look at that initial broad analysis on what we really needed to focus on and we created a core drafting team and most of them are sitting up here on stage with me.

That allowed us to then really start work on a draft report framework and the contents of that. We then met a face to face again in Washington in between the ICANN meetings where some of us met together to really break down the tasks that we had to do. When you first look at it it's a bit like eating the elephant, it's a

huge mountain of tasks and trying to break down into what was important and to give the group some focus was really important.

And we assigned what we called "work packets", so the team has been working away on very specific issues and coming back and reporting to the team. So let's talk about progress. There's been some really good analysis performed by the team and some good progress made, particularly around the areas of ICANNs governance of SSR and looking how broad its remit should be, how broad its remit is and how it is dealing with that.

Looking at the scope of its responsibilities and is it managing that scope properly. So we've been able to get some really good work on that. Really trying to be clear about ICANNs remit has been really important as well. What is it that they're responsible for and what is it that they have to help facilitate? So that's been a really useful sort of analysis sort of analysis and debate amongst the team.

There's been a lot of documentation. If you take a look on the SSRT public wiki you'll see a lot of analysis documents and you can see some of the thinking the teams going through and how that's broken down. And also we now have a report framework which we're working to, which is effectively at the moment some of its well filled in, but some of its empty and we're working through some of those tasks.

We've had some really good discussion and some really excellent debate within the team, both within the team internally but also

with ICANN staff. We've spent a lot of time on conference calls and working with ICANN staff and they have been, to a man or woman, absolutely fantastic. So I just want to say a big thanks to them here publicly from us.

They've been really transparent and really open with us when it comes through going through documentation and when it comes to opening up some of their processes to us. We've also had a chance to interview folks at the IGF. At the recent DNS-Easy and GC-SEC in Rome, so there's been chances to ground people and talk to them outside of traditional ICANN structure.

So we've got this great library now of documentations and findings and so if anyone would like to see that, that's in the SSR wiki. We've had some really useful discussions around non-disclosure agreements. And one of the challenges as a review team when you're digging into security information is at what point does that information become so sensitive that we need to sign an NDA in order to access it?

And of course, as a team as a whole we fundamentally said "I'm not sure we want to be signing an NDA because we want to be reviewing the publically available material, but more importantly we don't want to be bound by an NDA to not then be able to report our findings publically"; and we felt that that was too much of a conflict. So we haven't had to go down the approach.

And again ICANN staff have been tremendously helpful in helping us to take a look at the information we can see and can see without

having to sign an NDA. SO they've been fantastic with that. One of the other things, and I think some of you may have heard me mention it earlier on was that we've seen some really tangible changes in the way ICANN is looking at its SSR strategy, looking at the Strat Plan and we're seeing language changing that is a result of the work that we've been doing and the consultation with them.

So that's a really, really welcome step. This isn't about waiting for an SSR report to come out, we're seeing changes being made right now and we feel that's really fantastic and we really credit ICANN with doing that.   On the downside, I think the participation amongst the review team, and I suspect this isn't just unique to our team, has not been as strong as we'd like. We had hoped to have a draft report for you consumption here at Senegal and we're not in the situation to do that; we're some weeks away from having a fully populated draft report.

I think there are areas that we could share and there are some findings we could share, but we feel that the most important thing is to complete that draft report and push that out. So we will be hoping to have the report out somewhere midway between Dakar and Cost Rica. So we're thinking sort of Christmastime in mind, that's when we hope to have, and hopefully before that have our first draft report for public comment.

So what are we trying to achieve this week? We're midway through and we've already started some very detailed interviews with various supporting organizations and we've had some excellent discussions, we had a fantastic one this morning with the

SSAC. We've already got an outline for the draft report and we've been working on it this afternoon.

A discussion about how we move forward as a team, recognizing that some people are able to only commit a certain amount of time and some people are very, very engaged, so how do we use the engaged people really well. And again, I think that's not unique to us as an SSR team, I think that's unique to a lot of the review teams.

Consideration of the team structure as well, a reworked task break down and that really important now. We've got some great analysis in some areas and we're a bit light in others, so really focusing on those and a plan to get us to a draft report between Dakar and Costa Rica. So our next steps really are further face to face meetings. We've got more to go this week.

We're going to carry on with our analysis approach during the autumn of this year. As I said, we're going to be working towards a draft report between now and Costa Rica, and then hopefully getting it out to the community really quickly for feedback. We'd like to be in the position to come to Costa Rica with a report that includes the feedback from the community. So I think that's really important.

