

Chris Disspain:

Good morning all, we'll be starting in a couple of minute's time. Good morning ladies and gentlemen, if you could please take your seats. We're going to get started; we have an extremely busy morning, but what's new there? Welcome to the ccNSO meeting in Cartagena. We have, as I said, a busy day. We'll also have dinner tonight. The first session this morning is a planning session including the SOP and Finance Working Group, and that session is going to be chaired by Byron, so Byron, over to you.

Byron Holland:

Well, nothing says Tuesday morning like strategy; Tuesday morning, 9 a.m., strategy? We're actually going to break this up into a couple of sections. One is really an update on the SOP, the Strategic and Operational Planning Working Group, and just a report on where we are at, at this point. We also have the ICANN finance folks, both the outgoing and the incoming here, to walk us through the operating plan, the coming operating plan, and to give us a sense of the timelines and what's happening there. And then the third component will be an update on the newly established Finance Working Group, because there's definitely some interplay between the SOP and the Finance Working Group.

So those are the three broad sections; it will really, to a great degree, be reporting as opposed to some of the more interactive sessions we've done in the past. I'd also like to – I think it's a good start that unlike a number that I've been to, that we've all been to, I think we finally have the exact right sized room. Not too small, not too big, no pillars in the middle, I think the temperature's going to be good, so in the spirit of continuous improvement, I think

we've found it. (applause) We'll just keep coming back to Cartagena, yeah. The Goldilocks room, exactly.

Well, in terms of the SOP, it has actually been a challenging recent few months, as most of you are probably aware; in Cartagena the Board was supposed to be voting on the updated strategic plan, as you know, or as you're probably aware, it is materially delayed. Now, given the SOPs work plan, it was critical for us to get the draft plan back in late September as promised. That did not happen. In spite of some communication with senior ICANN staff who are responsible for the strategy part, which I might point out are not the folks who are here with us this morning, that part is not their fault.

In the end, the SOP had a conference call in the third week of November, to have some discussion on a proposed draft, but fundamentally the draft for the upcoming strategic plan was not delivered to the community until November 27. Clearly that was well, well outside of the original timeline, at which point really it was too late for the SOP to do the work that it envisions, which is to digest the draft, work on what the SOP believes are the key elements of the strategic plan that are relevant to the cc community, and then essentially take those and try to draft up a simplified version relevant to the cc community with some of the key points, and some key suggestions on what the community might like to focus on.

Needless to say, we are not in a position to do that, given that we did not receive it until November 27. I did personally send a note to Rod and Mike Silver, our Board member, noting that we would be unable to, as a Working Group, do what we intended to do. I don't know if it's coincidence or not, but within a few days of that note, and I'm sure I wasn't the only person making note of this, they extended the comment period to January 10. So the good news is we do have an opportunity, as a Working Group, to actually do what we'd intended. The bad news is, of course, it is a very compressed time frame, nonetheless; just over a month, running through for many of us, the Christmas period.

I don't know about the rest of you, but certainly in Canada where I come from, things work at about half speed for at least two weeks. So it's not an ideal time. That said, the Working Group met on Sunday afternoon, we mapped out a work plan over the course of the next month, in terms of breaking it up into digestible chunks for the Working Group, and we will endeavor to put out materials for the community to help you make comment on the strategic plan.

Now, I would hope that everybody could do that; as we've said before, please feel free to make liberal use of any of the materials that the Working Group puts in. That includes wholesale cut and paste, with your name at the bottom. We encourage that, if that makes it easier for you; that's certainly part of what we are trying to do, or any part thereof. Basically the Working Group is taking the plan that's just come out; we'll be digesting it over the next

couple of weeks, in about three and a half to four weeks we should have something to push out to the community.

Unfortunately, I'll say right now, that doesn't leave a lot of time for you as community members to take and absorb that and do your own thing with it and then put it into the comment period, I just want to make sure you're well aware that's what will be happening, and of course it will come right around, just after the New Year. So expect that to be in your inboxes at that time. From that, you can make your own comment, but I just remind you January 10th is the current close of comments for this. One of the other things that came out of this situation is the SOP is going to draft a letter that will be sent directly to ICANN, or to Rod and the Board, stating the facts as we see them, in terms of the breakdown and failure of the process.

You know, ironically one of the key items in the strategic plan is accountability, and fundamentally preventing the community from providing input into something as absolutely critical as the strategic plan, or otherwise, the direction of ICANN, certainly I don't think is living up to if not the letter, certainly the spirit of accountability. So we will be actually sending a formal letter highlighting our thoughts on the process to date, in a factual way, but needless to say, it won't be necessarily a complimentary way.

We've worked on that in the Working Group session on Sunday, and we will be putting that out to the community, but we will also be sending it as a Working Group letter; again, feel free to use this

as you see fit. If you think it's appropriate to take some part, either that or all of it, and you're also welcome to add your voice to this. So that's what's happening in the strategic operating planning Working Group. Needless to say, we'd hope to be able to report something a little more positive to you this time, but that is the situation we find ourselves in.

Before I turn it over to Kevin and Juan to walk us through the operating plan, which is completely separate and distinct, are there any questions or comments about where the SOP finds itself at this point? Or just in general, around this situation? Going once, twice, no comments? Okay, I'm going to pass it over now to Juan and Kevin. I will let Juan introduce himself, but he is the incoming controller to ICANN, and he is going to walk us through the timing and the operating planning process going forward.

Juan Ojeda:

Thank you Bryon, and thank you members of the ccNSO. Good morning everyone, thank you again for inviting us to your meeting. I'll be taking a few minutes just to brief you on where we are with the budget development process, some of the enhancements that ICANN is making, in the spirit of honoring its commitment to SOs and ACs leadership to provide earlier and more active participation in the budget development process from all of the SOs and ACs. [different language]

So as I had previously mentioned, based on community feedback, ICANN is making some enhancements to its budget development process again, to achieve a few things. First of all, to allow for

more active participation from SOs and ACs leadership. Some of the things we're trying to accomplish here is we want to clarify for you the budget development process, generally speaking, but specifically how SOs and ACs leadership can provide specific input to its development.

We want to clarify the current level of basic support services that ICANN is providing to the SOs and ACs, to ensure that we're giving you the tools and resources you need to accomplish your jobs. We also want to clarify the budget timeline. There have been some enhancements to it. We're starting a little bit earlier in the process, so we'll be going through that. And lastly discuss all of your thoughts or any questions you might have, so that we can come back with a well thought out and agreed upon process. Any questions?

So some of the major enhancements we've made to the budget time line, is that whereas before the strategic plan and the budget development process were two distinct six month processes, where the completion of the strategic plan was a pre-requisite before we began the budget development process, we are now tying in these phases to the ICANN meeting. So for example, the strategic plan was targeted for completion at the first ICANN meeting of the fiscal year, which is the Cartagena meeting, and we've done so. The strategic plan has been posted for public comments at this point.

The plan now is for the budget development process, the framework process, if you will, the target completion date for that is tied into the San Francisco meeting in March, and the draft budget to be approved by the Board is targeted for completion, or to be approved by the Board, in the June meeting in Asia. Whereas before, SOs and ACs comments could only be accepting during the framework public comment period, now we are expanding the timeline again, based on community feedback, so that we can begin accepting input on support levels earlier, before the framework has been posted.

Some of the comments that I've heard is that by the time the framework was posted, the budget plan was pretty much half-baked, and there wasn't enough time for SOs and ACs input into its development. So in our efforts to honor that commitment, we're starting this much earlier. So this is a graphic representation of what our new strategic plan and budget development are looking like. So for example, this yellow arrow which represents the strategic plan, as you can tell is being targeted for completion at this meeting, the Cartagena meeting.

The green arrow – I don't know how well the arrows show up on there, the green arrow, representing the development of the framework, as you can see now, the process begins prior to the completion of the strategic plan. This was not the case in previous years and again, this is in line with our commitment for earlier participation, expanding the time line for any input on support

levels. And the framework, again, is tied into the completion at the San Francisco meeting in March.

Lastly, the adopted budget, which is indicated with the red arrow, that will begin towards the tail end of the framework development phase, and tied into approval for the June/Asia meeting. These starbursts here, for lack of a better word, these represent at which point each of the phases posted for public comment, so right now for example, the strategic plan is available on the website for public comment. The target date for the framework to be posted will be in February. The adopted budget for the bylaws will be posted on our website by May 17; again for a final period of public comment. Any questions on that?

So now we'll briefly just go over the chain of events that will be taking place; so right now we're on the first bar. We're finalizing basic support services, and finalizing the processes for the budget development phase going forward. The next phase will be a period where SOs and ACs submission requests will be submitted, which we'll be going over briefly. There will be a point in time when submission requests will be received by SOs and ACs leadership, and they will be summarized.

Once that's completed, then the framework will be posted for public comment, which will include the submissions received from SOs and ACs leadership. Then based on public comments received on the framework, we'll develop the draft plan, the draft operating plan and post that for public comments as well. And then finally,

the final operations plan and the budget will be submitted to the Board in our June meeting for final adoption.

What we've listed here is a basic set of tools and resources that ICANN is currently providing to the ccNSO. Some of these services include, for example, secretariat support, subject matter expertise, both from staff and/or independent consultants; technical support for the Wiki and the website management, tele-conference for all the meetings, as well as legal and financing support. Again, this is a basic set of tools that ICANN will be providing on a year to year basis, so these items don't necessarily require any specific submission requests. Now, in regards to specific services, we also provide travel services for ICANN meetings; the top number represents the total fiscal year budget.

These amounts are for the entire period, so if you're trying to break it out by meetings, we just obviously need to divide it by three to get an accurate number on a per meeting basis.

So now, what does the ccNSO – the SOs and ACs leadership, what do they do if they want a specific request above and beyond these basic set of tools and services? Budget requests, and in the next slide we'll show the template, but these budget requests will be received by ICANN through SOs and ACs leadership only, just for quality control purposes. The submissions will be sent via template form, emailed to controller@ICANN.org, again just to ensure that submissions are being submitted properly. At that point, ICANN will take the SOs and ACs submissions, and perform a cost

estimate for if it's a staff, it's independent consulting, it's telecommunications and what have you.

This will be a little bit more clear when we go to the next slide and go over the actual template form. Once all of the submissions provided by SOs and ACs leadership have been cost estimated, they will be included in the framework, which will then be posted for public comment, sometime around February of 2011. One other point that I want to make, I know that sometimes we don't have full information by the time that we have to submit these templates for inclusion into the framework, so there will be a mechanism in place to continue receiving these special budget request submissions, through the final period of public comment. That will work slightly different, but as much as possible, it would be best if we receive these during the initial phase of submission. Any questions so far?

So this is a request template for specific services that the SOs and ACs leadership would like to see included in their budget. Fill out as much information as possible, provide as much detail on it, but the main area that finance will be working on, that ICANN will be focusing on initially, is what type of level by support area does the SOs and ACs need? How much of that support, technical support, telecom support, and what have you, the frequency of it, how many units, the headcount they anticipate they will be needing.

Once these are received by finance, we'll go ahead and go through the process of cost estimating this, based on current information

that we have. These will be included in the framework posted for public comment. So now to clarify the budget process time line, check marks indicate steps that have already been completed, so we've already had our community kickoff calls this past month. Now in the month of December, here in the Cartagena meeting, we're performing the community discussions where we hope to get some good feedback to make sure that we're all in agreement on the process, and that there's clarity, more than anything.

After the Cartagena meeting, we'll begin the process, or the period I guess, of budget submissions from these requests. This period will go through the end of January; this is to give us ample time to cost estimate these submissions, and include them in the framework which will be posted in February. That framework will be posted for public comment from the period of February through March, up to the March meeting in San Francisco, at which point I will begin discussions on the framework and discussing all the comments received from the community.

After that point, we'll begin the process of developing the draft budget, which again, by the bylaws, needs to be posted for public comment by the 17th of May. Opening it up again for one final round of public comment and submission to the Board and their adoption by the June meeting in Asia. That concludes our presentation; at this point I'll open it up to the members. If you have any questions, comments, or need more clarity on the process, we're here.

Byron Holland: We have these guys here for another 10 to 15 minutes, any questions?

Male: Sorry to ask, I just wonder what kind of benefit we will get from this information?

Juan Ojeda: The feedback that we've gotten from the community before is that SOs and ACs leadership felt that they didn't have enough input into the budget development, not enough and not early enough. Whereas in the past, the input from SOs and ACs would not begin until the framework was posted for public comment in February, the community felt that was not enough time. So in the spirit of honoring that request, we're opening it up for earlier participation. So at the conclusion of this meeting, if SOs and ACs feel that there's a specific request that they'll really like to see included in the fiscal year 12 budget, we're starting practically two months earlier in the process, with the hopes of being able to include as many of these requests as possible, given the resources.

Byron Holland: Did that answer your question?

Male: I mean as participated, what is going to get the benefit from this? What kind of benefit I'm going to get?

Byron Holland: So fundamentally, what's in it for you, and how is this going to benefit you? Or us, as individual members?

Kevin Wilson:

Why don't I take it? I'm Kevin Wilson, I'm the outgoing CFO. Thank you for the question. I think the short answer is the operating plan and budget process, development process is a really important process for the community because it's really where the prioritization of the resources comes in. So we've made great strides, really since the beginning of ICANN of getting that more and more open, more and more a community based budget; not a staff based budget, not a Board based budget, not a special interest group budget.

But the resources are allocated in the best priority in order for you, in this case the ccNSO, to get your work done. So as Byron started out the meeting by saying the room is now the right temperature, the right size, and some of the problems you've had in the past have been resolved; that's a good sign. Likewise, we want to make sure the budget and operating plan development process is a fair one, allows enough input so that the priorities are set straight.

So those who are not interested in setting the priorities it probably wouldn't be that helpful of a discussion, but we wanted to be open and transparent, and asked to do this outreach in order to explain that to those who might want to be able to set the priorities of the budget resources. Hopefully your question is answered. Is it?

Byron Holland:

I'm going to ask if you can just offer some good thoughts; fundamentally what's happened is you've introduced a new component. It's a three silo component, you talked about the framework part and then the actual budget component; two

opportunities for feedback, one on the framework, one on the budget itself. The introduction of the framework piece is somewhat novel. Could you maybe give us a little bit more comment on what you see as the distinction?

And what are you trying to get out of the framework versus comment on the budget? As a community, one way to look at it is we used to only have to digest two pieces and provide feedback on two pieces, and now we have to do it a third time, in theory.

Kevin Wilson:

Thank you, Byron. I think the third element, which is actually providing input to the development of the framework, whereas in the past public comment, sort of SOs and ACs comments happened once the framework was completed. I think that's one major distinction; the fact that SOs and ACs now have an opportunity to have a more active input into the development of the framework prior to it being posted for public comments. The critical element of the public comment period for the framework is that us in finance, we'd love to be able to say yes to everything; but being an accountant, being in finance, it's in my DNA, to try and contain cost as much as possible.

Byron Holland:

Just say no?

Kevin Wilson:

Exactly. As opposed to Nike, Just Do It. Yes, exactly. So what's going to be important, a real value added part of the framework public comment period is that that's going to be one major

mechanism tool for the prioritization of all the requests received from SOs and ACs leadership.

So those two pieces together are really a major component of how and when the SOs and ACs can really take an active role in the development of the budget; both in the inclusion of any special requests in the framework, as well as generating as much positive public comments for those special requests as possible during the public comment period of the framework. We'll take all those in hand and be able to make better prioritization of all the requests.

Byron Holland:

Thanks. One thing I might also make note of that came out in the SOP Working Group meetings on Sunday, one of the members raised the fact that “well, what if we're not interested in adding things, but we think we need to reduce expenses and take away things potentially?” which as Juan said it was probably the first time he had ever encountered that notion, and there wasn't even a form to address that.

But I would like to just make that comment, that in the framework piece, there is also opportunity to talk about maybe what we shouldn't have, or what we don't need, or what is in terms of value for money, something that is no longer required or not required. I think there's a question over there?

Lise Fuhr:

Yes, I'm Lise Fuhr from Denmark, .dk. For me, it's very nice to have another opportunity to comment, but I'd also like to have the reasons why you choose to follow some of the comments, and why

you choose not to. What I often see is that ICANN gets a lot of comments, but we don't know why you don't take them into account.

Kevin Wilson:

I think that's a clear commitment on all policy, but certainly in the last few years of the operating plan and budget, to actually describe what each comment, and part of the public comment process is a synthesis of the public comments, and identify it. We normally don't reply to each email submittal and say specific to each one, but in the summary analysis we do provide that analysis.

The other thing to address, which is a big change too, is the process of that prioritization, which is essentially what Byron mentioned earlier, of having the removal of budget items. That happens; in a typical budget cycle, our \$59 million this past year of operating expenses, when the first submittal came in, it was over \$75 million. So you can imagine – there is a definite process that goes from \$75 million to the budget which was adopted at \$59 million.

So it's a very painful process of cutting back, and every organization in the room I'm sure has gone through similar situations in your own organizations or your own household, for that matter. So the part that we're trying to change, and this is the evolution of the ICANN operating plan and budget process, is to get that reduction process open and transparent, and I like the idea of having the community actually own the production process.

As the outgoing CFO, I'm going to encourage that as the next evolution. I think the first step is to address what you just mentioned, that having an actual document where everybody in the community can see which items that were requested were not in the operating plan and budget, I think that's a powerful addition to the process.

Byron Holland:

Great, thank you. I think there is a significant attempt to make it much more transparent, where the comments and inputs go, and I think everybody here on average has felt or made that comment. We're encouraged to see that. Any other questions for these guys in the last couple of minutes that we have them? I think the notion of having a three part cycle as opposed to a two part cycle, while potentially increasing the level of effort from the community, is actually a step forward.

For those who want to participate, there is definitely more opportunity to shape the process. Now, of course that means you've got to participate in order to do that, so I would strongly encourage that. We have the opportunity; please make your presence felt. Lesley?

Lesley Cowley:

Thanks Byron, Lesley Cowley from .uk. I'd just like to quickly say thank you very much to Kevin, as the outgoing CFO, for the work that he's put in with the SOP group. It's been very much appreciated, and he's going to be a hard act to follow. I'm sorry that another senior member of staff is leaving ICANN.

Byron Holland: I would absolutely echo that; having worked with Kevin since the dawn of the SOP, even in just the roughly two years that's been ongoing, we've seen a significant change in the quality level of reporting feedback, commitment to financers, etc. So certainly on behalf of the SOP and myself, I would echo everything that Lesley said, and good luck to you. You have decent sized shoes to fill.

Juan Ojeda: That's what I hear, thank you so much.

Kevin Wilson: Thanks very much, guys.

Byron Holland: So part three of the agenda is a report on what is happening in the newly established Finance Working Group. So this should be relatively brief, and if there are any questions or comments, please speak up. So the Finance Working Group had its first meeting this past Sunday. It's a good sized Working Group and I'll put up the members of the Working Group in a moment, but first I just wanted to remind folks that might have seen this at some point in their inboxes the actual purpose of this Working Group. Fundamentally, if I can paraphrase, here's the actual purpose, but to paraphrase, it's to have the discussion about financial contributions from cc members to ICANN.

In the most plain language, that is fundamentally what it's about, and to coordinate and facilitate cc manager participation in that dialogue and in that process. Also I think important to note is that the Working Group, as part of its activities may submit comment on behalf of the Working Group itself. So it's another important

element of it. I'm sure, as you can imagine, this has the potential to be an interesting discussion, but I would certainly like it to go forward as much as possible, in a rational, reasonable way.

We're starting fundamentally with the notion that no potential models are off the table. We'll look at a wide range of models in trying to get to a conclusion here. I will also just put up the Working Group members here. I'm not a Mac person, so we'll see if it's true that any five year old can operate a Mac, because they do everything a little bit differently. Alt Tab is not the answer here. These are the members of the Working Group; I think it's important to note that it's a good sized Working Group, so we should be able to get a lot of good input, different points of view.

We have different sized cc's, certainly different regions represented, and I'm sure different points of view even in just the first meeting. There was good discussion, good feedback and inputs; I'm certainly very encouraged by that. So these are the members of the Working Group, so if you're close to one and you want to make your thoughts known, I'm sure they'd be happy to hear from you. As it was the very first meeting of the Working Group, we're trying to get coordinated, get organized, get ready to go.

One of the things we noted is that there has been a fair amount of work done in the past at different points along the way, in trying to wrestle with this issue. As most of you know, there is a current methodology, suggested methodology for how cc's contribute into

the ICANN budget. It is relatively – loosely interpreted, I would suggest, just by looking at the numbers associated with it, but there is, in fact, a methodology. So part of what we'll be looking at is how did we get there, what did the previous discussions had gone forward, what came out of those discussions or reports or previous Working Groups, and looking at that history, former surveys, possible different models.

So we'll take sort of a historical perspective to make sure that we understand what's gone on before us, and not try to necessarily reinvent the wheel, but take anything good that has come before us. So that is the first order of business. In terms of setting the expectation, my expectation and I think probably most of the Working Group's expectation is that this is not a conversation that will be resolved in weeks or months; it may in fact expand over a season or two. Perhaps not unlike the DRD, which I think has done a good job with a potentially contentious subject; but it has taken some time.

I think the goal here is to find the right solution, not the first to market solution. And also a review of the current financials, and the way the financials are reported; many of you hopefully, if we've done our job in the SOP, will be familiar with the expense area grouping report, which just looks from an ICANN perspective on how expenses are allocated. Of course they do that also by community, so there is a whole set of financial reports around what ICANN believes are the costs allocated to this community. So we'll also be reviewing that.

There will be material interplay between the SOP and the Finance Working Group. In fact, I'm quite sure that will be the case, as having been the Chair of the SOP, I know for a fact that over the past two years many times people tried to put other elements into the SOP hopper, because it seemed like the most relevant group for a particular issue, and certainly this was one of those issues. While it was definitely not the SOP's business per se, it's clearly very related.

As such, just administratively, one of the things that has happened is that I stepped down as the Chair of the SOP, as of the Cartagena meeting, and was put forward for election to be the Chair of the Finance Working Group. So that, within the Working Group, has happened, but that will need to be adopted by the Council itself. Hence the notion that I'm the pending Chair. Pending Chair, I think it's a new role, a new title, yes.

Anyway, the notion there is that there will be good dialogue and communication between the two Working Groups, because clearly they are different but there will be a lot of overlap and related discussion and activity. In terms of the SOP, Roelof has stepped forward and volunteered, or maybe the word is 'voluntold' (laughter) – no, I'm sure he volunteered of his own free will. Probably most of you, just by the laughter, understand what that means, to be voluntold in this community, yes? Anyway, Roelof is going to be stepping in to be the Chair of the SOP, and as part of

the agreement between the two Working Groups, each of the Chairs will sit ex-officio in the other Working Group.

So we'll make sure we have those good line of communication and dialogue between those two groups. So that's what the Finance Working Group has been up to. I think the short story there is we're just getting going. First will be to review what has come before us, to make sure we can learn and take all the good that has happened there, and to also make sure that we're well represented regionally, size wise, sophistication, a good cross section of the entire community. I'm sure everybody has a point of view on this particular topic, and there will certainly, as we move forward, be opportunity for everybody to make their views known. Are there any comments or questions at this point? Just the best of luck to the Working Group on sorting this issue out?

Okay, then I think that brings us to the close of my part of this a few minutes early, which is definitely how I like to run a meeting, a few minutes early. At this point, just making sure no questions, comments? I will pass it over to Chris.

Chris Disspain:

Thank you, and Byron thank you really hugely for the work you've done on the SOP. I know you aren't going anywhere, shifting across to finance, so to speak, but it's been a great Working Group and continues to be, so thank you for that. And Roelof, thank you for being prepared to participate. And we're moving on to our next session, unless I'm – alright, somewhat bizarrely, on my agenda, the next session, which is the session with the Board, has

actually not been printed out. I don't know if there's any meaning in that or not. So our next session is with Michael and Rod and Peter, and I guess some other Board members will be wandering in. Michael, did I see you come in to the room? Sneaking in quietly? Do you want to come and join me up here, so I don't feel too lonely? We are running, amazingly, slightly early, so we've got – yes, go ahead, Byron.

Byron Holland:

I am remiss, as Chris said, in just sort of moving across the hall from one Working Group to another, to personally thank all the members of the Working Group, the SOP Working Group. That was a brand new Working Group, much like the finance one, it started with a purpose, but really was a green field endeavor, and I just want to thank all the folks on that Working Group. There were quite a number who did a lot of heavy lifting, and often did it in a fairly tight timeline, as you can see by the process, we often had to do a lot of work with a lot of people – needless to say, as any Working Group around the world, in short periods of time. I think we produced some good work that's been helpful to the community. At least that's the feedback I've received, so for the SOP Working Group, over the past two years, thank you very much.

Chris Disspain:

Well done guys. Thank you. Michael, you wanted to say something?

Mike Silber:

Yes, just a indication, and apologies for not having been a part of the session earlier, and that is just so there is no confusion, this is

not an SOP. The draft which has been approved by the Board, and then submitted to the SOs and ACs – sorry, the Strat Plan for consideration. The entire organization is going through this edifice brush at the same time, and I think possibly because of the pressures of some of the work around other projects, it's all happening simultaneously.

Chris Disspain:

We may end up – well, it's on the list, so should we wait until we - - ? Okay, just so everybody knows, while we are waiting for Peter and Rod, as you all know, we sent out a call for questions for this session. I have a list here of the things that people have asked. What I'm going to do is actually ask you to ask; because it's tough to be sitting here trying to interpret what it is that you actually want to ask. So they go – they seem to go pretty much by kind of topic. I've got a couple of things here about staffing. I think that's you, Lesley?

Who asked about the IGF renewal? Was that you, Paulos? Okay, cool. The strat-plan process I guess was Byron? Geographic names is Annabeth, and you actually want to read that statement out, which is fine. Is that what you want to do? Yep, okay. And Keith, I know you wanted to ask about the ITU plenipot so those are the ones that we know about. If we have time, then we're very happy – we'll take ad hoc questions.

Peter, welcome, please come and join us. We'll take ad hoc questions; and I also think it would be – and I'm going to start just by briefly reporting to ICANN about some of the stuff that we're

doing. Specifically just what we've been talking about, because I think that's fairly important. I was going to say you'll doubtless be telling me that we have to wait for Rod before we get any answers. Well, maybe while we're waiting, I can just briefly start with giving you guys a quick update. I notice there are some other Board members here as well, so welcome and thank you very much for coming.

I suppose the key thing I wanted to update you on is we now have moved – taken a significant step in what is euphemistically referred to as a contributions debate – and we have now set up our Finance Working Group. That Working Group is tasked with a number of things, not just contributions, but one of its jobs is to work on methodologies and so on. So we are making slow but steady progress on that front.

Did anyone, Byron, did you want to say anything specifically about the – I guess there's going to be a need at some point for that Working Group to start talking to the Board? Can you, Gabby, can you give Byron the microphone?

Byron Holland:

So I guess this is just a quick update for the Board members in particular. We have just established a Finance Working Group, the first meeting was on Sunday, and it was really an organization and coordination meeting, and its fundamental purpose is to discuss and deal with the cc contribution issue into ICANN. The first order of business will be to take a look at some of the work that's gone before us. There have been a number of work team groups

and activities over the years, and then also an examination of potential models we could look at in terms of various funding models.

Currently, there is a tiered or strata based methodology in place, which is followed to some degree. It would be but one of the potential models out there. We have good representation from every region. It's a decent sized committee, so there are folks from large, medium, small cc's. Different types of operators from every region, so I think we'll have good cross-representation, good input, and no doubt many different points of view. So we're just getting going; Sunday was the first meeting, but we are off and running on what will no doubt be an interesting discussion.

Chris Disspain:

Trotting would be a better – slowly cantering. Yes, of course.

Peter Dengate Thrush:

Thanks Chris, thanks Byron. I think that's very good news, so thank you for the work that's gone on getting you to that stage. The reason why that's good news is the point that I've made previously; it's largely about politics and perception, which is really in this case, much more important in this case than the money, although a lot of people also think the money is important. The ccNSO, and the ccTLDs in general lose a lot of political influence and credibility in ICANN because of their approach to not appearing to financially support in a consistent and coherent way, so increasing that I think will make a big difference, so that's good news. Thanks.

Chris Disspain: Okay, so did you get an update – on his way, right. Before we start addressing questions, is there anything you wanted to mention? No? Kurt, do you have anything to say? Just came to watch the fireworks? (laughing)

Peter Dengate Thrush: I asked Kurt to attend because I only saw this morning, about an hour ago, the very detailed question about wording relating to Annabeth's question. I thought Kurt maybe – I also suggested that Amy, the lawyer – hi Annabeth – it's a good question. If we can answer it today we will, but I'm really in the hands of people who know those kind of stuff, down to the detail that you're wanting. If we can't get an answer today, I know that Kurt and Amy and the team will be happy to sit with you at some stage –

Chris Disspain: Well, should we take that now?

Peter Dengate Thrush: Take it offline.

Chris Disspain: Given that Kurt's going to handle it, should we take that now? Annabeth, do you want to start, and say what you want to say, and then we can get Kurt to respond and Peter and Mike if they want to? And then we can move on to the other ones when Rod's here.

Annabeth Lange: Sure. It's about the post delegation possibilities that was introduced in the dag 4. We were actually very satisfied with the wording, so at least in Norway it gave us support we needed to be able to perhaps support new gTLDs and geographical names. But there has been a changing in the words, and what's really

confusing is that your letter, Peter, to the GAC dated 23rd November, uses the wording of the dag 4, and the suggestion in the AG has changed that. That's actually from the 12th. So that's a little confusing. So in the dag, and in your letter, you're talking about that ICANN will comply with a legally binding decision from a court in the country, the relevant country, that has given the support.

In the AG, it says may implement, and it's quite natural that governments and also the cc will feel that that's weakening, and not the assurance that they were hoping to have. I think that that might be a problem for getting the support in quite a lot of countries, so if you want the geographical names to take off, I would suggest that you look into that once more, and I'm not sure whether it's intentional or it is just a mistake. Thank you.

Kurt Pritz:

So Annabeth, when you're mad at me, you stand and address me, so I feel much better that you're relaxed, just sitting and addressing me.

Chris Disspain:

It's just that she's surrounded by allies; that's all, Kurt.

Kurt Pritz:

That's right. We received the same question in the GAC, as you can imagine, so we had a chance to look into it. I can explain it, but we actually prepared a written response for Peter, so it would be better if I read it, because it will be more coherent. So the answer centers around differences between ICANN's commitment to government and ICANN's obligation to registry operators. So

in the guidebook, there's a section in the guidebook that talks about this obligation to follow the decisions of courts, and it is also mentioned in the registry agreement.

So this obligation really doesn't have anything to do with our relationship with gTLD registries, and we don't want to obligate ourselves in the agreement to gTLD registries, so in the agreement, it says "ICANN may follow the rule of courts" but it also says that in the guidebook. So we agree that the language in the guidebook should change, and that we will change the language to advise applicants that ICANN has committed to governments that it will implement court orders; so we don't want to make that obligation in our agreement with gTLDs registries, because it's not our agreement to registries, it's our agreement to governments.

So we're going to revise the language in the guidebook section and we're going to advise all applicants that ICANN will follow the court decisions. So it's that kind of parsing; I hope that was understandable.

Annabeth Lange:

Yes, it was. So it won't be really a contract or an agreement between governments and ICANN, so this is really a different situation? You have a contract with a gTLD registry, between ICANN and the registry, but there is not actually a contract between the government and ICANN? So to give that support, it's kind of giving away the government's serenity to a part, and I think they might feel a little bit uncertain about just a sentence in a sample letter, and that's how it is today. So if you could look into

that to give more assurance to the government, that it will be followed if they have a legally binding court order.

Kurt Pritz: Yes, so besides in the letter to governments, which is just a sample, we can also put that letter directly in the guidebook, and I'll try to get you a better explanation or a change of why we don't want to put it in the registry agreement for those reasons.

Annabeth Lange: Thank you.

Kurt Pritz: Yes.

Chris Disspain: Annabeth, while you've got the microphone, or just had it, did you want to say anything about geographics, generally? Where we stand in whatever it's called? The fag, or the –

Annabeth Lange: My concern now with geographic names is actually what happens with the country and territory names in ASCII after (inaudible 1:12:34). Because it's obvious, and we come back to that with the IDN and ccTLD PDP Working Group, and they have decided that it has to be at least one none Latin character to be an IDN, and that leaves all the ASCII country and territory names that for the moment have been taken out in the first round. So we have to work, in my opinion, we have to work further to find a solution to that. What do we do with those? Do we need them? Should we serve them? Should we treat them as a special category? Should we take them back again into the gTLD under the same conditions

as it is for other geographic names today? So the work's not stopped.

Chris Disspain:

And I say this every time you say what you say, because just to be absolutely clear, this is not about the ccTLD community wanting to have more ccTLDs. This is about wanting to protect versions of names of countries. The concerns that we have include things like the fact that Holland, for example, Holland is not an official name, it doesn't appear on the list, but it is the name that is commonly used as part of the Netherlands.

Currently, because that name doesn't appear on the list, if I understand correctly, that name is subject to the objection process. If you then move to the objection process, the challenge – whilst it may not be a challenge for the government of the Netherlands, there are cultural and political challenges to the concept of governments objecting, one and/or, to cultural and political challenges to the concept of governments paying to object. So it's kind of like a rolling effect.

The objection process is problematic for a number of governments for all sorts of reasons; the payment process is problematic for a number of governments for all sorts of reasons. The naming situation is problematic; so it's all three of those things combined that cause us issues. That is at least part of it, isn't it, Annabeth?

Annabeth Lange:

Yes, it's part of it, and it's also to avoid any confusion. How it is today, espania could be an IDN TLD, but Norway would not.

Norwage would, it's a complete mess. So we have to find a solution for those questions here.

Chris Disspain: Rod, could you come and join us? The questions that we've been waiting for you are the ones that I know you've got statistical answers for.

Kurt Pritz: So Annabeth, we should talk offline. Translations are protected, so I want to understand exactly what the issues are, so we'll talk later. Also, we found Holland on a list of translations of The Netherlands, so we kind of put it aside. But it seems like since it's such an important case, we should do a separate study for that and define whether it's protected or not.

Peter Dengate Thrush: I'm just going to give a personal reaction to language like countries having cultural difficulties with taking part in the objection process. I'm going to need a lot more detail about that before I give that any weight. I'm going to need a lot of evidence as to why individual governments wanting to take part in a challenge process doesn't feel that it should pay the appropriate fees to be taking part in that. I've got a very different view about the GAC, as an institution, taking part; it's an organ of ICANN and it's acting in the matter of public interest, I could be very easily persuaded that that's a very proper use of ICANN funds to take care of the public interest.

But a particular government pursuing its particular interest in relation to its particular name, I'd need a lot of further information

before I was persuaded that was any different than a government taking part in any other commercial or quasi-commercial or quasi-judicial process, including appearing before the GATT or the WTO and any other process.

Chris Disspain:

So a couple of things arise from that. One, yes I agree with you, the GAC would be a separate issue. The problem with that is that in order for the GAC – what that would mean is that the GAC would have to reach an agreement amongst themselves to object to a particular name. The timing involved in the process, I suspect, wouldn't allow that to occur.

Peter Dengate Thrush:

I think that's appropriate. I don't think the GAC should take itself out, it's not a matter of GAC interest, in the particular case of Holland. No, I can see the GAC taking issue in some matter that raises a matter of general public interest. Getting involved in individual country's issues I think is inappropriate for the GAC, unless it raises some kind of generic issue for all of them. If, and you've taken the example of Holland, so let's use that.

If the Dutch government has a problem over Holland, then I think that's a matter for the Dutch government. I don't understand why – as I say, I would need a lot more information before I could see why it wouldn't just ordinarily be required to take that proceeding itself and pay its own fees.

Chris Disspain:

Okay, and I understand that view, and I can't give you evidentiary answers to it, but I can point to a couple of things that might be

worth considering or looking at. First of all, as you all know, things like United Nations membership, United Nations contributions, in fact, ITU – all that stuff to do with money in respect to governments is all voluntary. And sometimes it's paid and sometimes it's not, that's the first point.

The second point I would make is that if you go back – if I go back to some of the traveling I did in respect to IDNs, and trying to work through the process of how to get contributions from ccTLDs, and let's be clear; in most cases for IDNs at this stage, its governments. There was a blanket culturally in some areas, a simple straightforward blanket “we will not, cannot, won't do this”. I'm not saying necessarily that they're necessarily legally prohibited, I'm talking about the way they function. There is – whilst they were prepared to talk about making voluntary contributions, they were even prepared to talk about making percentage contributions; what they weren't prepared to do, as you know, was sign on the dotted line that they would pay.

Paying a fee is, I suggest, no different to them. I'm not suggesting – we can't resolve this now, I'm just raising it as an issue.

Peter Dengate Thrush:

I supported and persuaded the Board on that very issue, and we moved forward on IDN/ccTLDs because of that. I can draw a very clear distinction between not paying a fee or having a voluntary contribution for getting your own – if that's how you like it, that's how other people see them – IDN/ccTLD. I don't see that's the same class of issue as them wanting to take proceedings to stop

someone else from having theirs, or what they think of as theirs. I'm really to be persuaded about this, but I think I need a lot more information.

Chris Disspain: Okay, I think we can't take that much further.

Rod Beckstrom: If I can just suggest for some others for an amount of discussion between the ccNSO and the GAC, I think that's something that may be worthwhile. The one thing that I think would be very interesting in that regard is potentially the creation of a fund. Peter, I don't think you would object to this. If cc's and governments are willing to contribute to a fund where their colleagues are able to draw from that fund to fund objections; now that would be an interesting test of the process. Do you trust that your colleagues are not going to abuse money that you've put in to fund objections?

Chris Disspain: Okay, and I again I accept that. But I think I have to say, so that we don't get lost in a debate about money, there is a higher level of issue, which is the concept of objecting in the first place. I'm not here to push a government line, at all. But I understand that governments have issues with entering into an objection process. Governments that don't even – and there are a number – that don't even, for example, recognize ICANN as having any authority whatsoever, moral or otherwise, are being – basically being told that if they have a problem, this is how they have to deal with it.

Again, I'm not pushing a barrow here; I'm just making a point. It's challenging for a lot of them. And the issue may be solved; I'm specific here talking about country names, I'm not talking about .nazi, I'm just talking about country names. That is, I think, it would be easy enough to excise that from this game, and actually say "look, if it's a meaningful representation, I know there's an issue with that and you've taken it out, if it's a meaningful representation of the country, it's not the same process". The government of the country can simply – it's on the list, it can be done. But anyway, let's not pursue that any further at this point. Rod, thanks, well put.

We've got a series of – we basically settled on what we want to talk about on the list, it's not meant to be specific, it's just a list. But the first issues on turnover and staff were Lesley's comments, so if I could ask Lesley to deal with that, that would be great.

Lesley Cowley:

Thanks, Chris. Good morning, as you've been pre-warned, my question is about senior staff turnover. One can accept an incoming CEO would wish to make changes, that's quite normal. Obviously people will leave from time to time, or maybe even be fired; but the high turnover of senior staff at ICANN has been a concern to many in the community, and I'd like to ask what is the current retention rate for senior staff, say over the last 12 months? You know, how does that benchmark, if you wish to benchmark that with Nominet, we've got an 86% retention rate of senior staff over the last 12 months, and an average length of service of five and a half years.

Obviously there are huge benefits from that kind of continuity, so linked to that, what is the specific and what measures are you putting in place to ensure retention and motivation and engagement of staff generally, but particularly senior staff? To give you some time to think on that, for the Board members present, what is the Board's view on this issue? I assume it is one of the risk factors that as a Board, you would always be alive to. Thank you.

Rod Beckstrom:

Thank you, Lesley. Obviously, all personnel matters have legal issues involved and confidentiality issues involved, so we don't discuss individual cases, just to make that clear. I think that's not what you asked for, I just want to make that clear. Also, it makes some slicing of the data sensitive as well, in terms of how it's handled. What we do, as an organization, is track overall staff retention and turnover. I can tell you that the overall turnover in the calendar year of 2009 was below 6%, which is extremely low by global standards.