And we're still aiming to have a final draft report in the Spring. SO I'm not going to say ICANN Costa Rica, but certainly by the Spring of 2012 I think would be fair for us to have our final report.

That's it from us. Alejandro is there anything that you want to add?

Alejandro Pisanty: Thank you Lesley. Thank you, Simon. Apologies for time lost in mazes. I end up walking around the building more than once to find my ways. Thank you all for opening up this session to us. We're very proud and thankful. I would add in compliment to what Simon has said a very few things. one of them is that we've been running this team on the basis that we are, and this is a very, very good team, its members are well-known in the community, they have made their names by high quality work, a deep knowledge of the system, both the technical side when necessary and the organizational one.

So the team has operated on the basis of reasonably well-defined tasks, not factory, Ford, tailored-like definitions but reasonably well-defined nonetheless, actually better so far for us; and empowerment which means that once each team member has his or her assignments, we only have one woman on the team. So when a member of the team has his or her assignments they go off and everyone else can trust that they will come back with valuable results.

We've been holding interviews, doing document analysis, asking ICANN staff repeatedly for documents; not only repeatedly, but also iteratively. So you ask for something, you get something in return which may be a bit more a bit less, you try to dig deeper,

EN

negotiate the disclosure conditions and so forth. One result of this is that the documents provided by ICANN have become more and more useful. We started just with a very valuable and well collected collection of documents that Denise Michele and Patrick Jones crafter for us, but it was of pre-existing documents.

And as we have been asking for more and more, we have been able to access some internal documents which are of a pretty fine grained nature. And also to obtain versions of documents, which we don't know if they were specially crafter for us in full or they are specially crafted editions of documents that exist but from which the non-disclosable part has been stripped, and still a vast amount of useful information is contained.

As Simon said, this nondisclosure thing has been with us from our very first session in December last year in Cartagena when we were just meeting face to face for the first time. It's not unusual. Lesley and many others who have been in the ATRT and WHOIS Review Teams and other non-AOC previous bylaws mandated reviews know very well. It's very hard to get nondisclosure agreements.

One of the things we find is that the companies to which many of our members belong have lawyers and these lawyers have serious reservations about these NDAs. It would take forever to have them negotiated company to company. So we have decided that – and then further, once we have this NDA information we wouldn't be able to use it. And we want to keep our review accountable and our work accountable and transparent.

So even if we don't provide a full documentary basis with an annex and a report, we want to make sure that if people want to dig in and challenge any of our conclusions when we get there, any of our recommendations, we can actually show where the whole thing came from. Or with our straightest face and say "I said so. It's my opinion." But to have it all substantive as possible.

So these are some of the considerations we have. I will add that we have found, again, this is again no surprise; that transparency and accountability in ICANN are usually in high demand from everyone else, whoever you are. And as soon as you ask any community, within ICANN particularly as you know well within the ccNSO, pre-existing communities about their procedures, their ways to get to agreements or the way things are operated, especially things that have an impact on stability, security or resilience, you'll frequently find circled wagons, to use the US expression.

You'll find closed doors. You'll find arguments of incredible solidity and elaboration that tell you that the world will come crumbling down if that piece of information is revealed to you, but of course, everyone else should put out their underwear for public sight. We are happy to use the same scale with everybody and triangulate the information in way that is useful for all. That's been a very, very productive approach.

We are a bit late, as Simon said, on our desired schedule. We would have wished to be done earlier, but the collection of information has indeed taken a toll on our time. For the

substantive issues we believe that it will be possible for us to make some pretty clearly worded recommendations that are actionable. That's taking into account combinations of risk management and the cost and benefit that go with realistic risk management.

One more point at this stage, which I think has emerged starting from this week, from questions from this week, but which we faced from the very start of the work. As we have repeatedly stated, we are not performing a security audit of ICANN. And certainly we're not performing a security of the broadest definition of the ICANN community.

We did ask first for the results of similar audits and certifications. Things like some of you in your organizations may be running, like ISO 27000, ISO 9000 for some processes 14000 for others. All the [ITIL and COBIT] IT management stuff.   ICANN has made decisions which we may come up to support as wise, not to submit itself as fast as they can to these certifications. Many of them are really misfits for the needs or would take enormous amounts of resources which would be taken away from the substantive work. So it would be like a more long term program.