There are some organizations that are lower, but the benchmarking we do is against statistics such as the US Department of Labor collects statistics by industry sector, in the high tech sector the turnover rate is slightly over 30% on average, in the non-profit sector it tends to be around 25%, 20 to 25%, so the turnover in calendar 2009 – and I started in July of 2009, was extremely low. I think it was actually lower in the second half of the year under my leadership than it was in the first half. We can pull some of that information together. Looking at this year, this year isn't over yet

so we haven't done the full analysis, but roughly speaking – it certainly has increased because there's been both voluntary and involuntary terminations.

So still, far below the industry averages, but probably more like 15%, roughly speaking. In terms of the evolution of the management team, it's been very deliberate for the most part, and it's been done based on consensus decisions made by the executive team of the organization. So every single new hire that has been brought in has been a consensus decision.

[problems with sound system 1:26:35 – 1:31:42]

Rod Beckstrom:

Sounds good. Now I can stop screaming at the front row. Thank you for your patience. So anyway, we have an organizational effectiveness initiative that we've reviewed with the Board, and presented to the Board, and it's a bottom up process that has involved breaking down ICANN into I believe it's 12 Working Groups of 10 people each, all led by the staff.

Looking at what do they think about ICANN, how's it running, how should it be improved internally, what are the issues, and we were very pleased. The key survey we did of staff in that the response rate was between 80 and 90% and it was the highest that the consultant had ever seen in an organization like ours. Anyway, so that's one effort to make sure that we're listening to employees. Another thing that I have done are called random employee

lunches, or RELs, since we need more acronyms in the ICANN family.

They are literally random lunches; there's a spreadsheet listing of all the staff in offices, and then when I, for example, go to Marina del Rey, we do a random selection of those I have not yet lunched, and 12 of us go have lunch and an open conversation for an hour and a half. That's given me a chance to have face to face time with over 90% of the staff, and that's been just an incredible opportunity for me to learn from them, and to meet the great people in ICANN. It's also meant to help retention and let them know that I have an open door policy.

Any member in staff can come to me, if they want to, and discuss an issue. So anyway, I think a very important issue up front is the retention of Akram Atollah as Chief Operating Officer. I think Doug Brent was a very strong operating guy and very popular with the community, but Akram is also an exceptional manager and leader who's managed up to 1500 people in very technical organizations spread around the world. We're starting to see the benefits of that already. So that's an intricate question.

Chris Disspain:

Lesley, you wanted to respond?

Lesley Cowley:

Thank you, I'm not sure that answered the question. The question was what is the current senior staff retention rate? And obviously we have no wish to discuss individual cases, that isn't where this is headed; our concern is about senior staff retention, which is very

different than overall staff retention. It would be helpful if that statistic over the last 12 months could be calculated, and shared. Thank you. I should also that many of us in this room have also experienced huge organizational growth and change, so we understand the issues around that.

Peter Dengate Thrush:

I'd like to just make a comment on this as well, because I just want to pick up on a word – you said you understood when a CEO came in he may wish to make some changes. I want to make it very clear that Rod was asked by me and by the executive committee to do a number of things. When I took over as Chairman at the end of 2007, really 2008, I found that many of the internal systems at ICANN were either absent or antiquated or creaking at the seams.

It was very clear to me that we needed to go through a reasonable process of upgrading ICANN into the ICANN that I actually wanted it to be. It was pretty clear that we were going to have enormous change in the responsibilities in relation to the new gTLD program; it wasn't exactly at the time clear, but I was pretty clear that the JPA was going to come to an end and we needed to – we still have to keep doing this, we have to reposition ICANN as a stellar example of a global body performing well. The ICANN of 2006/2007, pretty clear from the work that I was doing on the President's strategy committee, communicated with people – the early ICANN was not in a position to move to being a global body capable of assuming the responsibilities that it actually wanted to have.

What we've now seen of course, as what's matured into the requirements under the affirmation of commitments, that imposes a whole new level of demand on the organization that the ICANN of 2006/2007 really couldn't deliver. New gTLDs is going to be an enormous new set of systems, and you'll understand this, Lesley, you've seen the efforts to get information out of the finances. The finance or many of the internal systems in ICANN simply weren't up to it.

So the message that I gave Rod when he came in was that we have to build an ICANN that is going to function as a global body. So that's been where the direction is coming from as much as anything. In terms of detail, the compensation committee sits and watches much of this, and it actually does benchmarking studies, and we are right in the middle of re-doing that exercise, so that ICANN is benchmarked against the right basket of companies and at the right level within the basket. So that's going on.

And the Board itself obviously works closely with the CEO and has asked similar questions. The way I create the retreats that the Board does, the first retreat in the year seems to be a very much an inward looking one; we look at our systems. And the second one seems to be the outward looking one; we look at where we're going. So in Dublin at the retreat, we put all these very similar questions to Rod and went through the analysis of the staff and had the statistics and looked at that. The Board's position, I guess, because you asked for the Board's position, the Board's view of this is that we're satisfied with what the progress has been.

Chris Disspain: Okay, Lesley, you done? Okay. Paulos, I think you were the next. You wanted to ask about the IGF? Can I get a microphone for Paulos please?

Paulos Nyirenda: Thanks, Chris. I try to be very brief; I think one of the things countries definitely are dealing with is the current process of the processing the renewal or otherwise of the IGF, and in my country, we have faced a number of questions that needed asked as a ccTLD to clarify, and one of those questions involved a request to seek an understanding of what the ICANN stand is on the renewal of the IGF. So I thought I would get this clarification since I couldn't get it very clear before.

Rod Beckstrom: Sure, thank you, I think that's a really important issue for all of us, and many parties are involved in that discussion. As we shared at the IGF meeting in Vilnius, ICANN – and we as the Board had a discussion – we clearly support the continuance of the IGF. There's a preference from an ICANN standpoint, based on community input, also state that our discussions on the IGF continuance have been done in consultation with different communities, different groups out there; regional internet registries, ISOC, IATF, etc., informal discussions to make sure that we at least share our thoughts and we have input.

We share with each other that we'd like to see the IGF continue, that the preference is for it not to become decisional. That the preference is for it to continue to be multi-stake-holder, and to treat

all stake-holders equally, including both private sector and government parties. The person on our team who ICANN arranged to speak to the group, who has the most knowledge, is Behar Esmat, from our Global Partnerships Team, who's the lead on this issue.

But I think that summarizes it, so what we're going to seek to do in continuing that dialogue is try to support the IGF, as it's been functioning, and have good discussions with many of the community partners so that we help to create together the future that we think is good for the multi-stake-holder model.

Chris Disspain:

Thanks Rod. I'm conscious of time, I know you have other things to do.

Peter Dengate Thrush:

I'd like to jump in if I can, Chris, and just report really another sort of success if you like, in the area of international relations. That is first of all that under Rod's tenure, we've created a much more explicit set of goals in terms of relationships with our siblings in the eco-system. We've now got a very much clearer program under Rod's direction of outreach to the RAR's, to the IATF, to ISOC, to all of the sibling organizations so that we move forward together. We've had Board to Board meetings with ISOC, for example, and there's been a lot of cooperation – I don't know whether we've got time for Rod to talk about an upcoming meeting that he's attending in New York, the IDN.

ICANN was asked to appear and speak on behalf of the internet, we just instantly refused to fall into that trap, we've gone back and made sure that all the rest of the players in the eco-system are either invited or our attendance is either going to be very limited or not at all. Let me just finish I guess with a little summary of the ITU relationship. When I started, it was relatively bad. I went to see Hamadoun Toure in Geneva in 2007, he came to see us in 2008.

He spoke at our meeting, came and had a private attendance session with the Board. In 2009 at Sharm el-Sheikh he said, at that stage orally, at the IGF meeting recognition of ICANN as the authority in relation to domain names, and then at Marrakech a month ago, we got the first formal footnoting of course, but that is formal recognition by the ITU. In Guadalajara, sorry; and we responded and I've had very good feedback, Rod, from your speech yesterday in terms of the outreach to the ITU. So I think just another bit of good news, really, the global strengthening of the ICANN relationship in the eco-system.

Chris Disspain:

Okay, thank you Peter. I am conscious of time. Byron, I know you had a question. Gabby, can you give the microphone to Byron? Thanks.

Byron Holland:

Thanks for joining us this morning. A question I'd like to get both of your takes on it, because it's extremely relevant both the Chair and the CEO, but clearly from different perspectives, and that's around the strategic plan and how we got to where we are today,

which is certainly not what we anticipated a number of months ago. Really what I'm referring to is the notion that coming to Cartagena, the thought was that we would be, or the Board would be, approving the strategic plan. The strategic plan being arguably the single most important thing that a Board does, or has responsibility for, and given that we've gotten to this place without achieving that goal, I would argue the communication getting to this point has not been great.

How is it that the Board got to the point where arguably the most important thing that it does is not being achieved on the timeline that it is supposed to be, and that is an ongoing process? There shouldn't be any surprises here, this wheel should continue to turn the same way every year, and why are we so late? Fundamentally I guess the same question for Rod from the staff perspective. How did we get to this place?

Peter Dengate Thrush:

I think the single most important thing a Board does is employ and sustain its CEO, actually, but I agree with you that the strategic planning process is pretty high up there. The part – I'm partly to blame – I'm guilty of trying to change too many things too fast I guess, in some ways. I actually don't think that the mechanism that we had, where we had six months of consultation on the strategy and then six months of consultation on the op side was actually appropriate.

What it wasn't allowing was enough time for contention between the parties, so I've been trying to move the staff to a process where

we were looking at three four month cycles, or even four three month cycles. Particularly as what we are now moving to is a much slower pace; the first strategic plan we came up with five years ago was 73 pages and really was a political response to the whistlers. We've got an interesting history of budget development at ICANN, and strategic planning, and for a long time we didn't even have a strategic plan.

We were in the organizational development stage where a budget really was the only strategic planning document we had. So this is a, sort of an iterative process. What I wanted to get to was a process where the community affectively, and I've been encouraging the communities to develop their own input to the budget; go into that, publish the draft, and then go into contention phase with a look at priority development. We haven't really had enough of that. We had that on the stage in fact, in Brussels, where we were about to pass the budget and we had community groups come forward and say "my stuff isn't here".

We haven't had an explicit development of proposals going forward, preparing what they would look like. The entire wishlist all costed out, which would probably run to \$200 million. If everybody got what they wanted on a budget list, a strategic planning list, and then a objectives plan and a budget would be --- So what I've been trying to do is just work out a way of changing the timing on the process so that we can get to that point. It can be some very healthy, I think, community in-fighting about who gets what done when. And then the Board and the staff can go back

and reprioritize. So to a certain extent, I've been responsible for some of that, but not all.

Chris Disspain:

Can I just deal with that first, and then – thanks. Peter, I acknowledge that, I accept that. From my point of view, you may very well be right in doing that and promoting that change. But from a process point of view or from a community engagement point of view, given that our input is both desirable and required, it might perhaps have been better to say that stuff was happening, and maybe transition to that over a period of time, especially given that there was effectively a transition to a different strategic planning model last year. Or at least a different shaped strategic plan format, thanks Rod.

So you know, we just get used to that and then the next thing happens. So nothing against, necessarily, the plan itself; not the strategic plan, the plan to change the way the strategic plan is planned, but we need to know what's going on, because we're everywhere in the world. For us to get together and be helpful, which is what we actually strive to do, takes a bit of planning in itself.

Peter Dengate Thrush:

After Rod goes, I'm going to ask Kurt, who's now responsible for this to also respond on behalf of the direct –

Kurt Pritz:

So all your comments are really well taken. Doug Brent, I know, in previous meetings put up the proposed cycle for how we were going to revamp this process. It really didn't generate much

comment, because in the abstract a new process, until you actually use it, you don't see the effects of it. What we tried in previous meetings was to have a discussion about, or at least put it up, that we were considering changing the cycles, and then certainly we think that any strategic planning cycle requires the proper input from the ccNSO, and the other constituency groups. We've had one consultation so far.

Besides the community input, the Board has had very specific input on the strategic plan, and even at this meeting gave direction on how they would like to see the plan amended to be more objective and more goal oriented, comments people in this room made. So the Board's not going to approve the strategic plan at this meeting, so that there is enough time to have another round of public consultation so you and others can reflect on the changes that were made based on your first comments, and also implement specific changes the Board requested to make it more objective and goal oriented, which I think came out in the consultation we had with the ccNSO also. Byron, did you want to say something?

Byron Holland:

Sure, just a follow on; improving the process I think I and others would applaud any action that is going to improve the process, so it's not really a comment on that. It's really about how did we get there? One of the real challenges here is not that the new process is bad, or better, which we don't really even know yet, but part of it is how it's communicated. Nature abhors a vacuum, and what we found ourselves in this fall was a vacuum of information about

a fundamental change to a fundamental process that requires us to participate.

It's not just that we're required to participate, we're pro-actively trying to help in the process, and do good work and provide good input, which we were fundamentally precluded from at this point. It was never clearly laid out, the why and the when, what was happening. I think that did a real disservice to the momentum that this community has built up in engaging and providing good feedback, and it certainly does a disservice to ICANN as an organization, that we were left in this vacuum.

So in the spirit of trying to make a constructive contribution, you know things like getting the updated plan November 27 at 8 p.m. on a Sunday night; while that may just be when it was available, those are the kinds of things that make community members say "Are you kidding me? One week before Cartagena you deliver it at 8 p.m. on a Sunday night? Really, honestly? Is that how you're going to do it?"

Peter Dengate Thrush: The whole world doesn't revolve around Canadian time.

[background conversation]

Byron Holland: It was 5 p.m. California time, but I would still make the same comment. Sunday afternoon – pick a time slot. Those are the kinds of things –

Peter Dengate Thrush: Can I just – I agree with you. I think the Board’s feeling about the same, quite frankly. We don’t feel we’ve had enough time on it ourselves, and we’re scheduling extra time here to go through it, and we’re delaying the process. I suppose it’s an excuse to say we spend all our time in Trondheim going through new gTLD resolutions. So we probably need to make sure we keep our eye on the basics, as well as having to deal with some of these – there’s been a couple of other crises that we’ve dealt with, so I guess that’s the usual kind of reason. But we’re onto it, and thank you for the comment.

Rod Beckstrom: And Byron, if I can just thank you for the excellent leadership you’ve shown in pulling that group together, and I can understand the frustration. You do that work, you get everyone ready to go, organize it, etc., and there’s not the insertion points or the dialogue points that you were hoping for. So first, thank you again, and secondly, Kurt and we on staff will sit down and see what we can do to try and improve the process going forward. If you want to sit down and discuss that while we’re here too, we would welcome that feedback. So thank you, thank you very much.

Chris Disspain: Okay, we’re short of time. Keith, did you want to just briefly talk about the ITU, or has Peter answered your question? Okay, cool. Rod has to go. Does anybody have any last – Roelof? I have your hand up in the back.

Rod Beckstrom: Thank you to all of you as well, thank you very much.

Chris Disspain:

Thanks, Rod.

Roelof Meijer:

Roelof Meijer from SIDN. This is addressed to you, Peter. You made some kind of – you caught me unawares, but you made some kind of a comment on the subject of the financial contributions Working Group where you made a link between contributions and respect and influence in the ICANN community or something. Do you think you can repeat that statement? They probably wouldn't want you to, but –

Peter Dengate Thrush:

That's a statement that I've made to the cc community for many years, that – it loses – the time that it's taken to come to grips with making financial contributions, and not having a mechanism ready, I have seen has cost the ccTLD community political capital, and it's good that there's now a mechanism in place to deal with that. It's the basic reality of politics. The people who pay money and participate are taken as being supporters of the system. People who come but don't pay any money are seen as supporting it, but to a lesser extent.

Roelof Meijer:

But I think you also made a link between influence in the system – and is this just a remark and a notion that is valid for the ccNSO? Because you know better than I do that there are organizations within the ICANN community that don't contribute financially at all. Does that have any influence on their political standing or on the impact that have if they make comments?

Peter Dengate Thrush: No, I think if you're making the obvious comparison between the At-Large community for example, and the ccTLD managers who are seen as registry operators, which many of them generate large amounts of revenue, there's a great deal of – it's easy to distinguish between those and the At-Large community.

Roelof Meijer: Okay, but I know that my government generates far more money than SIDN does, and I don't think you expect any contribution from GAC in any way related to an overall whatever you call it.

Peter Dengate Thrush: Absolutely.

Chris Disspain: Can I just – Roelof, my take on it is that I accept that there is disquiet amongst some people in the gTLD world about what they consider to be a mismatch, if you will, between contributions between the g world and the c world. And that some people in the g world, as Peter has just said, we're simply just another registry operator and we should be treated in the same way. I would not, however, go as far as Peter and suggest that even has necessarily a roll through effect on political capital or influence.

My experience of dealing with the GNSO in almost every aspect, both as a councilor and individual member of the GNSO has been that over the last three or four years, we've actually developed an extraordinary cooperative and close relationship. We know we don't agree on a whole lot of things, and we even, as you would know, talk about the fact that we don't pay as much money as they do. So it's not hidden, it's out in the open.

Now that doesn't mean that Peter's not correct and that there aren't some people or some groups of people who think we don't have the right to be as loud as we are or speak as much as we do, or etc. That may well be so; but as a fundamental principle, I don't believe those two things are as connected as perhaps Peter does.

Peter Dengate Thrush:

Well, that's because you haven't seen the Board coming to a vote on issues, and I can particulate reference; the IDN/ccTLD discussion about whether or not IDN/ccTLDs should be linked to contracts. You will remember Board members who sat there quite clearly and said "no shoes, no shirt, no vote", and made it absolutely clear what their position was and the reasoning that gave for that was the lack of – was in part the current failure of the ccTLD community to adhere to a system of voluntary contributions. That was being proposed as the mechanism for the new IDN/ccTLDs, they pointed to your history and said "why should we trust this group?" This was an explicit discussion.

Chris Disspain:

Sorry, I accept that, and if you want to be specific about the Board and specific about certain issues, I would agree with you that not that I think it's a loss of political capital, because I think that has a different meaning, but I would certainly accept that there were discussions on the Board, and Board members whose view is that our methodology of dealing with stuff wasn't acceptable, and as you said, no shoes, no shirt, no Steve Goldstein. Lesley?

Lesley Cowley:

I'm sorry, it's a different subject. Is that okay?

Roelof Meijer: Well, I think most people know my opinion about financial contributions by the ccTLD community, but if the Board reacts to that situation in such a way, it almost forces me to reconsider if the financial contribution to this IDN has been paying over the years, does this have any effect? Because I'm considered, .nl is probably considered part of the ccTLD community, and if the Board has such an antagonistic feeling about the ccTLD community because they don't contribute, then what's the point in contributing if it's not the whole community? Do you understand what I mean?

Peter Dengate Thrush: I think that's a question you'll have to answer for yourselves, I don't think I can help you with that. Mike?

Mike Silber: I think I sit somewhere in between Chris and Peter on that one, because I agree with Peter, I've seen certain individuals who take the community as a whole and lump them together and say – and I think Roelof's point is absolutely correct. SIDN is paying a contribution which potentially is out of synch with what they are obliged to do, I know that the ccTLD with which I'm associated, given the fact that we register at the third level rather than the second level, we could get away with paying even less than we currently pay, but compared to the number of registrations of any level that we have, we're making a relatively small contribution.

I think there are some that are making no contribution and there are others who are making even larger contributions. I think for some individuals, the concept just doesn't wash and they can't get

beyond it. I think it's very easy to point a finger at Steve Goldstein because he's no longer on the Board and he's no longer here, mostly because he's done a huge amount of brilliant work to facilitate internet connectivity to the Latin countries across the world. So he's not a person who is centered around a particular country; but Steve had a particular view. And I think that the point that Peter is making is not that necessarily there's a general view, but rather in the minds of certain individuals that process doesn't quite wash with them.

They don't understand that they don't comprehend how you can then regard a community based on the fact that some are contributing way in excess of what they potentially should, and others are contributing absolutely nothing. I think it's something that we're going to have to deal with. It's a question of marketing, the fact that this is a community where some people are willing to contribute more than they absolutely have to, on the basis that some of their fellows can't contribute even what they potentially should.

Chris Disspain:

Lesley, we really do have to wrap it up.

Lesley Cowley:

I was frustrated at not getting a direct answer to my question, so I went away and did it myself, and I think there's an ICANN senior staff turnover rate of 78%, which is of nine VP Chief level staff, I think we have seven new. So if that helps inform Board deliberations going forward, then that's my calculation.

Chris Disspain: Thank you, Lesley. We really need to wrap this up. Thanks guys, for coming, and we'll continue the discussions as we always do. Annabeth, I know you asked a deadline, I'm going to ask Kurt afterwards if that's okay. It'll be too hard to do here. Okay, Gabby? We have coffee now? Is now the right time for coffee, Gabby? Given that it's not actually on my agenda. Okay, the next session is the IANA session that starts at 11. If you want to go and grab a cup of coffee and come back in that would be fantastic. We do need to keep going to get everything done in time.

[break]

Chris Disspain: Okay. Ladies and gentlemen I realize that some of us are still out getting coffee but we need to get going and people are slowly wandering back in. We're coming to our next session which is the IANA update, and we have Naela and Elise, so over to you guys.

Naela Sarras: Okay, good morning everyone. My name is Naela Sarras, I've worked with in the IANA management area for about five years now, I've come to the meetings off and on. I recognize some of your faces so if I act overly excited when I meet somebody that I've been exchanging emails with for the last five years, don't take it too personally. It's because I'm really happy to meet you. I'm here with Elise Garrick, VP of IANA, and we're happy to give this update. Normally my colleague Kim Davies is here giving the update, he said that I should be able to share with you - he apologizes that he can't be here and that he's in Bali, Indonesia for his brother's wedding. So, good reason.

For the IANA update we want to give you an update about our recent activities since June, and there's nothing better to start with today other than DNSSEC. Purely from an operational point of view where we're all at with DNSSEC, as you all know, the root was signed on July 15th. Since then we have received a very high number of requests to the IANA to add DNS records in the root zone for the signed TLD's. The number of requests that came in, and I'll show this on the next slide, very quickly overcame the number of signed TLD's that we had in the ITAR, listed in the ITAR.

So this allowed us to, in October, to quickly announce the retirement of the ITAR system, and then it was finally taken offline 30th November I believe, or no, 18th November, the last entry was removed from the ITAR system. So this chart here, and I didn't look at this earlier because I have black slides with white font, pretty bad I think. It's okay? Alright, so this chart here shows you going back to January 2009, with the introduction of ITAR. We had a steady growth of the use of ITAR but as soon as June 2010 hit, you can see how quickly the root zone surpassed the ITAR.

I'm having an issue here where you cannot see a link that we provided on the slides. These slides will be published so please follow that link. We do have, as of the making of these slides, we said there were about 60 TLD's in the root zone right now...there you go, okay. So it's - right now we stand at 64 signed TLD's. So that's where we're at, and this link will be provided on the slide.

We also have here a map, showing the signed TLD's highlighted in green, and we think it's pretty interesting looking at who - at this map. In terms of processes, the way we've been handling DS records changes is very similar to the way we handle NS records changes in the root zone.

We ask ccTLD managers to fill in IANA text template, mail it in, IANA does its technical checks. There are instances where - the technical check that we do is checking to see if the DNS record key exists in the TLD zone; if it doesn't, we come back to you and ask for clarification of why it doesn't. Typically, this is flagged as an error but if there's a good reason why it's not then we are able to proceed.

What we've learned so far in processing, up to now, we said 64 - it changes - additions to the root zone. Sometimes the agreed technical checks that we currently do, may miss some DNSSEC related issues. So for example, what's happened with a couple of changes that we've worked on is that queries to some name-servers did not return the RRSIG records for the DNS key. This doesn't show up in the IANA technical checks that we currently do, but it could be flagged further down the road when we get to implementation.

So what we may need to do for this issue is come back to the community and talk about the current technical checks that we do, and see if there's any enhancements that need to be implemented for further checks that we do on the operational level when we

receive the request. So that's pretty much - this is a much better picture when we can show the whole picture - we think -- I think what we should do is hide the bar but I'm not going to mess with it now. This is a photo of Kim Davies, honestly. This is two months into signing the root; things went a lot better than expected, everything was smooth, no major hiccups, so this is happy Kim.

But in all honesty things really did go a lot better than I think any of us thought at the time. We haven't had any major problems that we know of, at least. So that's what we have on DNSSEC. Another area of operations and work that we've spent time on this year is the work-flow automation. It's been a while since we've given an update on work-flow automation. Just to give a little bit of a background, this is the new system that IANA is creating to allow TLD managers to submit changes to IANA through a web-interface as opposed to the current manual system.

I've been personally working on that in the last year or so. The process - the system, the way it's spec'd is that it does not change the current process by which we implement changes in the root zone, all it does is allow you an interface online to submit those changes. It also allows you to track the status of the change request instead of - we get frequently emails, saying 'hey what's going on with my request?' So we're hoping this is a way for you to pro-actively go in and check on the status of the request.

It also will allow us from the processing end to communicate the changes to VeriSign via APP as opposed to what we currently do,

which is to send it over email. So that's a quick overview of what the automation will do. Where we're at now is, I think the last update we talked about this was during the ICANN Sydney meeting. We started what we call a parallel deployment, where we wanted to run everything through the production system as well as through a test system and compare the results.

Very soon after we started doing this we ran into a pretty major issue and we had to stop to fix the issue. At the same time DNSSEC became a higher priority and so a lot of resources went to DNSSEC. We did continue working on the work-flow automation system, we certainly fixed the issue, and we addressed a couple of other things; enhancements that we wanted to have in the system. At the same time because of where DNSSEC was at, it was thought that it would be a good time to add capability to handle DNSSEC records. So the good news out of this is that we now support DNSSEC when the automation is finally released.

So where we're at now with it as I said, what I've been doing is testing the system so I have a set of controlled test cases that I am running through the system because I am checking for specific things. So that's one set of test cases. In addition I'm taking all the changes that are coming in from TLD managers for changes to the root zone and we're feeding them to the system in a complete test environment where the results aren't released.

We've done this with a very large number of requests that we have a much higher confidence level that the system works as designed

now. So what we want to do next is enter into a formal period of what we're calling parallel operations. So we're going to take everything that's coming again from the production system, feed it through the testing system, and then we want to compare results and have 100% match between production and testing.

Our goal to declare success is to be able to run this for 60 consecutive days at 100% matching zones. We expect to go into this period pretty quickly. Once we've done all that testing and we've achieved our 60 days of 100% matching we'll be able to declare that the system works as designed and we'll go ahead and release it. Of course, after we release it then hopefully not too far after the release we will work with ccTLD managers to distribute credentials to access the system and use it. We'll provide some training and education on how it works and we'll also get feedback from you on enhancements for future versions, because we do expect that there might be feedback in that way.

So that's where we're at in the work-flow automation system. If there are any questions I'll take them at the end. I also do have a running operational version of it here, so if anyone wants to have a look I'm happy to give a little demo. Next we wanted to talk about IDN/ccTLD's. Here is a map of all delegated IDN/ccTLD's currently in the root zone. We have 15 TLD's that have entered the root zone and they represent 12 different countries.

In terms of processing requests, we've continued to get requests throughout the year, pretty much since April this year. The rate of

change of applications for the IDN we're seeing has slowed down a bit. We're not sure - we don't want to over-conclude - whether that's suggesting that its initial demand has been met or not, but that's where we're at now. Throughout the year in processing all of the requests that we've completed, we have run into some process issues and the Board has asked the Board IANA committee to look into these issues and make recommendations.

What we've learned from processing the IDN/ccTLD applications is that - as you're all aware, we have two different processes. The first process is the string-approval process and then it comes to IANA for the delegation process. The requirements for each of the processes have been getting a little bit confused. Specifically, we have government support and local internet community support required for both; however, the criteria to fulfill these two are different, and so that's where most of the confusion has been.

What we've done to help with this is to improve our up-front communications with the applicants to explain that the documentation to provide for the string-delegation is a little different than the IANA delegation, just to help users with what to expect when they get down the road to the ICANN - IANA delegation process. We've also, in general, learned and I think this was said yesterday in several re-delegation/ delegation meeting that you had in the afternoon - in general, we do realize that the documentation about the delegation/re-delegation process needs to be enhanced and better explained.

So on the topic of documentation we have undertaken a project for a while now to improve the root zone processes and documenting them and publishing them. The initial draft of this improved documentation was shared with the ccNSO redelegation group in late 2009 for their informational purposes. The drafts of this improved documentation have gone through several revisions and we expect that IANA will share a final draft of the guide to delegating/re-delegating country code top level domains with the ccNSO for their information before publishing.

That's where we're at with documentation. In terms of what all of this activity this year has done on workload of IANA, we wanted to do a little bit of comparison. So we're almost at the end of 2010 now. We took the data from 2010 and charted it against 2009; so we prepared this around the end of November. Here's our data for 2009, and the green bars represent the number of incoming requests for IANA by month. So by the end of November 2009 we sat at 265 requests. Again these are incoming requests that came to the root management domains area.

This compared to what happened in 2010; same data, from January through November. Orange are the 2010 data and green are the 2009 data, and we see a significant increase, we're seeing nearly 40% increase here. The bulk of the increase, you will see, is May through November. That's when most of the - that's when DS records were sent to IANA for addition to the root zone and IDN/ccTLD's. That's pretty much all of the operational stuff that we wanted to report on, no need to save these. So, thanks to our

host, gracias, thanks, shukriya, and спасибо, and I'll take any questions.

Chris Disspain: Thank you. Do we have any questions? Wow, okay, so no. Of course you may.

Elise Garrick: I just want to thank Naela for giving the presentation, and one of the reasons that we did thank you in the different languages that we chose is that the team that processes these applications for root zone changes are speaking these languages natively. So Naela is from Palestine, Nadia is from Belarus, and obviously Kim is Australian. So we just wanted to say in our thanks that we recognize our host as well as the team that processes all of the reports.

Chris Disspain: Thank you, that's wonderful. If we could do the thanks in an Australian accent...

Elise Garrick: Okay, we'll let Chris do that.

Chris Disspain: I just had one thing, Elise, I just wanted to - you know this, but some of you may not - we participated in the Cyberstorm exercise which the US government cybersecurity war games thing, and we participated this year and two years ago when it was last done, and this year we ran a game with IANA and it was really, really interesting and worth doing. I'll probably just briefly talk to you guys about it tomorrow at lunchtime, but I wanted to suggest that perhaps we should start talking about the possibility that there's no

reason why we can't do this sort of thing ourselves. We could have like a cc/IANA war-games to test things and talk things through and see what happens when stuff happens.

Elise Garrick: That's a fascinating idea...do you think it's safe?

Chris Disspain: Well, inasmuch as...

Elise Garrick: What kind of war games are we talking here? I'm joking, of course.

Chris Disspain: Well, obviously...and we played a fairly straight-forward scenario from our point of view, which was that - I'll tell you now, it's easier - which was that we put an additional name-server into the data-base entry, and when we started the game, basically we told IANA - basically we told our staff - and then eventually we told IANA that that name-server was rogue and had been added because my email address had been compromised, and that it had to be taken out and that it had to be taken out as soon as possible. But because my email address had been compromised they couldn't use the normal mechanism to email me to check that it was okay to take the zone file out that I'd put in in the first place with the compromised email address.

So we went through this process about what's required and how would it work. It was very interesting and made perfect sense, but as far as I can tell it was - it's not actually written down anywhere, is it?

Elise Garrick: I don't think those war-games are public, per se, or you're saying that we don't write down those processes? Right.

Chris Disspain: I meant - yeah, because we ended up with a letter and some signed vinyls, which is very personal, makes perfect sense, but it's not there anywhere, right?

Elise Garrick: Internally we have that.

Chris Disspain: Internally, right. So we threw that out as a very sensible solution. I think it would be great to be able to come up with some scenarios and maybe once every couple of years or so, just...because I know you guys sit around with nothing much to do, we could just run a sort of cc/IANA kind of play group and...

Elise Garrick: I also think it would be fun also, and obviously we can't do it monthly or anything like that, but with a little bit of planning - because there was quite a bit of planning behind this cyber-attack and some groups knew it was going to happen and other groups did not know it was going to happen and so the obvious intent was to surprise some groups and see what the behavior was and if it followed the process or if it didn't follow the process and whether the issue was resolved or whether there were problems that had to be addressed later. But no, I think we'd welcome that, Chris, thank you.

Chris Disspain: Uh, yes, Jian Zhing.

Jian Zhing:

Thanks for the update, and what I'd like to comment on is the IDN/ccTLD Fast Track, the strength of the dedication process, it's good that you are reviewing of course, everything, but I guess, why is there some confusion in the first place is because there's no document or publication that the applicants are referred to for the dedication process. We tried to look on either side and couldn't find anything on it, so that's probably why there is the confusion, and I wonder if going forward, in the very, very near future, you might publish this process very clearly on your website somewhere.

For the process refinement that could also be showed to committee. There are some concerns that different administrations all face; different countries, different all have different concerns that they may not know how to address (inaudible 22:34). One that I have here is because the, as you say, the government support and the community support for ICANN and IANA is different, it is very difficult for the applicant to go back to the government or even go back to the community and say hey, I need a second support. And they'll be questioning "why are you asking for it again, you've already done it once." All of this takes time to prepare, it takes time to draw up and get through all the levels, so it is not fair to us to have to do the simple steps twice. Thanks.

Elise Garrick:

Thanks for your question. I think I've got three questions. One is why does the IDN and delegation process different? The other is lack of documentation. Then the third I think had to do with the

discrepancy between government and local community requirements, which is sort of the same as the first one, which is IDN and delegation processes are different.

So, let me talk about why the IDN string evaluation is different than the delegation process. So the string evaluation is about evaluating the string itself, and so with that, it's more about the linguistic and support for the selection of that string. So the government and local community support for that is all focused on the string itself, the actual characters in that language and what they represent. When you get to the delegation process, the government and local support is about the sponsoring organization and the operator and the technical capabilities of that operator to maintain the DNS stability and security.

So there are different things that are being evaluated, so the type of support that's being requested, one is linguistic and the other is DNS operational support, and it's specifically support for the operator of the domain. So that's why there's two different definitions of the criteria, even though they've got the same name. Government, local community support, they're supporting different things; the linguistic string or the technical capabilities of the operator and the support for that operator.

So that's the first part of the question, and the second part, which is one that we feel very strongly about - and I notice in your review of the ICANN and the IANA that you all do also - and that is documentation. We have been working on this and we feel very

close to being able to publish something, and we feel badly that you all feel surprised, and we are hoping very soon to have a document out there for the delegation and re-delegation that talks about the process as it is done today. So I heard you say that you would like to give input to that documentation and we certainly would welcome the input of whether it's clear and understandable, but the documentation that we will be publishing is the current processes.

There could be a follow-on activity where you may make recommendations or provide advice on how you might like to see the process and the procedures change, but what we'll be sharing with you is for informational purposes, and Naela had that in her slide deck, so that you know that we are trying to publish and make sure that we have accurate documentation on what the requirements are and the criteria and what we'll be looking at and what the process will be as it flows through the IANA. And that is the process we do today.

A second step could be suggestions from you as to how the processes could be improved or optimized. But for the documentation we plan to publish, it's what we do today, which is better. The documentation will be better than the one document that does exist today on the website, which we've been told is inadequate. And if I could make a plea to this group, I think you could help us accelerate getting this documentation published, if you send email messages telling me that the documentation is inadequate.

There are some debates that the documentation may be sufficient. Those of us who work with those requests, your requests, feel very strongly that you don't find it sufficient, and it would help us if we could actually point to examples of countries and organizations and ccTLD operators who feel it's also insufficient, so thank you. I hope that answered your question.

Chris Disspain: Thank you, thank you very much. Gosh, an opportunity to send email...

Elise Garrick: You may send them to me directly, and epg@ICANN.org.

Chris Disspain: Thank you, and we will. Thank you very much. Okay, we're going to wrap this up now because we need to move onto the next one, but thanks very, very much, and can I just say that you're not Kim and that's not a bad thing, thank you.

Elise Garrick: It's a good thing.

Chris Disspain: Jean-Jacques, would you care to join us please? Our next session is the ccNSO review, ICANN Board Working Group recommendations. Jean-Jacques, of course, is the chair of the ICANN Board committee that dealt with the ccNSO review. Welcome Jean-Jacques, and Ram is here as well, and Bart is here...oh you're not here? Okay.

Jean-Jacque Subrenat:

Good morning, it's a pleasure for me to be back in this community, and it's been an honor for me to work with you. Thanks to the review Working Group constituted of Ram Mohan, who's here, Alejandro Pisanty, who will be with us somewhat later - because he's in another group just now - Demi Getschko, who is not with us in Cartagena today, and also Vittorio Bertola, who has not made it here either. Before we put anything on the screen I'd like to make a few general remarks about the work we've done on the review Working Group.

This will be essentially two things and then I'll ask Ram to continue on one specific point. My three points are this: first of all, the findings of the Working Group, the essential message that I want to bring to you, is that the ccNSO has proven its usefulness by the value added that it has brought to the community and this segment of ICANN's work, and indeed, more largely, the internet. This brings the question how much can you influence the PDP - the development process for policy. But also the cost-effectiveness, what is the effectiveness of your work here compared with the effort you put into it. I did listen carefully to the debate you had with Peter, the chair of the Board, about half an hour ago on this question.

My second point I would like to make is that you all noticed that when we were defining the remit of the independent reviewer's work, there were some questions within the community about the financial question, and there was concern that the question should or should not be included, and I just wanted to say that we were

conscious of that and the decision made was very much in keeping with the general advice of the ccNSO and of staff and the community. In that respect, I just want to say that the financial contribution is something that has to be set up between - that exists between the ICANN and the cc's individually, so it actually falls outside the scope of the ccNSO review.

In reality this concern, as I have just mentioned, does exist so rather than just pass it on to silence I wanted to make the point here that we are conscious that it could be an issue. I note with satisfaction that you have created a Finance Working Group, the first meeting of which has occurred already here in Cartagena, with two main remits: one, to analyze ICANN's costs associated with ccTLD's, and the second point is to discuss with ICANN a methodology for individual ccTLD's to calculate a fair and equitable voluntary financial contribution to ICANN and to propose this for future work.

My third point was about risk management. I think this is a very important aspect of your work because the challenge is the sustainability of your community and its work. I would encourage you to look more closely at the parameters of risk; for instance, one example is the high dependence on key individuals. So for things like succession planning and what to do about that, how advanced are you in that, I think is crucial for the sustainability of the ccNSO community.

Those were just some general remarks I thought I'd signal, and now I'd like to ask Ram to get a few more remarks, perhaps, on the sustainability of the ccNSO community's work.

Ram Mohan:

Thank you Jean-Jacques, and thank you for having us here. It's actually been quite a good process to go through this review and certainly learn quite a bit more about the organization. I've interacted with many of you directly, individually, as well as in group. Some of my comments go kind of beyond the borders of the review itself, if you will. These are comments that you could consider as potentially advice, for the future perhaps.

As Jean-Jacques was saying, there are two things that come to mind. One is to ensure that there is some level of focus on the sustainability of the organization itself. When you look at things like leadership or succession, that's one thing; the other is to spend a little bit of time perhaps thinking about the sustainability of the platform function that the ccNSO intends to be and wants to be.

There is clearly, from the review that you see and the notes that you see, a clear establishment of the value of the organization. It might be worthwhile spending some time thinking about methods to ensure sustainability of the platform function itself. So that's, kind of at a broad-level, my comments on the review itself. Back to you, Jean-Jacques.

Jean-Jacques Subrenat:

Thank you. As we know, this review process has gone on for some time and we've had several iterations. I'm just reminding ourselves

of the status and next steps, which you see on the screen now. The board Working Group draft report was posted for public comments, and this was lasting from 15th of November to the 15th and January. The final report will of course take account of the comments received and then it will be sent to the structural improvements committee and the Board after that for adoption and then we go into implementation.