But in the absence of those we have had to ask for all of this direct input from ICANN. And I think in the end the recommendations that will come about that and the recommendations of the task are going to be productive. Second point about the recommendations that we foresee emerging, they will mostly be directed to the core ICANN operation, to ICANN HQ, to people, things that will end up being done by people in ICANNs payroll.

However that is too narrow and we have to find a way to make these recommendations in such a way that they are actionable by the community. Probably channeled by – this is a little bit speculative, but it seems to be a way to make them work – to be channeled by ICANN with its capacity to call on the community for collective action, but then progressively enacted by further and further outlying circles of ICANN influence.

We identify as you know well and I don't know Simon if you mentioned the three circles or tiers of action? No? Okay. So, I won't' extend this anymore. We are looking for feedback and input. We'll put out the draft report at some time as Simon has said. We believe that that point will be extremely important for us to get prompt, deep and very well-reasoned responses of any kind; very open and very frank. And if they need be official so be it, we can get them informal or individually, all the better so if it's fast. Thank you.

Lesley Cowley: Thank you Alejandro and Simon. I'm aware we have other members of the team up on the stage and I don't know if you feel that you would like to add any comments at this stage, but while you're thinking about that and while the audience is thinking about questions, maybe I could ask for a bit more precision. So Spring is a lovely vague term, which if you're a UK Civil Servant may mean anything from January to about May. Do you have any more precision on the timeline please?

We've also heard about a great deal of work, which I can fully understand, are there any hints as to possible proposals or policy recommendations at this stage please? And obviously, we invite questions from the floor as well.

Jeff Brueggeman: Lesley this is Jeff. I think maybe I can touch on that. And also I think the timing issue as Alejandro and Simon said, are we think we're on track to produce a report well ahead of time to get public comment before the next meeting. I would say we'll learn a lot from that comment – I would say I'm optimistic that we're going to be pointing to things that are going to be supported and generally agreed upon by the community. And if that's the case, then I would think we're going to be very close to be able to finalize.

If we get a lot of comments that we have to absorb, I think we want to make sure that we leave enough time to have the community feel that they were able to have their say on it. So to me that would be the biggest variable on the specific timing. But if we do our job and we get this out well before the next meeting then we'd be able to be on track to get it done quickly after that.

And as far as the specific issues I was going to make the point that one of the things that we have found is progress within the SSR framework documents and other things, even while we've been completing the review and we've been very optimistic about that as Simon had touched on. So I think there are areas where we're

going to be focusing on things like transparency, consistency and those types of things, but there are also areas where we've already seen progress that we can document in our report.

Lesley Cowley: Thank you Jeff. Alejandro did you want to add to that?

Alejandro Pisanty: The recommendations we can foresee, some of them are actually we found today in our interactions with ICANN and with the SSAC. I mean these interactions with ICANN yesterday didn't give the same result as today. So this is a fast moving target, not only a moving target as everything else is in life. We are clearly going to make a recommendation about where and how security and a risk management framework has to exist within ICANN. It doesn't exist to date.   There's no general DNS broad risk management framework that's accepted and published.

There is, I mean ICANNs not working in the vacuum of course, but this document doesn't exist. The responsibility lay with the SSAC for many years. In very early 2011, or at the end of 2010 that's almost a year ago, the responsibility was formally removed from the – I think this was in Cartagena in December – it was formally removed from the SSAC. And the resolution then meant to form a Board Committee, which wasn't formed not defined, and to call on a cross-community effort to make a bottom-up edge-inwards definition of the framework.

Many of you know about this and some of you are members of this. There's about seven people from each community in ICANN who are members of the DSSA. So that's a structure that's collating that variables that go into a risk framework and prioritizing them with some criteria. The news today is that the Board Committee is about to be formed. It's not going to be a Board Committee as we originally heard. It's going to be a Working Group. We'll find out more about its character once it's resolved; whether it's Board only or more inclusive. We should not speculate on that.

So that seems to follow what we would be recommending when we have our report in June, let's say. We'll have to manage our recommendations according to this moving target. Our work, the input on which we base our work will change dramatically on Friday after the Board Meeting. So that tells you also about the timeframe.

The other thing, the timeframe right now, Lesley to your question, will lead us to the second meeting during 2012. Because GAC did not attend to the SSRT issues during the boreal Spring and Summer of this year. They are only taking it up again now. In our discussions within the team with the GAC representatives, we know now that both sides will make an attempt to shorten, if not short circuit which is not possible, the cycle between meetings so that something can be done in an inter-sessional way.