That is done by staff and ccNSO together. That then has to be the plan - implementation of the plan then has to be adopted by the SIC and the Board, and finally the implementation. So some key aspects we want to underline here is that, of course the public comments in which we are engaged just now, is vital to the quality of the final report. Of course, we put it up here but it should be obvious, but we thought it may be useful to say that the statements of support are just as welcome as suggested modifications.

Do we want to know whether the report statements match ccNSO expectations or changes - which are in the pipeline. There are just a few examples, which we mentioned but you may wish to bring up completely different things. That's about what we wanted to do in a very brief presentation but, chair, we leave it up to you to orientate our discussion.

Chris Disspain:

Thank you, Jean-Jacques. Just a quick question - we'll take questions and comments from the floor if indeed there are any - just a question from me, Jean-Jacques, your term on the board is

coming to an end in a couple of days. Do you stay on this Working Group, given that there are non-board members on it anyway?

Jean-Jacques Subrenat: I've not been instructed either way, so I'm available for telephone consultations but travel also if they're paid.

Chris Disspain: Is that a general comment, or only in a specific...

Jean-Jacques Subrenat: No, I'm answering your question about ccNSO review. I'd like to get a sense from staff of when this is due to fold up. I suppose that after we get all the comments, after the close of the comment period, which is 15th of January, then we go into the final report. That has to be sent to the SIC and then to the board, etc. So it's a question - I'm looking at Olof, who's nodding there - I suppose it's a question of a few months, right? So I just want to signal my availability for that kind of work to be continued if I'm required to do so. But yes, I am leaving the Board on Friday this week.

Chris Disspain: It would just be a shame, I think, to lose the corporate knowledge - for want of a better term - of process and how we've got to where we've go to. So that would be great, thank you. Do we have any questions or comments? I know that some of us are obviously planning to respond to the public comments process, but I'm not sure...I can't remember whether the Council is - did we talk about the possibility of a Council response? We did, didn't we, or am I dreaming? There's a hand, yep, there's a hand in the back. Yeah, that'll be Joshi, I think. Bart, can you remember? Hang on a sec, Joshi.

Bart Boswinkle: What I recall from what we discussed the draft report just after it was finished so that was the last call, and as far as I recall the Council thought it was a very well-balanced report taking the view of the independent reviewers and comments into consideration, and the recommendations were very logical following and workable. So, in fact, no. No follow-up because...yeah.

Chris Disspain: In that case, the most important thing on Jean-Jacques' slide is that the comments agreeing are just as welcome and just as important. Those of us on the Council should certainly be considering putting in comments and encouraging other to do so as well. Joshi, did you have something?

Joshi Prashant: I just wanted to ask if the reporters could give a little bit more detail about what they viewed as this sustainable platform. What, exactly, do you mean by that?

Chris Disspain: Actually, I was going to ask you the same thing. I wasn't quite clear what you were talking about when you were referring to "the platform".

Jean-Jacques Subrenat: So, thank you for the question. There are two factors that seem to be at work here: one is ccTLD's themselves, and then the other is the ccNSO. One of the things that the report clearly points out is that attempting to create some sort of a common policy across all the ccTLD's is not necessarily something that works in a normal

manner. However the ccNSO, as an organization and as a body, clearly plays a role and has a function.

What I was suggesting was that further work be done in exploring that piece of it because the ccNSO, as an important actor inside of this overall DNS environment, has a role that is different and is kind of at a meta level from what individual ccTLD's do, or even collections of ccTLD's coming together do.

So that's what I mean by sustaining that platform function. You have a platform for influencing and helping guide and direct where the future of the DNS itself might go, and that piece of it is what felt to me as something worth further study and further talk because there is a potential to do something there. But what it is, is not something for me to prescribe, it's something for the organization to think about.

Chris Disspain:

Okay. Martin would like to say something. Okay, so speaking personally, it seems to me that ccNSO does several things. It does the things that it's supposed to do in the bylaws, which is to do the policy where it's necessary, and at the moment that's IDN's and we've also been looking at del/re-del but not in a policy sense at this stage, and then the best practices and so on. It also is about representing the ccTLD community in non-ccTLD management areas where it's important.

I would put in that basket things like geographic names and gTLD's and so forth. It's also about, because we are an ICANN-

supporting organization, it's also about supporting ICANN. What that means is supporting a model. It doesn't mean that we agree on stuff, it just means we're here because we support the model as a general expression. So those are the sorts of things we - that I would put on our platform. Is that really what you're talking about?

Jean-Jacques Subrenat: Yes, it's all of that. That is what I'm talking about, but I'm also noticing that as time is going on, some of the things that you are dealing with are no longer applicable to a cc - um, just in a cc area. Some of the things that you deal with are actually...you see trends, you see issues that may be precursors to issues that are going to hit the entire global DNS platform, and that's something that an individual ccTLD may be able to say something but ccNSO may have a real significant impact on the entire organization to help guide it and lead it in a different direction.

Chris Disspain: Understood. Martin?

Martin Boyle: Thank you. I'm Martin Boyle from dot uk. Bearing in mind you said that supportive comments were also welcome, I thought I'd put down some supportive comments. Certainly I was very alarmed by some of the comments that were included in the initial report. The report -

Chris Disspain: Do you mean the report or the review?

Martin Boyle:

The review, yes, and the report back on that I think has taken very firmly, very clearly into account the comments that have been made, so let's have that one clearly on the record, that I think we have generally been listened to. One of the clear things that came out, certainly when I read it, was that the review itself had lost sight of the nature of ccTLD's, so it was actually very good to read in your report that very clear statement.

Similarly, I think it was also quite good that you picked up on the binding policy and the very limited nature of binding policy for ccTLD's. Your last point, the concept of breaking down silos, I would agree that we do need to break down silos between the different organizations. We, in the ccNSO have had some strategy discussions, have looked wider, but it might be one of those things that's useful if only just for our own education of doing some of that work with other groups, but overall, thank you, thank you guys very much.

Jean-Jacques Subrenat:

Thank you very much, Martin. I'd like to react to those three points by saying that it was a question of fundamental methodology. It was our purpose to let, perhaps, a freer reign as to the independent reviewer in defining it's remit, to leave it quite open, and what one usually does - I've been on several review Working Groups - and this one, we really wanted to give the independent reviewer the possibility to take up questions which we thought were maybe slightly off-color or not exactly in the preoccupations of the community.

We thought it was precisely our job as a Working Group to pick them out and say when we agreed or disagreed with those and that's what led to the result which you are kind enough to point out by saying that that was a good result. It's the combination of the two. We could've picked a style of initial independent review, which would've been perhaps very different. More knowledgeable perhaps of the milieu of the ecosystem, but I think that's one of the points of the final result, is that it's more contrasted.

The initial independent review I think was closer to what perhaps the general public or people who are less knowledgeable, who are less insiders of the ccNSO community would think of spontaneously. We tried to bridge the gap so that the value added by the Working Group itself perhaps comes out slightly more.

Chris Disspain:

Thank you. I just wanted to pick up on Martin's point about silos and widening things. Ram, you might want to take this back to the g-world. We had our usual Council - G&C Council - luncheon yesterday, and the topic that the GNSO specifically wanted to talk about was cross-constituency...I hate that word, constituency...cross-ASCO Working Groups, which we've kind of made a sort of specialty of really, and we had a very good conversation with him about that.

What became clear as we went into this conversation is how much harder it is for them because they are split. They are not on the same platform, to use your expression, and so the trust level isn't good enough yet to be able to sit into that Cross-Party Working

Group without everybody being there and that makes it really, really hard. I think one of the things that we can - I tried to say to them yesterday, we don't agree with each other.

We're lucky that we all came from the same place in the sense of experience but we don't agree with each other. I think there are challenges in the ICANN model - I know it's got nothing to do with this but it just struck me as I said it - I think we can be useful from that point of view by sort of leading that kind of thing, making that sort of thing happen.

Ram Mohan:

Yes, Chris, that's precisely the trust of my own directions. You have such a tremendous opportunity to show how to do some of these things. On the g-side it's - more time is spent on just getting everybody to agree that this is the right chapter to work on, much less what should be in it, but you have tremendous ability, an in a couple of areas. If you look at IDN's as an example you're well out of the gate, and by the time others are even going to start thinking about it, as operational experience that you're going to have. That's the kind of experience that ICANN the organization is going to need. So, yes, thank you.

Chris Disspain:

Do we have any others, any other comments or questions? You can go ahead.

Jean-Jacques Subrenat:

Well, if there are no more comments or questions I would just like to take this opportunity to say personally, as a member of the Board leaving the Board in a few days, to say what a pleasure, but

also what a very useful experience it was for me to be asked to chair this group and I'd like to thank especially all the members of the ccNSO who contributed to this work by reacting to or interfacing with the independent review team. Thank the Council and the Council-members as well for this. Thank the members of this Working Group; Alejandro, Demi, Ram, Vittorio, and also the staff-members. Marco Lorenzoli, who has left ICANN, Olof Nordling who has replaced him very ably, Alice Jansen, who has been permanently on that job, and Bart Buswinkle, I can't underline sufficiently the contribution he has brought because he has the experience both as staff and as ccNSO so that has been invaluable. To all, very many thanks.

Chris Disspain:

Jean-Jacques, thank you. You and the team of guys on the Board Working Group made this a very simple and worthwhile process and I thank you for that. On a personal level, as you're leaving the Board, can I personally say that it's been a real pleasure to have your elegant and diplomatic presence around ICANN and it's a sad day that we're losing you, thank you. Okay - sorry did somebody say something? No.

Okay, we are going to look very briefly now at cancelled Working Group roles and responsibilities. I'll just briefly deal with that and then we're going on to the regional organization update. If I could ask the regional guys to get ready, get their presentations organized, that's the two Erics and Peter and Jan. Peter I can see, and I guess not yet the others. I'm sorry, I can see hands, thank you others with hands. I'm going to - I need to go at 12:22 to

accountability and transparency review team session, so I will let Lesley, if you wouldn't mind chairing the update. And then Byron's doing a CIRA update and then Byron is, Canada is buying us lunch and then we're back.

Now the current timetable that you may have suggests that the GAC session starts at 2:15. The GAC have asked if we could start it at 2:00 which means that it will effectively start at 2:15 but at least - if we could please try and be there by 2:00 that would be great because they need to finish it at 3:30, so if we could do that it would be fantastic.

Just to give you a brief update, most of you will know that the Council has been - because of the changes that are coming up in the not too distant future with me going to the Board and so on - the Council has been working on some roles and responsibilities, looking at defining in a little more detail the role of the chair and the roles of vice-chairs and the roles of councilors and how the Council itself can work more efficiently. Also how we can off-lay some of the responsibility to non-councilors, participating members of the ccNSO who are prepared to do some work.

We have a flow-chart - a spreadsheet - that has listed out most of the responsibilities. We're still working on defining those in a bit more detail and then sort of assigning responsibility for them. Figuring out, for example, whether we currently have two vice-chairs, do we need to have three or four, should there be one vice-chair a region, all of that sort of thing. We anticipate that

discussion on the Council will be finished relatively soon, though given the fact that we've all got varying lengths of Christmas break, in the case of Australia, that's basically the whole of January.

We'll endeavor to get it out to everybody as quickly as possible. Just to give a couple of examples we worked on splitting things up into formal and informal roles. So there's a formal role of liaising with the chairs of the other AC's and SO's, but there's also an informal role. The formal role is where you're organizing meetings and all that sort of stuff. The informal role is the monthly chat to find out what all the latest gossip is and what, if anything, we can do about it. That sort of thing is the level of detail we're getting into so it's going to be quite useful from the point of view of defining roles and responsibilities.

We're also putting together - part of the process of putting together the roles and responsibilities has led to the clear requirement for a work plan - that's also something that came up in the review so we'll be starting to work out a process for the work plan. Then of course because one defines roles and responsibilities, different people doing different things, there has to be a mechanism making sure that's working properly, so we'll have to do that too. So, that's where we are with it and we'll endeavor to get the information out to everybody as soon as possible. Does anyone want to ask me a question and have I missed anything? Any of the councilors think I might have missed something in that

explanation? No? No questions, excellent. Alright, can I get the regional liaisons up to the front then please?

[break]

Lesley Cowley:

You can talk amongst yourselves for a few minutes. So the next session is the regional organizations updates, we're going to start with CENTR, and in case you haven't noticed, Vika is here instead of Eric, for the AfTLD. And then Jian, and then another Erick to conclude the session. Peter?

Peter Van Roste:

Thank you, Lesley. Good morning everyone, my name is Peter Van Roste, I'm the general manager for CENTR, and we're the platform for the European ccTLD managers. The main difference from the typical updates you get from the regional organizations at this time we've been particularly asked to just focus on some topics, and I selected four topics of our last meeting that I wanted to share with you.

Obviously the time frame of these presentations don't allow for any in-depth news, but the goal is obviously that you are able to catch up with us, if you need more information about any of them. First issue is DNSCert; yes, it's still on our list. The reason why it's still on our list is some supporters of the DNSCert plans cannot be convinced that we really do not like it, as it stands. But it's not just about giving comments on the DNSCert approach that was launched or presented by ICANN earlier this year; it's also about coming up with a more constructive alternative. That is a cross-

constituency Working Group that would then list all the existing initiatives, and that would work in cooperation both with the staff members of the ICANN team that are responsible for security, and the members of the community that these projects should support in the future.

The events that we've seen, like the security rated survey that was sent out by ICANN without the knowledge of most of the community members, to the governments in Europe is something that really is not up for repeat in the future. Our comments on DNScert can be found on our website.

Second issue, WHOIS, obviously being unaffected by any future changes that the WHOIS recommendation team might bring to the gTLD world, the ccTLDs are looking very carefully into WHOIS for a couple of reasons. First of all, because of the accuracy issues that we've seen across many of our members. One of the most interesting updates that we got on that was an accuracy study from Nominet in the UK that they shared with us. For me, the most important conclusion from that was that if you provide your users with the option to opt out from having their information published in the WHOIS (DT), accuracy of that data goes up impressively.

Another interesting aspect was that we've seen more and more members building additional services on the existing WHOIS service. Particular tools for search for educational or academic institutions, so different ways of leveled access to the WHOIS. Third interesting point is that WHOIS is more and more being used

across Europe as a tool against phishing. The lack of accurate information in the WHOIS tool is used as a contractual reason to terminate the domain, and has been proven extremely efficient in tackling the phishing issue.

Third item on our list is a very interesting discussion we had on the reputational DNS. We would expect that most of you in this room know what reputational DNS is, in summary it would allow third parties to add reputational tack to WHOIS information. The technical details vary depending on the tools that you're looking at, but probably the think that you're most familiar with is some of the email traffic control that is already being put in place by organizations like Spamhaus.

They provide blacklists and are used by ISPs to control email traffic flow. Based on a very bad experience with a mistake, well depends on who you're talking to, obviously; but by an action taken by Spamhaus one of our members was seriously impacted, and it's proof that it's definitely not a good idea to hand over the control of the DNS system to a third party. So we are definitely not in favor of reputational DNS.

And then the last point, I think Jian is going to talk about it as well, is that we have been discussing in the CENTR community recently is the issue of blocking. What is it? It's basically a government initiated process that would force ISPs or any third parties in the communication channels to block access to specific content, typically foreign content, through the DNS system. It would

provide the ISPs with a list of DNS addresses that cannot be accessed from that particular country. Why is it on our agenda? The European Commission has a proposal in the context of the fight against child pornography, and plenty of European member states have launched almost identical initiatives.

It's a problem because it's not scalable, it's a problem because it's not efficient, it's a problem because in some cases might be seen as a threat against the stability of the DNS system. It's a problem because it quite often lacks the judicial reviews that you would expect in a democratic society before content can be removed. And it undermines the trust in DNS, which is something I think we all care very much about.

What can we do about it? I think we should keep on talking about it to the government authorities and government employees, and CENTR will be drafting an issue paper that will help explain the issue to them, so feel free to contact me if you need it. And then the last point is we have our ccTLD news, obviously we're going to focus on Europe. If you're interested, send an email to my colleague Patrick. Thank you very much.

Lesley Cowley:

Okay. Thank you, Peter. Can I ask everyone to hold comments and questions until the last presenter? But if you can start thinking of them now that would be very much appreciated. On to Vika. Just to fill in space while that's going on, we had a security penetration test at Nominet recently, where we had USB sticks in the carpark put there by some contractors for us, to see if anyone

would pick them up and download them into their computer. If you did, you downloaded a virus that checked whether you were silly enough to plug in somebody else's USB, or one that you found in a carpark. No one plugged one in, thankfully. We had lots of email about "someone has found a USB stick, have you lost one?"

Vika Mpisane:

Thanks, Lesley. I want to make a quick presentation, I am here for Eric Akumiah, the manager for AfTLD. He is not here unfortunately, he got held up. This is an overview for the current membership for AfTLD, 43% of the African ccTLDs are members of AfTLD. We still have 57% to work on, but year after year we see an increase in our members, we also have associate members, as you can see them listed there, the list keeps on growing.

We have a couple of applications that come in, more than we expected for some of the registry players, we will not announce at this stage. In terms of what's been happening, or what we've been doing, we have been holding technical workshops in registry operations. The IROC cause took place in Nairobi the week before the Nairobi committee, and we also had AROC which is Advanced Registry Operations Cause taking place in Bamako, Mali, in late September, the week of the IGF, if anybody went to the IGF.

Then we also had the Secure Registry Operations Cause, which is the last leg of this training, set to take place in April next year, in Accra, Ghana. Our main sponsors for this cause, as you can see them listed there, AFNIC is one of them. (inaudible 0:10:57) registry, in fact they have an MOU with the AfTLD for us to

collaborate with them on some of this stuff. OIF and then Association of African Universities, those are just some of them. We also have ICANN, ISOC, NSRC as some of them.

There's an ongoing five year strategic plan that Eric is working on, and there are Working Groups, so if you a member of a TLD they focus on specific work areas. And then also are outreach activities that take place, particularly targeting the issues of diverse cities. Africa is at least four languages, international languages spoken; French and English being the most dominant, but we also have Portuguese and Spanish, so whatever the specific territory is working on is getting materials also in those languages, but that's an ongoing work.

We'll jump quickly, there's this .africa gTLD stuff, where the African Union has taken the lead on that one, which coincides with the MOU process that AfTLD is working on, we will be signing an MOU with the African Union, not really on .africa, but on internet issues. We've worked for a couple of years to get through to that stage and we are now close to it. We will have an MOU with (inaudible 0:12:23) and particular the African Union Commission, that we will sign an MOU with, and work on the issues of the internet and the domain name issues in particular in the African region, ranging from trademark issues to infrastructure issues. That gives us a good springboard in our attempts to get African governments to take their ccTLD seriously.

We're not pulling them, take charge of their ccTLDs, but we are pulling them to invest some resources and help the ccTLDs group. The rest of the strategic plan, this is what we are working on. Eric has been working on this one now, before the report to the AfTLD Board, I am one of the Board members, we also have in the house Paulos Nyirenda, from Malawi. He is also a Board member of AfTLD, and Souleymane Oumtanaga from the .ci, Cote d'Ivoire is also a director. I am also a director. So we are considering that for now, the strategic plan, and I think it's a three year strategy, and it's really tabled for discussion by our members in Accra in 2011.

We have our annual meeting in Accra, we've been having our meetings since 2006 and so far we are happy that we have not had to go back to the same contract to hold our annual meeting. Our target is to preserve the state in Africa before you get your next term. There's also a forecast now on an operation planned for next year that again, the work is what Eric is working on, sort of a short term what we're doing. Forecast and research is there, we'll try to focus on research. That will be finalized in due course. Also initiatives, these are more internal, the community of experts that Eric mobilized, people to assist in different areas of AfTLD.

Sometimes it gets requested by some of our members, or sometimes even potential members to come and assist them in different areas of registry management. So that's one of the things that we have people assisting us when it comes to technical development and all this stuff. (inaudible 0:14:42) building programs, the ROCs, the registry operation causes, and there will

be next year a DNSSEC, a detailed DNSSEC workshop that AfTLD will set up. I think in the next letter the date will be there. We'll also forecast on the policy workshop in the next year, we'll have two policy workshops.