We need to have an official document from the SSRT to present to the GAC officially in order for the GAC officially to receive it,

officially to process it and officially give us an official response at some point. We'll try to make that short though.

Lesley Cowley: That was a lot of "officials". Okay, so any questions or comments from the floor please? We officially have no comments at this moment, but we look forward to hearing the next installment no doubt. Thank you very much. Okay, well we're coming up to our final session, the speaker for which has yet to appear. So let me just fill with some notes I could add to the end so we can save time.

So three things from me – there is a Day One ccNSO meeting survey, which Gabby will be sending out if she's not done so already.   We'd very much welcome your feedback on today's sessions, presenters, level of stage and so on. So we look forward to seeing that and that feedback is very much considered by the program committee and the council when we're thinking about what to do at our next meetings.

Next announcement is tomorrow we restart our day at 9:00, not here but in [Salon Brun], which is for our meeting with the GAC. And the main items on the agenda for our meeting with the GAC are the Framework of Interpretation Working Group and what we are calling GAC Road and ccNSO World. We recognize it's been a while since we've engaged fully with the GAC and we have asked the GAC if perhaps they would be able to give us an update

on their current work priorities and we would also give them an update on our own.

Do come, I'm filling space for your arrival. And finally for this evening, we have the ccNSO dinner this evening. If you have booked and not yet collected your ticket from Gabby, please see Gabby as soon as possible because there is a waiting list. The restaurant is two minutes from here via taxi. Apparently you can get there by walking, but for which you will need walking shoes. I wouldn't recommend high heels on the route to the restaurant. And if you would like to walk to get some air and exercise, to meet in the lobby at seven, otherwise if you travel there other than by foot, we will see you there at around 7:15.

Okay, so for the final bit of our day, and thank you very much for your dedication and attention, we have a visitation from the Nominating Committee. Adam, Vanda, oh Rob, yes. How could I forget? Over to you please.

Adam Peake: Would you like us to – Oh good lord this is an interesting room. Yes, well we found our way up here. Thank you. Adam Peake, I'm the chair of the 2011 Nominating Committee. With me is Vanda Scartezini who is the chair of the 2012 Nominating Committee and will begin leading that committee this coming Friday, and Rob Hall who is the chair-elect, going to be the chair of the 2013 Nominating Committee. This is a change of process. We now have a chair who's going to be sitting and learning and

preparing for his term of office and this is a great improvement I think.

But we're here today because, as many of you know, the Accountability and Transparency Review Team has required that the Nominating committee be better informed about the types of skill sets that are required of an ICANN Director. It's specifically about directors although are interests are across broader than that. The reason it is directors is because the Affirmation of Commitments mention directors in terms of reference for the Accountability and Transparency Review Team, therefore said directors.

The nominating committee selects a member of the ccNSO, selects ALAC members and GNSO, so we are interested also in hearing what you think the skill sets are for those positions, but we do have a formal requirement to ask you about the skill sets for directors. I think there's a slide up there which very simply says "Directors – what qualities and experience are needed on the Board. What do we expect of a director?" That would be the first set of questions that we have for you and we hope that as, this is a formal request, Vanda's committee would like a response from you on this.

So, what are the qualities that are already on the Board, what are the potential gaps? And that leads to the issue that the Nominating Committee, well they begin their work on this coming Friday, but the person or people that they select will not take their seats until this time next year. And so, then it's a three year term for the directors. So you're really looking at future issues. What are the

challenges that ICANN will be facing in two or three years' time? If we can do that futuristic sort of analysis, then those are the sorts of skill we're looking for I think. Not the ability to see into the future, but to address issues that will perhaps be there in two years.

And then what do we expect of the evolution of ICANN and the multi-stakeholder model? So what are the skill sets for an ICANN Director that we should be looking for, both in the recruitment stage, because you obviously have to find and look for candidates with those skills, and then to help in the selection of those candidates. And I think given that you are the ccNSO, then to focus on the directors as we require by the ATRT and also on the ccNSO positions, then that would be useful. With that I'll pass over to Vanda and Rob.

Vanda Scartezini: Thank you for having us today. And thank you for your input. Like Adam said, it's a formal input that we need from this constituency. It's not only personal thoughts, it's the formal one. And we need in the end of the period to cross relate it with what we select with the others, the things that you have in addressing. If it's fulfilling the requirements and so on. This is the mandate so it's a really formal one. So we need that formally before the starting of posting of the Expression of Interest. So we have this slot time till the end of November to get some feedback from you.