In terms of strategic partnerships, we have existing MOU, memorandum of understanding – memorandi of understanding to be more correct, with AfriNIC, and also with AFNIC as I said early on. And then we have pending strategic partnership initiatives with the AAU, that's African Association of Universities, and the African Union, which I've already alluded to. OIF and then with our fellow regional TLD organizations we have specific collaborations; there will be one that we will conclude in this meeting for information sharing and then related activities.

AfriSPA is the African Association of Internet Service Providers in Africa, and the ATU; so those are a couple of partnership initiatives that we are working on. And Souleymane Oumtanaga is the director in charge of all this, so this is pretty much his work. Recent and upcoming activities; recently we were, as some will know already, we had our fourth annual African ccTLD event, in Nairobi. That REMPAR was presented by an initial registry operations cause training, AfTLD was at the African Internet summit in Kigali, Rwanda. In September we held the workshop in Bamako, as I said.

Upcoming events is our annual event in Accra, Ghana, next year in April. In fact, to be correct it is the second week of April in Accra,

Ghana. We have a DNSSEC workshop that I think will run over two or three days, during the African Internet Summit 2011, which will be in Dar es Salaam in Tanzania, and then we also have another policy workshop as well alongside the IGF in Nairobi. And then the IROC workshop, another (inaudible 0:17:01) will support the French and English trades late next year. Those are the contact emails for Eric. Thank you.

Lesley Cowley:

Thank you very much, Vika. Jian?

Jian Zhang:

Hello everybody, I am Jian from APTLD. I'm going to give a quick update on our recent activity we had in our AP region. I know you're hungry and tired by now, me too, I promise I won't bore you too much. I'm going to be focused on our last APTLD meeting in Jordan. We had our last meeting from October 30 to November 1, we had two full day meetings and one full day excursion to Jerash in between two day meetings. There is a special reason we did that kind of arrangement, I'm going to talk about that later on.

We did enjoy Jordanian hospitality, and wonderful Jordanian food. We had a lot of fun there; actually this picture shows Roman theater in Jerash. Jerash is a Roman ruins city like 40 minutes away from Amman, and we did take a group photo several years ago in our previous APTLD meeting, so this time we took a group photo at exactly the same place, and there is a possibility that the ICANN meeting next year in Asia is going to be held in Jordan.

I'm thinking maybe if that happened we could take a group photo of our ccNSO there.

Look at the happy faces we have there. The topic being discussed during the meeting, IDN is still a big topic in our region. Since 12 out of 15 dedicated IDNs so far are from our region, furthermore another 15 pending delegation, most of them from our region too, we did talk about registration policy and outstanding issues on IDNs like variant and the opening of single character IDN. We did have a session in this room yesterday on the opening of single character IDN.

Also the IDN/ccTLD membership is a big concern right now, in our region. We had more than 10 speakers who shared experience in that IDN session; (Andrey) from .ru was there. Right after he went back to Russia, their registration blasted off like a rocket, so it seems they were very inspired by our IDN session. So if you are doing IDN, do come to join us.

We also discussed the DNSSEC, and the security. From the quick survey during our meeting, there are only two ccTLDs deployed DNSSEC in our region, so there's still some work that needs to be done in that area. Also there's a new topic that has been discussed during the meeting; risk management of domain bills, is similar to CENTRs blocking topic. We did discuss how to handle the sensitive names and phishing. Also DNS blocking has been introduced; also the concerns on different blocking methods. We

did have discussion on that. I think there's opportunity, we could work with other regions on that topic in the future.

Also we talked about the risk and opportunities that new gTLDs will bring to our ccTLDs. And last we had the AROC registry operation training, thanks for the support from ICANN and ISOC, it was a really big success. We had more than 15 people from the region attended the training, which included the people from Inman, Syria, which we had never been able to reach them before. So it was a really nice outreach approach.

And last I am going to talk about the fun we had there. This is Jerash; as I mentioned before, there's a reason that we did the outing day and two days meeting, because we want to force everybody to go out together.

Our region is so broad and so diversified in terms of language, cultures, everything. So you can imagine diversity is good, but sometimes makes things really difficult, like communications and the cooperations, and sometimes we are way too serious and we work hard. So we decided to go out together to give everybody a chance to chat, to know each other better, and to make friends.

So that's why we went to Jerash. I couldn't see well – that's all happy faces there – so while CENTR is busy studying how to block somebody's website, and LATLD is concentrating on their marketing promotion, we're busy at dining, outing and have fun. So do come to join us, our next meeting will be February 17 and 18

in Hong Kong. We may have a cruise on the Hong Kong river, or we may have a firework over the (lactera) bay. So do come to join us, and thank you for your attention.

Lesley Cowley:

Thank you Jian, and volunteers for a ccNSO group? I think we may need a ccNSO Excursion Working Group. Okay, over to Erick from LACTLD, lastly but not leastly.

Erick Iriate Ahon:

Gracias, [speaks Spanish]. Welcome to Colombia, to Latin America, it is a Spanish speaking country, but I will try to speak in English. I use the same joke always, that my English is better than my Spanish. I will try to make a quick update of Latin American region. The first thing in this assembly, three days ago, so we have now 35 members, 27 ccTLDs and eight affiliate. Our next assembly will be in Cancun, you are invited to participate, in May. In May in Cancun, very nice place, very warm.

We will have a policies and regulatory workshop, in that assembly, you are invited. We have new staff in LACTLD, we incorporate three persons, technical officer and meet with this officer, that is who coordinates our booth at (inaudible 0:27:25), and the police officer who will be starting next year. With that, the best of LACTLD has increased the staff to have better service to our members and increase the proficiency of our institution. Part of that is our strategic plan. We have a four year strategic plan, we're in the final process to approve for the assembly. We have 24 priorities for the next years. Our last workshop from the last ICANN meeting was three. Our AROC workshop in Guatemala

will have 14 ccTLDs, more than 30 participants, the host was ccTLD.gt from Guatemala.

We have the support of ICANN, ISOC, and NSRC. Our fourth technical workshop was in Montevideo, it was focused on DNSSEC, Anycast, and EPP. We have 17 ccTLDs with more than 50 participants. In the past week we had here the Economic Aspect workshop. In the beginning of this workshop, we called it commercial aspects, but not all the ccTLDs feel that they have a commercial activity. They feel they have some activities related on some parts of the market, and need to change the commercial vision to more economic vision.

For example, one of the principle issues in execution was how do the funds of the ccTLDs in social responsibility for example, within the community. Also we're talking about vertical integration, we're talking about registry models. The workshop was in English and in Spanish, we have around 86 persons from 40 different organizations, ccTLDs, registrars, United Nation organizations like WIPO, ICANN and other institutions.

You can have access to all the presentations in that address. Our next workshop will be in February, in Nicaragua; probably in the Caribbean coast for Nicaragua. In May we have in Cancun, our political and regulatory workshop. In June we have the dispute resolution workshop with WIPO, in Costa Rica, maybe in the Pacific Coast. In September we have our technical workshop, in

November our Commercial aspects workshop. Sorry, that's my mistake, Economic aspects workshop.

We have now discussions for those workshops. We will have one of these in Havana, the other one in Belize. We don't know which one yet. And finally, the four regional organizations have advanced in our memorandum of understanding. This is our first step to try to make better bones between our organizations to collaborating and changing information related to ccTLD administration and operation, best practices among the members, global surveys and other mechanisms to sharing information.

This document has six principle activities; organize a quarterly conference call or in person meeting to exchange or plan the exchange of relevant information, share information about upcoming meetings and presentations, participate in each other's meetings as much as possible, collaborate on surveys. We tried this year to have a global survey, but we had some – it was not possible, but we decided to have this next year, the first worldwide picture taking the same survey to all of the ccTLDs around the world. Circulate among themselves information they might acquire, and jointly maintain a website, create together a website for the ccTLDs.

So part of this request, Ava – where are you? I would like to invite you to be witness to the signing of this document this month. This is the idea of the organization to serve better now.

Lesley Cowley:

Okay, while they are busy signing papers, thank you, Erick, for your presentation. It's a very significant moment I think, for that MOU to be signed, so well done to all concerned. Can I ask if there are any comments or questions for any of the panel? No comments about day trips? DNSSEC surveys? Okay, please join me in thanking the panel. Thank you. (applause)

Okay, before we move on to the lunch sponsor, Byron, if you will just get ready to do your lunch sponsor thing, we have a brief service announcement. Particularly given that our Chair is outside of the room, so this is secret for everyone in the room. As you may be aware, Chris will be standing down as the ccNSO Chair in San Francisco, in order that he can take up his post on the ICANN Board after that meeting. He has been the Chair of the ccNSO since 2003, which is almost eight years of unpaid and voluntary service to the community. I suspect he didn't realize when he took on the job how much time it would take of his.

We are going to be thanking him properly for his service in San Francisco, and we very much hope if we're able to give him a small present to mark that occasion. As is traditional, Gabby will be having a collection. If you are able to contribute, that would be very welcome. The suggested contribution is \$20 US, if you are able to afford that. More, of course, would be okay. And we're not going to have a contribution Working Group, but we will make a presentation to him and have a proper celebration and thank you to Chris in San Francisco. So any contributions, please, to Gabby in the meantime. Thank you.

Byron Holland: I see a USB key in the computer next to mine, and I'm never going to look at one the same. I guess the moral is no unprotected USB keys. I know that I'm the only thing separating you from lunch, and CIRA or .ca is the sponsor for lunch, so I'm going to keep it very short and sweet. Enjoy lunch!

[break]

Hiro Hotta: We have eleven Working Groups and most of them have updates to share from the ccNSO members meeting or in other open forums this week, so they may not need update in this session. Besides them what I have on my list is an ICANN-wide geographic regions Working Group update by David, an incident response Working Group update by Jörg. Any other updates necessary from Working Groups? No? If not, let me pass the microphone to David.

David Archbold: Thanks. Good afternoon, ladies and gentlemen. I was a relatively young man when I first attended ICANN and made the side-comment to Chris that I didn't understand why the .ky was in the European region, and he said "why don't you look at it?" Well, two Working Groups and five reports later I'm still looking at it, but we're getting there. There is light at the end of the tunnel, folks.

When I was asked to give an update originally I was told I had three minutes. So I said okay fine, no slides, I will just say we have an open public meeting Thursday, it's in room 161 which is on the floor below here, and it's at 10:00 to 11:00 on Thursday. I was also

going to tell you that the second of our three reports is out for public comment. There is a link from the agenda so that you can see it. Comments can be made up until the end of January. Please look at it and please let us have some comments.

In our first report we looked at where geographic regions were used throughout the ICANN organization. The second report looks at the reasons why they are being used and if we are achieving those results. The last report, which is the one we're about to work on now, is what shall we do about it? I've been given slightly more than three minutes, so I've just added a couple of the slides from that presentation and discussion we're going to have on Thursday, just as tempters, just as an idea of some of the things that we are going to be talking about.

Way back when, when Pontius was a pilot, geographic regions were defined as an aid to ensuring the broad international representation of the ICANN board. The makeup of the ICANN board should reflect the geographical and functional diversity of the internet. The procedures for appointing board members were to be sufficiently flexible to permit evolution to reflect changes in the constituency of internet stakeholders.

Now, if we look at the breakdown of users back in 2000 when that was said, that's what it looks like; the size of the users in each of the regions. See how it's changed to 2009? Which is the latest figures I happen to have. You see, going back, oh it wouldn't go back. There we go. That's 2000, that's 2009; quite a change. If you

look to the future, the red lines show the existing internet users and the green bits show the population, so in other words the potential users. So you can see in some of our existing regions, we've almost reached saturation point. So, North America's not going to change much in the next 5-10 years. Asia, Australia, Pacific has got miles to go. All I'm suggesting is that the changes are going to continue to be quite large.

Of course we haven't changed the makeup of the regions or the allocation of countries or representation on the ICANN board since 2000. So have we achieved the flexibility that reflects changes to the internet? That's just one of the questions that we will be looking at and addressing on Thursday.

Put another way, are ICANN's current geographical regions consistent with international norms, are there other structures equally or more consistent with international norms, would dynamic ad-hoc groupings be consistent with international norms? Do the present ICANN geographical regions and their use enhance or detract from ICANN's goal of reflecting the functional geographic and cultural diversity of the internet, at all levels of policy development and decision making? What changes, if any, could be made to better reflect the cultural diversity of the internet.

Those are some of the questions that we will be looking at and looking for feedback from you on Thursday. This is really where the rubber hits the road, and we will be recommending things that

could change and impact upon the ccNSO as well as other organizations, so please, we need your help. Thank you very much.

Hiro Hotta: Thank you, David. If you have questions right now, please - of course you can ask David on Thursday, but if you want now.

Male 2: Thank you, thank you, Dave, for an excellent overview of the issues. First remark is that it just struck me that especially the visceral overview that you gave would fit quite well into the more general governance debates as well. I don't think this is just an ICANN board issue, although that's the reason that you're doing it.

David Archbold: No, no, I wasn't suggesting it was.

Male 2: As a suggestion, if next year you want to go to Kenya and present it there I'm sure quite a lot of people would be interested in that evolution. Secondly - and I don't know if I'm speaking for other people in this room, as well, but for me it would be very helpful if we - and you probably have already done that, four years ago - if we could get again the overview of countries - or sorry, extensions that would be affected by any changes that might come from this process.

David Archbold: Yeah, you can see some of that on Thursday, but as the fundamental question of should we be changing the number of regions? Do we need regions in their present form at all? Should we be looking at ad-hoc groups so that if the islands in the Caribbean and the Pacific want to have a grouping, a special-

interest group, for small island states, why shouldn't they? If the Arab states wish to have an Arab special-interest group, why shouldn't they? Why are we tied to sort of arbitrary regions that were created when ICANN was first founded, that look as though they were based on our RR's? You know what I mean, I can't get it out. The regional Registries. It was a good idea at the time, but even that, as soon as they started moving to UN statistics it all got screwed up, basically.

Male 2: Where does dot ky get its IP ranges from?

David Archbold: Sorry?

Male 2: Do you get your IP ranges from Ripe? Or...

David Archbold: No, from-

[background conversation]

David Archbold: Yeah.

Male 2: Okay, thank you.

David Archbold: But that doesn't apply to the other Caribbean states, they're split.

Hiro Hotta: Alright thank you. Any other specific questions? No? Okay, thank you, David. Next update is from Jörg.

Jörg Schweiger:

So hello, everybody. My name is Jörg Schweiger, I'm currently chairing the Internet Response Working Group and I'm happy to give you a short update of the achievements that have been made in the recent days since Brussels. Just to remind you once again if you're not too familiar with the purpose of the Working Group, we are set to implement mechanisms of the engagement of ccTLDs and the interaction of ccTLD registries during incidents, and for sure these are just incidents that impact DNS. The scope of our Working Group was to set up a repository of ccTLD contacts and channels of communication for instant response.

As to this, we, in the first part of our working plan, define what we consider to be an incident, and if you're curious to find out what we came up with just look into the backup, because I do not want to go over that once again because you already have been presented with that in Brussels, for example. Then we did define what we think the use cases for this contact repository are. We, by the way, did not come up with any escalation procedures or actions paths.

The Working Group was tasked to do so but we felt that any escalation procedures or any action paths would have been so generic that they just wouldn't be of any use. So we skipped that. What we did do, we did define the repository data model to achieve the use cases and right now, in Cartagena we are up towards the implementation of this specified contact repository. There are a couple of decisions to be made at this stage; one would

be should we buy something or should we make a contact repository that is implemented solution.

The next question would be once we've got this contact repository, we've got to come up with suggestions on who would run that contact repository, who will actually maintain it and what would be the level of acceptable expenditure that would be covered by whom? By the way, what we did do in addition was to see into the discussions referring to - should I really use that word? Because I haven't heard it since Brussels - and that is the DNScert initiative that has been quoted or invented by ICANN.

Well, more into detail; make or buy decision for that contact repository. We basically came across two possible solutions, and I do have to admit that we didn't make a severe or detailed investigation on the market. What we did do was, well, two possible solutions just popped up. One was pick a clearing house, and we just haven't had the time to take a closer look into what a packet-clearing house might be offering, but what we did do was we looked into a tool that is called Trusted-Inter User, and this might be really interesting for the contact repository as it is already being used and is by the so-called CCERT, and CCERT is the international organization of computer emergency response teams, so that's quite familiar requirements that are behind the usage of this tool.

If you take a closer look at the tool you will see that it almost immediately would meet the requirements that are set up by the

contact repository by the data model and by the use case requirements. It might even be very easily adopted to some special requirements as basically just a browsing tool where you can glance through an alphabetical list of contacts. They do offer a secured, that is PGP email communication, and they do offer not only internet based communications and mechanisms but also those ones that are not based on the internet; namely they will provide us with voice communication and SMS.

In addition they would run their solution in two redundant data systems, data centers, so it's quite resilient, to put it in that way. Dark side of the moon is that there is sufficient cost incurred in that solution, and that is that each participant to be listed in this browsing tool would have to pay an annual fee of \$1,400 US and there is a one-time setup fee of \$1,300. Those would be the "buy solutions" for sure, one can think of implementing.

However let's move onto "make" the contact repository, and that might just be yet another browsing solution, for example, or it might just be a database solution where you can just easily read contacts and maintain them and renew your data.

[background conversation]

Alberto Perez:

...and the price you were quoting was the price to become a full member of the trusted-inter user, so I don't know if it's feasible, and I can try to contact through [Terena] to have access to the tool that they're using. So what are we talking about here? To become

another member of the Trusted-Inter User scheme? That means that you are a cert but you are not merely paying to be listed, you have to comply with certain requirements to be included. Or, something else would be to look at the tool they are using and see whether it is feasible to get it from them and fill it with our own internal information.

Jörg Schweiger:

Yep, basically that's exactly what I've been talking about; selecting this tool and custom it, or just make it work for the requirements that have been set up by the Working Group for this contact repository, and what I just try to resume is that trusted-inter user may very easily be adopted to these requirements or it might even already fulfill those requirements, okay?

Alberto Perez:

What I don't see is the point of - I mean we are paying that fee for our DCERT because we have one, but I don't see the point in getting the tool and paying the same annual fee that we are paying with a real CERT.

Jörg Schweiger:

Okay, no. I do understand your specific situation, and I do know that it's not only you, there are probably a couple of people in the room who are experiencing the same situation, right? This might just be a point of negotiation between the supplier of the tool and whoever is going to take the decision to take this tool or select another tool or whatsoever.

So I just want to make clear that there is a tool out there and that can easily be used. It's not set in this very point that this would be

the solution we would suggest or that this would be the solution that has already been decided for. Okay, Alberto? Okay, which brings me to the point that there are, in fact, some must have requirements we came up with, and those are functional as well as non-functional requirements. Those basic requirements, the Working Group found, and the upcoming tool must support for sure the envisioned use cases, it has to be high availability, high available, that is 24/7.

It not only has to provide us with communication channels using the internet but alternative communication channels as well, and one additional requirement would be that the data is kept up to date each and every time and second of the year. Anything else that you can think of that is definitely a must-have for this contact repository, just feel free to make right now or send me an email. Anyone right now? Okay.

Roy Adams:

Just to get back on this - my name is Roy Adams - just to get back on this tool Trusted-Inter User, it doesn't actually look like a tool, it looks like a service; a service for teams to be included in the repository of CCERT's, not a stand-alone tool where friendly incorporating ccTLD's can talk amongst themselves about instance, if that makes any sense.

Jörg Schweiger:

Meaning what? I just do not get the point. Still it would be a solution to be used for the contact repository, just to exchange information which is up to date on one hand, and which is available at each and every time. That is exactly what you want.

You want to make sure that you know whom to contact, when and where and with which means you should use. Basically, this is what Trusted-Inter User, to my knowledge, seems to be offering.

Roy Adams:

Just to make my point clear, the - what happens next, by using this tool for instance, we share the data not only amongst ourselves, we share the data - the contact repository data - when to contact them and how to contact them, with the entire CCERT community. As long as that's understandable, as long as that's a goal, then it's a proper tool.