Another feedback that is quite relevant is the Expression of Interest. Which questions do we need to ask to really get the

correct answer to select correct people? So it's not only for the Board, especially for your community and others community that you can address that.

And one thing that I'm raising in other forum is about what is your opinion compared with my opinion that from the future, from the next review of NomCom, I do believe we don't need to select the people for constituents. I do believe that constituents has capacity to select the people for their own and not demand the services for NomCom. And NomCom could concentrate only in reduced costs and reduced work and concentrate on selecting independent people for the Board Members, just that.

So I'd like to have your thoughts about that too. If you do believe that it's a good idea to have NomCom select some members for your constituents or it's better to have yourself doing the process and selecting all members for your Board. So that is something that I'd like to have your opinions on that. Of course we cannot change these bylaws right now, but it's a process that needs to be built during some time so it needs to start. And your thoughts are quite important for that because if we get consensus on this back, we can go further and finalize this more quickly.

So that's the ideas. And so the questions we need is even for better selection of the persons for, specifically questions for your constituency, specifically question you want to or don't want to see made for selecting people for the Board. So those thoughts are quite important and need to be addressed in this slot of time. Sorry to be, because changes so much the process during this year, so we

are jumping on that in the last minute. So next year with Rob is starting right now and take the chair in the next year, but following the process things now would be certainly more easily to insurrect during the year with that. Thank you. That's my points. Rob.

Rob Hall: Thank you. I want to follow on to what both Adam and Vanda have said, with one other or two other points. It's important for you to tell us what you do want. It's also important for you to tell us what you don't want, because that's often easier. So I'll give you the example. Keep in mind that yes, we appoint to the Board, the GNSO and the ALAC, we also appoint someone to the ccNSO Council. So we would very much like to hear from you on what criteria you want for them, in fact what questions you might want us to ask because this year for the first time, Vanda is going to put a different questionnaire to each specific position.

So we have the opportunity to say "Hey if you're applying for the ccNSO position, these are the questions that we want to know". SO both the questions and what you think the right answers are to them of course, or what you think are the answers the candidates should have. So it's important to ask "What do you want in a candidate" and "What don't you want in a candidate", but please also keep in mind, we have to pick the ccNSO.

And for example, the GNSO, one of the parties, one of the Houses said "We don't want anyone from within our House. We want someone that's more independent. We don't want anyone from the

other side of the House either, so pick someone who kind of has some of the issue knowledge but it's more important that even if they don't know any of the issues, it's more important that they be able to decide on evidence. But please don't pick someone that could have gotten there and not been elected by us. So don't pick the loser in an election and put them there."

That's not our job, our job was to be more independent they felt. So we're looking for that type of address for you as well. And to give you an idea of the timeline, we start taking applications in December. Vanda's NomCom meets for the first time on Friday, it's not officially incorporated until after the AGM. So Friday afternoon we start. That's the sounding of the gun. We start taking applications in December and end in April. So we will need this advice before December. Thank you.

Lesley Cowley: Okay, so if I think I've listened to you properly there's three questions. There are skills and qualities required and potentially questions for ccNSO Council members that come through the NomCom route.   There are skills and qualities for ICANN Board members from a ccNSO perspective. And there's also, I think I heard you suggesting that maybe we might review or suggest improvements to the NomCom process for ccNSO Council members?

Rob Hall:	The improvement suggestion is outside of our purview. SO there is a separate process going on that you should be commenting on, on whether the NomCom should be appointing yours or not. That is not within the purview of this NomCom by any means. We're very strictly narrowed to appointing the candidates, recruiting and finding and appointing the candidates, so we need your help with recruiting as well, but we'll talk about that a little later in session. But no we are not tasked with that.
	I think that was more of an opinion of to try to get you involved in changing the NomCom if you believe that we shouldn't be appointing ccNSO, because we've heard a lot about that from other constituencies.
Lesley Cowley:	So just so we're clear Rob, where would suggestions on that issue go?
Rob Hall:	Not to us, sorry. I believe ICANNs got separate independent processes running a review of the NomCom in two years. I don't think that's on the table for now.
Adam Peake:	If I could….I will give you an example, I'm the outgoing chair and I think from the public microphone from my experience as the chair this year, but also from things that I've been hearing from different constituencies, I think that the Nominating Committee is

very important for the Board of Directors. I'm beginning to feel that the ccNSO may not need the Nominating Committee to appoint for you. I'm pretty sure that the GNSO has changed substantively enough that perhaps we don't need to appoint for them anymore. And the ALAC is maturing; they have regional models that are doing a good job.