Jörg Schweiger:

Now you're interfering with the interest of Alberto, so he was pointing to the - we can use this very tool for the both purposes. What you are currently saying is oops! If we do that in this way, then the community using those addresses would get larger than what we would probably have been envisioning before. I'm not saying that we should use this tool and I'm not saying that we could use it as-is. All I'm saying is that it's a really good baseline to set upon and it has to be specified in which way it's going to be used, if it's going to be used. For example, there are some objections concerning cost-wise.

Roy Adams:

Your observation is correct, my point is different from Alberto's.

Jörg Schweiger:

So now then, we already tackled a critical issue in that Working Group at this point in time I think, and this issue is that we feel further steps can't be taken by the Working Group on its own, on itself, and that is due to the fact that if, for example, we would

decide to use Trusted-Inter User, and we take that as an example, then for example concerning financial issues, one could come up with a question like who's covering those expenses?

Will those expenses be covered by ICANN for example, and ICANN would do it so completely. Would expenses be covered by a mode where I can pay some money and the participants listed on those tools are paying the other amount of money that is due. You can think of sponsoring models, you can think of fixed-price models and so forth. Basically this is the point where we came to the suggestion that we basically should pass along what we currently have because we couldn't decide on what financing, we couldn't decide on money that is beholden by ICANN or whomever. What the Working Group is proposing is that the ccNSO Council or ICANN is due to suggest and seek input from this community on how we should finance a service like that that has to be implemented.

We feel that the ccNSO Council and ICANN has to further task further examination and implementation of a contact repository that is clearly oriented at the data model that has been specified by the Working Group. The use cases are specified by the Working Group and the must-have requirements you have just been presented. Finally, it seems like if that is accepted there is no additional work to be done and that means that we could clearly close down the Incidence Response Working Group, and that will be it.

Hiro Hotta: Okay, any questions, any further questions? So, Jörg, as to your final points, is the Working Group going to suggest something to the ccNSO Council in writing in the next opportunity, or are you intending this to be the one?

Jörg Schweiger: This is in writing, isn't it? I know, I just don't know how the formal criteria looks and would you need anything in addition?

Chris Disspain: We can just turn this into the Council tomorrow, is that the idea? Okay, so we'll discuss it tomorrow.

Hiro Hotta: Okay. Okay, thank you, Jörg.

Chris Disspain: Okay, thank you very much, Hiro, thanks Jörg, and thanks, Dave, for your patience, wisdom and age. We're going to do delegation - no we're not - we're going to do IDN/PDP stuff now. I think we're starting with Russia, are we not? Who's doing that? So we're going to start with a presentation of the Russian experience of their IDN/ccTLD in the fast track. Irina is going to do that, so sit tight.

Irina Daniela: Thank you very much, Chris. Hello everybody, good afternoon. I'm Irina Daniela and I'm from the coordination center of internet - can you hear me like this? Okay, thank you. We are Russian Registry and we administrate two country code top-level domains, .ru and IDN .rf, which is newly launched. I spoke here yesterday, in this exact room, focusing mostly on the technical issues of the .rf launch experience, but today I will try to provide you more information on administrative and marketing issues.

Here is a very brief background, a history of our sunrise period, which started almost a year ago. We gave priority for the statusory and for the trademark owners. Initially cyrillic trademark owners and then we had to expand this category to all the other trademark owners who have non-cyrillic trademarks or combined trademarks. We also tried to draw all the categories that need to have priority, federal mass media, company name owners, and other special categories. These - our sunrise period ended in September, and during sunrise period we got 18,000 domains registered.

To be honest maybe not all of these are categories were choosed right, maybe we gave priority to too many categories because we definitely have gotten some headache about regarding some troubles and some funny stories, too. For example, mass media. We realized finally that it's not that difficult to register an electronic mass-media.

It's not a long process in Russia, so we got a lot of requests for domain names for the mass-media register. Maybe not to be a real media, not to be a newspaper and not to be a website, but just to get this domain name. As soon as our official board, which deals with the registering of mass media, got thousands of requests, much more than they usually get, and they send us a notification. So we had very quickly to review this rule and do some changes in our process.

Another story, and this is just a couple of our cases are what domain names are registered as a company name. It's not like how it sounds in Russia but it just gives a picture. So there. What we learned is that the creativity of our people have no limits. The conclusion is that you can't be good with everybody and maybe there is no sense even to try. From the very beginning of our .rf story, we were considering scenarios of how we would launch the open-registration, the period when everybody can get a domain name. Definitely this is not a thing that happens every year, so this is the important day and important process for everybody who is working on the domain market.

Our initial idea was to run a type auction, like the first day a domain came to purchase for ten million rubles, the second day for five million rubles, the third day for like 100,000 rubles, etc. We investigated this issue very deeply and actually developed the full set of documents describing that and finally decided that we will not do that because of a few reasons. There were a few concerns regarding the implementation on the paperwork around this process and regard also the anti-trust committee who voted for not doing that.

There was a saying on all sides, that like .rf was a national treasure and supported by the Russian government and President and that it should be equally accessible by all the people, so you can't sell it for ten million rubles, it should have a price which is affordable for the average citizen of Russia. So after we gave up this idea we were looking for other options of how to launch this open

registration. The main concern was that big volumes of the domain names might be purchased by the professionals at the market not by ordinary people so first of all, they will not be available for ordinary customers and secondary that big volumes of requests will definitely cause a significant registry database load.

So we are looking for different options, how can we manage these risks and how can we eliminate these concerns? Finally, at the end of September our board - which makes fundamental decisions on .ru/.rf domains approved the very simple scheme which included .rf price at the same level as .ru domain and in price for registrar it's about 2.3 dollars, but I mean the registrar price. And the registrar puts his own price for end-user cost. We also put some technical limitations to ensure the stable work of the registry database, and put - administered limitations and the purpose of these limitations was somehow to limit, again, limit purchasing of big volumes of domains for selling them. That was actually the main purpose.

Okay, the launch launched on November 11, at 12:00, and we were sitting, crossing our fingers, waiting first for news from our technicians and watching 40,000 domains first hour, 45,000 second hour, etc. etc. until we finally realized that okay, this registry database works good and stable. Domains are registered, nothing happened, at least it works great. So the first day we got more than 200,000 domain names and today we are - well, yesterday we crossed our 640,000.

Here's how it looks day by day, and again, we are getting 5,000 domains a day, currently. If we look at the distribution of domain names between organizations and individuals, we see that 66% of registrants are individuals, and it's more or less similar to what we see in .ru domain names. 44%, they figure on December 1st, and yesterday's figure was already at 46.5% of domain names are already legated, they are up and running.

We haven't done an analysis on what are these domain names used for, but the feeling is that most of them are definitely a redirect to the current websites existing in .ru. Especially because of the strong governmental support you can now almost every day read in the newspaper that okay, this state's already launched the Cyrillic website, or this newspaper or this TV channel have already - have now Cyrillic website.

So now the domain names which are up and running today, these are definitely the names of them. Cities which are used by city authority is the names of the newspapers, but there are also like (inaudible 0:40:31) and sometimes you can just see, okay, a one-page website thing that the webpage is under construction and here will be the website about the health, for example. This is just a couple of examples we have got almost 2,000 two-symbol domain names registered, and we have five 63 symbols -- domain names that long.

I have no idea who will use them and how. Probably we will check another day. Definitely this is successful story launch, and thank

you very much to everybody for the warm, warm words congratulating, but this is not only the success of us as a registry, but also the success of the whole idea and program and the Russian language and Russian country, but - however, not all the people are happy with the results of the open registration.

Since the very first day, we also are getting claims, and most of the claims are definitely regarding domain name registration, like AleutianAir. While discussing these rules, the approach taken by our organization and our Board was that the domain names should be registered for the end user and the customer. However, you know that there are popular names which everyone wants, like auto, or music, or job, there are a lot of them. There are a lot of people who would like to get these domains, and our approach was that this should be served on the first come first served principles.

It is what our rules state, but that didn't happen. What we got is that one of our biggest registrars, actually the biggest one, had purchased quotas from the other registrars, to get more domain names registered. The technical limit that we put, which I mentioned before, for 1800 domains was equal quotas for every registrar, to ensure that any of them, any of 20 had equal access to the registry database and had equal possibility to register domains for its customers. However, one of them used the quotas of the others and – for you, the left picture shows that centers purchased are registered during the first day.

34% of the domain names, but if we include the quotas of the other registrars that he used, we will see that this is 56% of all the domain names registered in the first day. And this is now the subject of anti-trust investigations, they have got claims from the customer and they started this investigation. We do not know the final result yet, it will be somewhere in the middle of December, so it's in the process now. The most bad thing is this 56% of domains is more than 100,000 domains. Most of them were not registered for the end user customer, but they were registered by the registrar to be domain names for himself. If you look in the WHOIS data, you'll see that registrar and registrant is the same company.

Registrar definitely can register domain for his own needs, for the professional needs of the company, but these domain names, a lot of them, at least 25,000 were registered for selling through the auction. So the idea of auction that was cancelled by us and by our Council during the pre-launch period, against the rule was implemented now by the registrar itself. We definitely see at least signs of malicious conduct and of broken rules, and we are investigating this case right now.

We are far from making final conclusions, but at least we consider this a very bad practice. So we put an additional announcement on our website and it is also in press and in mass media, warning the customers from participating in these auctions, and we are getting more and more complaints every day.

Well, another interesting story is about the stop list. Our rules state that words contradicting public interest, humanity, and morality principles, in particular unspeakable words, can't be used as domain names. It's good to have this rule, but how do you implement it? Actually the Russian language is very rich, and while there are only four basic roots, but they can be used in combination with a lot of prefaces and suffixes, and when we asked one of the biggest world authorities in the Russian unspeakable words for assistance, he tried to compile this list for us.

We found out that the potential quality of combinations counts like 5 million combinations. Well, so what we did as a temporary solution, we took a list from the internet, went through it manually, and put it in the database; at least to avoid these unspeakable words in their first ten. Not to have unpredictable word as a first registered domain. And definitely it's not a total solution of the problem, and we definitely have a lot of different variations in the list of domain name registered, but however this is what we implemented, and our plan actually is to create a team of experts who will be able to deal with this issue and do some judgment.

We, as the registry, definitely don't want to be a judge, so we want to include some experts in this decision making process. That's the plan. Well, there are a couple of technical challenges facing not only .rf but also other IDNs currently and the number one as we see is email issues, because currently the email address, using Cyrillic domain, looks like this, so it cannot be totally Cyrillic, and

it's not only like an email software issue, but it has to do also with keyboard issue. The at sign on Russian keyboards are only in English, and when you switch to Russian letters, there is no at sign. Somehow it must be changed also on the keyboards, while the second issue is with the search engines.

Today there is only one Russian based search engine, which has probably 10% of Russian market, which provides you search results as a search result in Cyrillic domain names; the others do not. This is really important for the success of IDNs, because that's about the customer experience, and what people feel using IDNs. I think they will feel comfortable if they will be able to do easily what they were used to do with ASCII domain names, then it will be okay and the IDNs will be even more successful than today. Okay, that's all that I have. Thank you very much, and if you have any questions, they are welcome.

Chris Disspain:

Do we have any questions? Young-Eum? I'm reminded of the glorious domain name in Australia which is a company that owns a pen shop in Queensland, and the name of the pen shop is Pen Island. Yes. Work it out.

Juhani Juselius:

You said that you had sunrise period for the governmental and the trademark names. Did you think about renting an advantageous – giving the .ru, existing .ru registrants some favorite status?

Irina Daniela:

No, we decided not to do that, and there are two reasons. First is there is no IDNs in .ru, so all the .ru websites are ASCII. They are

written in Latin characters, and actually two corresponding letters between Cyrillic and Latin make this transition. Sometimes it's easy, but sometimes it's very difficult. For example, like borsch, is Russian, it can be written in Latin letter eight or nine different ways, so we decided not to do that.

Chris Disspain: Anyone else? Yes, over there?

Young-Eum Lee: Thank you for your presentation. My name is Young-Eum Lee from Korea. I want to ask you about how much the traffic of the name resolution comparing to .ru for – I don't know how you call it, the same is in Russian, right? Ru, right?

Irina Daniela: Traffic to?

Young-Eum Lee: Name resolution, the reason I'm asking that, is two or three years ago, we opened up the Korean name, .kr. We got lots of registration, but actually the resolution traffic is less than 5% compared to English name .kr. So we are going to introduce the .korean, (.hongo), probably only next year, but we're not sure about how well the domain names will be used, so I just want to know how Russian people really utilize your Russian name domain names.

Irina Daniela: Well, I'm not ready to answer yet because I don't have this statistic currently. I have some figures on WHOIS query requests, but we can just keep in touch and I will find it out for you.

Male 2: Maybe the same kind of question as Young-Eum Lee, do you have such status as how many percentage of the domain names have their unique web pages and how many are redirected to existing pages?

Irina Daniela: Not yet, this investigation is in our plan, and we will run it in the next few months. Just three weeks past, but we're really busy with other issues. But the feeling is that they are mostly redirects, because it's just too early to have regional websites on these pages.

Female: My question is actually an extension of that. Even if you don't have specific figures, did you see any type of increase in resolution requests since you've launched the Cyrillic?

Irina Daniela: We see a lot of increase in the DNS queries, in the WHOIS queries.

Female: Do you have an approximate figure?

Irina Daniela: No.

Chris Disspain: Okay, I think we're finished.

Irina Daniela: Thank you very much.

Chris Disspain: Irina, thank you very much. Okay the next bit of our IDN/ccTLD festival is Hiro, who chairs the second IDN Working Group which is the structure IDN Working Group; the Working Group that's

looking at structural issues for the ccNSO that come with the introduction of IDN's membership structure and so on. Hiro will present the report from that Working Group. One minute joke, okay. See, you just can't think of one when somebody asks you to do that, it's just not possible.

Hiro Hotta:

Okay, thank you, Chris. This is our first report to the members - the ccNSO members meeting about the IDN ccPDP Working Group too, which is about the inclusion of IDN/ccTLD's in the ccNSO. The Working Group's purpose is to report on changes to article 9 annex C on accessing the ICANN bylaws to include IDN/ccTLDs of who members in the ccNSO equal footing as the current members. It means that the structure of ccNSO in the era of having IDN/ccTLD's as its members. So issue report is here and interim report was published around ten days ago.

The Working Group's members are here, from various regions, and the Working Group identified potential issues such as, the first one is, membership definition, and the second one is roles of members and the third is eligibility and selection of councilors to the ccNSO Council and initiation of PDP and voting, and the third one is quorum for voting and the scope of PDP as defined in annex C. So these are the issues identified by the Working Group, so I'm going to explain one by one.

The first one is membership definition and qualifications to be a member of ccNSO. The current bylaw says that a ccTLD manager is the organization or entity responsible for managing them.

(inaudible 0:59:52) country code top-level domain; and the ccNSO shall consist of ccTLD managers that have agreed in writing to be members of the ccNSO, and this means that an organization managing ccTLD is not regarded as a ccTLD manager by the current bylaws because it says that the ccTLD manager should manage the ISO 3160 country code.

Therefore an organization managing ccTLD is not qualified to be a ccNSO member but when IDN/ccTLD's are coming - we already have some - so we have to solve this. The solutions faced is, first, the basic principle is IDN/ccTLD managers should be a ccTLD manager. So change should be given to the bylaws so that the managers of IDN/ccTLD's are regarded as ccTLD managers and qualify as ccNSO members. This means that the bylaws should be changed to accept IDN/ccTLD managers as ccNSO managers.

Second, A, is about eligibility and selection of ccNSO councilors. Potential issues is the current bylaw says about no requirements to qualify as a potential councilor, anybody can be a potential councilor and any ccNSO member may nominate and/or second a potential councilor. A candidate needs to be nominated by a ccNSO member and seconded by another member from the same region. This is what the current bylaws said. Therefore, for example, if one ASCII ccTLD and the five IDN/ccTLD's are delegated in the same territory, so six ccTLD's are in the same territory, that territory can nominate and second three councilors in the geographic region.

One, just one territory can nominate three because one nominates one and the one second the same person, so if we have six members in that territory, then three can nominate and second three councilors. This means that even three individuals residing on one territory can be candidates at the same time if ccTLD managers in the territory behave so. If all the six ccTLD managers behave to have three candidates from that territory they can do so. I don't know if this is good or not but solution space may be, the alternative one is just one councilor for one territory. Maybe this is a good - for example, candidate with the highest vote among the candidates in the territory wins, and the second alternative is voting can solve issue eventually after the voting if the principle only one vote per territory is safe-guarded.

If more than one nomination or second comes from one territory. I'll talk about the voting later and come back to this point. Initiation of PDP, the current bylaws says that the ccPDP can be initiated by at least ten members of the ccNSO therefore it's becoming easier to initiate PDPs because we are going to have - we already have some IDN/ccTLDs and we are going to have more so it's becoming easier, because just ten is becoming a smaller percentage of all of the members. Territories with more ccNSO members have more power and influence in initiating PDPs, right, so this means that just one territory, if it has ten or more ccNSO members can initiate a PDP.

So solution space, the Working Group listed four alternatives here. One, replace the number ten by minimum percentage of the ccNSO

members, or two, introduce a ceiling on the number of managers from one territory. Three, ten members should be associated with different territories. Four, leaving ASCII TLDs. Now, voting; I think I have three pages for voting, because it's the most important one for us. The bylaws says that up to one ccNSO member per territory. We have only ASCII ccTLDs so an ASCII ccTLD manager can be a ccNSO member, this is what it is. One vote per ccNSO member, so the conclusion is one vote per territory, okay. This is what we have in the current bylaws. In the ASCII-only ccTLD era, so therefore inclusion of IDN/ccTLD managers and ccNSO members would shift the balance of one vote per territory, which might be envisioned at the time of ccNSO creation.

If one territory, in this case the territory can mean the country or territory, if one territory had ten IDN/ccTLDs and if they can vote - each ccTLD manager can vote, can cast one vote, the territory can cast ten votes or eleven votes, including the ASCII, so basic assumption if we have this kind of misconception IDN/ccTLDs and ASCII ccTLD managers should be treated equally. This implication as the IDN and ASCII ccTLD manager team, the territories should have equal voting rights, at least at the level of ccNSO. I don't know locally how they are weighed, but from the view of the ccNSO IDN/ccTLDs and ASCII should be treated equally.

So the solution space may be where more than one ccNSO member from a territory take part in voting their collective vote counts as one. For example, for any voting members from the same territory,

each member gets one divided by m vote. This is the first alternative. The second is consider each organization managing ccTLDs as a unit of membership of the ccNSO, having equal voting rights. So if multiple ccTLDs in a territory have the same manager it currently - many of the IDN/ccTLD managers are the same as the ASCII ccTLD manager within each country or territory. Then that manager is considered one member of the ccNSO. So if the territories have different managers there will be two equal members.

For example, in Egypt the ASCII ccTLD manager and the IDN/ccTLD managers are different, so they have two members. This solution is the chain of the membership definition. The third one, where a territory has two or more ccTLD managers who are members of the ccNSO, one of those is designated as the representative of the territory for voting in the ccNSO. That just means that in a country or territory which has two or more members, one of them is appointed as representative of the territory in voting.

It's a matter for the members in the territory to designate one member as representative and that if it cannot be agreed in territory, whether it's too hard to agree, then some sort of resolution, such as rotation is put in place. The fourth alternative is all acting IDN/ccTLDs are treated as having equal voting rights. This may cause a problem because many IDN/ccTLDs - if a territory has many IDN/ccTLDs that territory has many voting rights, more voting rights than a smaller number of IDN/ccTLDs

territory. So for this point the Working Group has a preferred alternative, which is one vote per territory.

We have to stick one vote per territory, that's the Working Group's consensus, and this can be achieved either through appointing one representative for all members from that territory or one divided by m - for member - vote for territories and members. Appointing one representative may make may take time, that's a tradition that needs to be in place for the duration of the local appointment process and dividing the votes into one over n may impact the results and what it represents. This is not easy to understand. I have 0.2 votes and you have 0.25 votes and combined votes, what does it mean? To solve this, our staged voting process may resolve the issue of combining votes. First, the votes per territory are counted to determine the vote for that territory. So the territory should have a combined vote, which says yes or no.