So the question is, is my opinion – I'm interested to know, and perhaps it would be a discussion that would be useful for you, is this a valid opinion of am I completely wrong? I have been wrong before, often. But I think this is a good discussion for us to have because we're talking about the evolution of ICANN and our various models within it. It's not necessarily, and in fact it has nothing to do with the ATRT. It just happens to be a subject that has come up as we've discussed this model of recommendations and so on.

But the formal part is we do need your advice on the skill sets of directors. That is the formal request.

Lesley Cowley: Thank you for that clarification. Okay, so we're being asked for our input, comments and views on characteristics. Anyone have some thoughts, Roelof?   He's sitting at the back on purpose Gabby. We've talked so much its run out of batteries? Is there a spare mic?

[background conversation]

Rob Hall:

Adam will be posting to the list, to you tomorrow at the sessions rather, the criteria that's been suggested for the Board by everybody that we've talked to and they're very high level. So I think that would be a good starting point. We'd be looking for you to add any that you think are missing. For instance, for the non-commercial set we were missing human rights from there, whether people had human rights experience as a possible criteria that they wanted added. So yes, we'd be looking to your community to add some.

I agree, in this short time it's probably not practical for you to feed back to us specifics, but by all means the communication, this is just the start of it. We're reachable. We'd love to hear from you officially or even individually as to what you want. You also have a representative on the committee, although we need more formal than that, we could also do it informally through your representative on the committee. But I hate to say that the committee is made up mostly of non-country-code participants and when we pick a cc it's often a black hole.

So we're picking someone for yours that we think is great, but the more important you can give us the better decision we can make. The other very important point is please send us candidates. Because we only can pick the best from what we have that apply. If no one applies are hands are tied and we can't pick – so far

every Nominating Committee I've been on has I believed picked the best from what they had. Often I think I wish they had better candidates to pick from, and that's not a slight on any individual, it's just the broader the pool we have…

So I would look to your group specifically to say whoever you can nominate and get into there that you say this is the type of person we want. It gives a much better chance of getting somebody you'll be happy with.

[background conversation]

Rob Hall: The nominations will be open from December to April, so you've got a lot of time for finding candidates. It's what questions you want us to ask of them that we need before December.

Adam Peake: Yes, so the sort of timeline that we're looking at, and I think the first thing is yes, we will send you a list of attributes of directors, potential attributes of directors, we'll do that in emails so that you have something to work with. But also, it will be distributed at a round table meeting we're holding tomorrow morning at 9:00 in, I think it was room B5, B6. We'd very much like, I think you unfortunately have your meeting with either the GAC or the Board at the same time, so it's not a good time for you guys.

We will make sure that the attributes that we have so far are distributed to you. You can rate them. You can decide however you wish to deal with those and please add any that you feel are missing. That's of course important. Ongoing from here, Vanda's committee starts its work on Friday, so that is the time when [Jean] will be there and if you have thoughts over the coming days then please pass them to her. They can be just informal thoughts. Everybody has ideas about these things.

Candidate recruitment – just to reinforce that. I'm sure as you look at the Board when it sits up on this sort of dais thing here, you would think I know someone, or at least I hope you would think I know someone who could be sitting up there and doing a better job. If you really do think that try and get them into the candidate pool that Rob and Vanda and their team are going to be selecting from. If you know someone who should be sitting up here on Thursday, Friday, when the Board is meeting, the way to do it is to try and get them into the candidate pool so that they can – well, recruit them and select them. That's really the challenge the NomCom has.

Lesley Cowley: Okay, thank you very much. We understand the question. I think that there is an interest in this issue, even at this time of night. But as you can see, some people have had to leave for other events so I think we can commit to doing some work either as a Council or as a ccNSO in terms of our mailing lists. And we'll get you some feedback for December. And hopefully we'll be able to get you

some candidates to. Any questions or comments, other questions of comments from the floor please? No, in which case, thank you very much Vanda, Adam and Rob.

And we close our meeting for today, but thank you. Alright, a long day. We're in the GAC tomorrow morning as you say, so I (inaudible) need to miss your meeting. And I look forward to seeing many of you at the dinner this evening. Thank you.

[End of Transcript]