Not 30% yes, 70% no, that's indecisive. Territories should decide whether it says yes or no, definitely. And secondly the votes are counted on pro-territory base, as usual. So here, we said that the voting Council is the issue, the bottom line. If we have only one vote per territory basis, the eligibility of selection can be solved in the same way. And the quota, the current bylaws says that 50% or 60%, 66% or something, which is counted by the ccNSO members as a unit, so in this case, inclusion of IDN/ccTLD managers as members would go against the concept of equal rights for territories.

Of course equal rights of members, but it's against the equal rights of territories. The solution space is if the principle of one vote per territory, then basically the same solution can be achieved for this also. And scope of PDP; the current bylaws says that scope of conduct of PDPs are limited, and defined when ccTLD was ASCII only. Therefore, we need to see, we need to check if there are particular characteristics of IDN/ccTLDs for ICANN's role vis a vis the IDN/ccTLDs which would require the development of specific IDN/ccTLD policy.

The solution space, so far the Working Group found no such point to widen the scope of the PDP. Because IDN/ccTLDs and ASCII ccTLDs should be treated similarly, and no special arrangement regarding positive (inaudible 1:16:12) for IDN/ccTLDs should be introduced, consequently the Working Group believes that the scope of PDP does not need to be adjusted to include IDN/ccTLDs in the ccNSO.

So these are the points, this is a point regarding Councils direction, the ccNSO Council direction, which would be discussed in the ccNSO Council tomorrow, which is about the scope of the Working Group. In the course of the Working Group discussion, for example, one of the issues identified by the Working Group is a membership voting mechanism, on the other hand, the Working Group found that ccNSO rules and guidelines include the procedure relating to membership votes, which may need to be adjusted to the proposed revision of ICANN bylaws.

However, I got into that charter, the scope of the IDN Working Group 2 is to focus on the bylaws, so if needed, at the direction of the ccNSO Council, the Working Group will further look into those guidelines as well, and propose changes to rules and guidelines along with recommendations on the IDN ccPDP, by broadening the scope of the Working Group. It depends on the Council's decision tomorrow. And this is the final page.

Comments from you all, the IDN PDP Working Group to final interim report was published on 22 November. This was my birthday. We had two months public comment period. Especially are all topics and uses identified? If not, which topics should be included? And should other alternatives be added to reserve and identified? What is solution, if any? And we need your input. So give us your comments in this session, or to any Working Group members. Or send comments to this address. Thank you, that's all.

Chris Disspain:

Thank you, Hiro. It's complicated, huh? Thank you. Are there any questions at this point on that? Dave – if he says it's something about geographic regions, I'm going to kill him. Yes, Dave?

Dave Archbold:

Just a comment, there is a little bit of intersection here between two Working Groups, and I'm talking about the regions one, but I don't want to presume to say what our final Working Group recommendations will be, or indeed what the Board will do with those recommendations, but if I were a betting man, I would say that it is likely that the Board wouldn't presume to dictate to organizations such as the ccNSO how they organize their regions.

But there is a good chance that they may encourage such organizations to adopt as flexible a view as possible. So if Council were to look at the whole issue of voting within the ccNSO, I would encourage them to think out of the box, and not necessarily stick to the present method of voting. Like could Council adopt a view more like is done with the Board, where the question of diversity is looked at Board level rather than trying to do it by constituency.

Chris Disspain:

Sure, the regional aspects are relevant only in certain circumstances. They're relevant for Council seats, because currently the Council is regionally divided. So three from each and then the NomCom. If the number of regions were to increase, for example, just to take that simple example, then we would have to make a consequent change to our bylaws, and that would mean a consequent change to either the number of Councilors or the spread of Councilors across the various new regions. So that's one aspect of it. But other than that, regional voting, that only comes into play – it doesn't come into play all that often, I think. What did you have in mind, Dave?

Dave Archbold:

At the moment, each region is its own constituency.

Chris Disspain:

Only in the case of – only really in the sense of Councils. Not in any other sense.

Dave Archbold:

Yes, only in the sense of Councils.

Chris Disspain:

And I think that would be – given that the community, here in the ccNSO, given that the community itself has regional organizations, with one exception, which are totally independent of ICANN, totally independent of the ccNSO, that lends itself to a continuation, to some extent, of that regional focus.

I'm not saying that it's not possible to think outside of those, but my concern would be more that if timing works that we get to this before we get to the region thing, then we just need to make sure that our changes are scalable, so that we don't make changes and then have to go back and make more changes to the same thing. But accepting that if we were to be in a circumstance where – what I suppose I'm saying is that if ICANN's – if the geographic regions Working Group was to recommend that there be no regions, for example, and that – and ICANN said to the SO, "If you choose to ditch the regions as a concept in your management of the ccNSO, you're free to do so."

I suspect that we, at least initially, would say "No, we're actually quite comfortable with the regions." It's an easy split for us, but right now we actually have no choice because the bylaw is clear that that's the regions. Does that make any sense at all in where you were headed?

Dave Archbold:

All I was doing was putting a marker down, that if we're looking at voting we should keep our options open.

Chris Disspain: Right, absolutely no problem. Yes, Bart?

Bart Boswinkle: The level – the Working Group looked at voting was at the level of what will happen for individual ccNSO members? How they're spread across the ccNSO, whether over regions and everything else was not looked at, so it's only on a per member basis and what will change. So what we mean by territory here is say you've got the basics of one member currently per territory, and that will change. And what is the impact on the bylaws? That's all.

Chris Disspain: Absolutely, I understand completely. In an ideal world, we would have the results of both of these at the same time, and then we'd be able to deal with the consequent changes. Maybe that will happen, because we don't know how long this is going to take. We know you'll take at least another three or four years, but we may in fact – Yes, Bart?

Bart Boswinkle: There is one aspect that I think you mentioned it which is not taken into consideration, which might change some of these alternatives, is how to deal with variants. If they will be delegated, if not –

Chris Disspain: Don't – don't – any more.

Bart Boswinkle: So we have to wait – this Working Group has to wait quite some time now before the first Working Group comes up with a recommendation on the variant management stuff before they can take that into consideration.

Chris Disspain: Okay, so look. This is obviously important – no, you go ahead Giovanni. Carry on, please, Giovanni.

Giovanni Seppia: I just wanted to thank Hiro and Bart because they guided the Working Groups through a not easy process at all, and especially because of the interdependency with the other Working Group and the difficulties in the bylaws, so thanks a lot, really great work.

Chris Disspain: Thank you, Giovanni. What? I wasn't thanking him on your behalf, I was thanking him on my behalf. It's getting late. Look, this is important and we're not going to have a massive discussion about it this afternoon obviously, but it's important. We need to make sure that members look at this, because this is key core structure stuff that we need to work through. Those of us who have been around since the beginning know how difficult it was to get these things agreed in the first place.

So any changes that are as least disruptive as possible are great. So things like maintaining one vote per territory, and etc., is all good. Annabeth?

Annabeth Lange: I have a question actually, because I find this really confusing, it's difficult. But in the Europe region, France has a lot of ccTLDs in ASCII, we have three, but we have one vote in CENTR, and in ccNSO. It's a pure accident in a way, from the beginning, who got more ccTLDs than the others, and it has nothing to do with the size of the country, because that's all of the ISOC list, when they established these things. And now, it's also part of an accident

which countries have different scripts and those who only have ASCII in their script, they will remain with one ccTLD.

Chris Disspain: At the moment, yes. We're just trying to protect the status quo, really.

Annabeth Lange: So this should also be a point in the discussion.

Chris Disspain: Absolutely. Sorry, you go ahead.

Male 2: If you look at the progress, or the interim report, this is one of the topics that has been identified, in the sense of what Hiro said, some of the IDN/ccTLDs and the ASCII ccTLDs are run by the same operator. Now, if the ASCII ccTLD is already a member, the question is do all rights and obligation apply to the ccTLD manager for both? In your case, if they apply for them both, the next step is what is happening, say in this case, with Norway and the other cases is AFNIC. Should you apply the same rule?

Because if you think it through, there is one very important section in the bylaws, and that is does a policy apply to the member? Now, you have the weird situation that say if you run more than one ccTLD, whether it's IDN/ccTLD or ASCII ccTLD, and only one is member, should the policy apply to the non-members as well? Although the entity itself is member, and that's one of the ambiguities that -

Annabeth Lange: Right, that's why this is really complicated.

Chris Disspain:

It's very complicated. You could also end up with the absolutely fascinating circumstance where because of cultural challenges around a language or a script, the ccTLD operator of the ASCII would be prepared to be bound by a policy, but the same ccTLD operator operating a non-ASCII one couldn't be, because of the cultural problems. It's immensely complicated, but you've got to start somewhere. How do you eat an elephant? One bit at a time.

It's getting late and we're tired and we have dinner. So I don't want to go too much longer. I want to do a couple of quick things on the IDN PDP stuff. The first one is that we're going well on the other side, on the policy side, we're going as well as can be expected. We have one major thing, which is variants, it keeps coming back and back and back, and none of us has the foggiest idea what a variant is and what we should do about it. We are working on a cunning plan to try and deal with this. We're going to try and set up a Technical Advisory Group which is basically going to be Patrick Hosein, because he's the only techie who speaks non-techie. Ram wants to be involved in a couple of others, so we're going to try and do that and see if we can get clear on variants.

Secondly, Hiro's point about asking the Council is the Working Group two should consider the rules and procedures, I suspect very much the Council will say yes, there's no point in doing just the bylaws, you may as well do the rules and procedures. Thirdly, Bart and I have sent a paper to the Working Group dealing with the

country names. It's probably best, Bart, if you briefly explain. You want me to just read this out? Okay, let me just read this out so it can make sense.

As the scope of the IDN ccPDP is limited to country and territory names in official or designated languages which contain at least one non-ASCII character, the following alternative actions, which are outside the scope of the PDP may be considered to resolve the issues. The issues being the use of names of countries and territories listed on the ISO 3166 list. We could initiate a new PDP on the use of country names, which would require the current resolution under the new gTLD process to remain in force until the recommendations of that PDP have been implemented. So we could do that. This is all about the discussion we had in the GAC today, about geographic country names. We could extend the reservation of blocking of country and territory names under new gTLDs indefinitely, or we could do nothing.

Basically what we're going to do is send it up to Council saying "Do you want us to – what action do you want us to take in respect to this?" There's an argument for saying that if we launch the PDP on the country names, then that would have the effect of blocking their use elsewhere. The problem is that that is incredibly complicated and difficult time consuming thing to do. So we really don't know where we are with this, so the Council is going to talk about – have we got this on the agenda for tomorrow? Right, okay.

Bart Boswinkle:

Maybe that was clear from this afternoon's discussion, the more you look into it, the more you see there are very, very weird cases. Today's discussion focused on the use of Holland as a meaningful representation of the Netherlands. That's one question. Another one is, for instance, Annabeth's example, the use of Norvage, which is French for Norway. That is – Norvage includes a non-ASCII letter, so – but it's outside the scope of the PDP because it's a non-designated language.

A third one is in fact because .rf and Cyrillic got delegated, what is going to happen with Russia in Cyrillic? Is it open now for the new gTLDs? Do the new gTLDs apply? Should we consider under the PDP reservation or something else? So you see, the more you look at it, for all these different cases, you might end up with different solutions. So there is no solution that fits all.

Chris Disspain:

That's right, that's right. So the simple argument, if people were sensible and listened to me, and just did what I say it would all be fine. The simple argument is that what you should be able to do is simply say 'country names or meaningful representations of countries are placed in a reserved pool and that's it.' If the IDN ccPDP should decide that a country is entitled to more than one IDN PDP per language, which right now they're not, if we were to decide that they are, then Russia would be available for Russia, obviously, in Cyrillic, because they would be allowed to have more than one in Cyrillic.

If we decide that it's not available because they're only allowed to have one, then it should stay reserved. Now, the challenge with that, as we know, is that some governments would say "Actually, no we don't want it to be reserved because we might want it as a gTLD." Anyway, we've been around this God knows how many times and we don't seem to be getting anywhere with the Board. If any of you have friends and relatives in the GNSO, talk to them and tell them to say it's all okay. And if you know your government person, you're government person is here and you're unclear what their position is, go and talk to them, and get them clear.

The problem is sort of solved at the moment, in the sense that right now country names, short form and long form country names on the list in the five UN languages are blocked in this round. That's good. That's really good, but it's not actually enough. The only other thing I wanted to do before we packed up is this. Now there is currently an IDN review going on, an IDN fast track staff implementation review going on. It's out for comment, and we need to look at this. There's nothing much in there that's really a problem, but this. Let me just get the other microphone and I'll read it.

So this is about IDN tables, and currently the situation is that you launch an IDN table when you apply for your IDN/ccTLD, or you can rely on somebody else's. Right? So if there's one there already, you can say "Annabeth's table is fine, I'll use that." What is does is, historically the content of tables has not been evaluated

and approved in any way by ICANN. This includes the IDN tables provided in the fast track process.

Staff does review the received tables in a very limited capacity and only in relation to, for example, obvious errors and to what extent the tables fulfill the requirements. However, there has been discussion in the community that requesters should send in or refer to other IDN tables that have already passed through the system, and in that way their lack of a table will not delay the processing of the IND ccTLD request.

In other words, if you want your Cyrillic name, you can refer to Russia's table, right? Such behavior opens the discussion of whether there should be better or other types of checks in place to review the received IDN tables. I'm not quite sure what the link is there, because I don't see how that behavior does lead to that conclusion, but anyway. The responsibility for serving the community in the best possible way and the most secure way by having measures in place for these IDN tables, including sufficient variant identification registration rules; which is intended to avoid user confusion, blah blah blah, is a priority responsibility of the TLD registry. That is true.

The question is, as we open up for more IDNs at the top level, should additional rules be in place? In other words, should ICANN vet your language table/ approve your language table/ create a whole new process for checking the language tables are okay. Does anybody here think they should? Cool. So we need to

go back to the bar and tell them to go away. Alright? Handled, happy? Good. No one wants to say anything? Pretty clear.

The question was do we think that ICANN should be approving language tables, to which I feel the answer is no. It's the responsibility of the TLD registry, right? I mean, ICANN gets the language table, and as this says, they do a couple of checks just to make sure there aren't any obvious errors and so on and so forth, and that's perfectly fine. We don't have any problem with that, but the concept that there would be a process to put additional rules in place, which effectively means that ICANN gets to approve/not approve a language table is – that's a no, isn't it? We don't want them to do that. So I've got Peter and then Annabeth and then Mohamed. See, I knew if I stood here long enough, somebody would ask a question.

Mohamed El Bashir: No, indeed, I do not think that ICANN should decide on which - on a table, but I think they should definitely encourage language groups to come up with one table.

Chris Disspain: Oh, absolutely.

Mohamed El Bashir: And that should probably be made more clear because it's like the problem where you have one watch, you always know what time it is. If you have two watches, unless they are identically running, which never happens, you have no clue what time it is.

Chris Disspain: You don't even have wrists, either.

Mohamed El Bashir: So the same thing with the tables. I think they explained the problem technically yesterday during that late session. There are so many mismatches between the tables that are being sent in that nobody knows which one to trust. So there is an issue in probably making sure that they work it out amongst themselves.

Chris Disspain: I don't understand why there's an issue if I'm using my table for my Cyrillic TLD, and you're using your table for your Cyrillic TLD, it doesn't matter because they're two separate tables. Now, in an ideal world the Arab script would have one table, I agree, and the Cyrillic script would have one table, I agree, in an ideal world. But if you remember back to the discussions that we had before the Fast Track, the Arab states were very clear that whilst they were committed to having an Arabic script table, it was going to take a very long time and in the meantime - they would talk to each other and cooperate - but they should each come up with their own language table.

So I'm not sure that we're being accurately briefed here, but I do agree with you that the encouragement is very important. That has always been there but that should maybe be said some more. Annabeth?

Annabeth Lange: It's actually not about this one, I've just got a message from the other room Kurt Pritz has officially now said that they change the AG to will comply for the post-delegation. Court ordered.

Chris Disspain: Good, excellent. Well that's marvelous. I don't actually think they had any choice, frankly, but that's a different issue. Yes?

Mohamed El Bashir: I think, approve is not the word, but we need to see IANA have more control on the IDN tables submitted to the IDN repository. It could create confusion, especially when you have a registry submitting lots of different language tables, so that's really clear. But it's not a really clear mechanism so we need more control on that for that tool to be useful.

Chris Disspain: Bart.

Bart Boswinkle: I'd like to say too, that my understanding with regard to the current rules for the repository of IDN tables that both ccTLDs and ASCII ccTLDs can submit IDN tables. This one is specifically for the IDN table for the IDN/ccTLD itself, so there is this link. So what is weird, in my case that's why this isn't included in the review of the Fast Track process, but it's more a general problem on the use and the rules of the IANA IDN table repository.

Mohamed El Bashir: If it's for the Fast Track I think at least a check could be useful, I mean a linguist I think could do that check for the Fast Track, definitely.

Chris Disspain: Okay, yeah, got it? Okay, yes, Jian? Hang on, hang on.

Jian Zhang: May I ask a question not IDN-related?

Chris Disspain: Of course.

Jian Zhang: Variants.

Chris Disspain: No, I'm not going to talk about variants, it's too complicated. What would you like to know?

Jian Zhang: I know. My question is very simple. You know JAS is publishing the initial report on variants and as you mentioned IDN and PDP Working Groups, one is going to talk about variants, right?

Chris Disspain: Yes.

Jian Zhang: So what - basically my question is I don't know how it should work...I mean once we finish our final report on variants, we're going to take it back to our Council?

Chris Disspain: Yes.

Jian Zhang: What's next after that?

Chris Disspain: Don't know, depends.

Jian Zhang: Shall we wait until IDN/PDP Working Group have the conclusion on variants?

Chris Disspain: No, because there are different levels of detail that need to be gone into, so the JIG is very much a sort of over-arching, looking into

things that matter to both, right, and that's very valuable and useful. That then comes back to the Council and that then feeds into the IDN/PDP and we will then use that to continue the work of the specific IDN/ccTLD variance issue. Because there are different circumstances that apply in the ccTLD scenario because of overarching requirements, such as meaningfulness and so on and so forth. It's not just a technical answer, it's also a political and a policy answer. So we need to take that and put it into the PDP so you shouldn't wait, you should finish.

Jian Zhang: So not until we finish the PDP process, any policy on variants wouldn't be...

Chris Disspain: I don't want to - I don't know, I mean it's up to the Council, but I suspect the Council will say let's wait, let's go through the PDP to come up with any policy on variants, because I think the two things are so inter-connected it's quite hard to see how you could not do that. But it's up to the Council.

Jian Zhang: Okay, and also, the same question applied to single-character openers.

Chris Disspain: I think that's different because single-character is not a launch - there's no issue on policy with single-characters, it's either meaningful or it's not. If it's a single-character that's meaningful and it's allowed then it's allowed, if it's a single character that's not meaningful then it's not allowed anyway.

Jian Zhang: There is a recommendation in the final report on single-character IDN.

Chris Disspain: Yes.

Jian Zhang: Because we, if that's adopted, we need to change Fast Track policy.

Chris Disspain: Oh, sure, sure, sure, but Fast Track is not policy so it can be changed.

Bart Boswinkle: And the...say the conclusion of the JIG on the introduction of single-character, TLD's could be included in the PDP as well because the only real outcome of that Working Group that's relevant is currently the restriction is to one or to two characters that should be lessened to one.

Chris Disspain: Yeah, so basically you just need to finish whenever you finish doing what you're doing, whenever you finish the JIG, just send it to the Council, obviously, and we'll work out what to do next. But I don't know - I don't have a straight answer for your question right now.

Jian Zhang: Okay. Thanks.

Chris Disspain: Okay, one more thing. As is Gabby's constant refrain, she sent out an email to the list, to a survey on how today's gone. If you could please fill it out, we would be grateful. It's one of the ways we find

out how to make changes and things. The buses are going to dinner from the Hilton at 7:00 - sorry 7:15, and also from here, if anybody want to hang around. Also at 7:15. Yes, okay. We will be reconvening at 9:00 tomorrow morning, but the councilors...any councilors in the room? You have breakfast with the board tomorrow morning at 8:00, somewhere, here? Expo 1, downstairs. Thanks very much everybody, see you later.

[End of Transcript]