
DURBAN – ccNSO Members Meeting Day 2
Wednesday, July 17, 2013 – 09:00 to 15:300
ICANN – Durban, South Africa

LESLEY COWLEY:

Okay. So good morning everybody. Welcome to day two of the ccNSO. Let me just check with my recording guy at the back, yes we're on. Thank you. It must have been a good celebration because I notice we're missing a few people this morning.

And I do have some people to thank for helping us with that celebration, but I'll do that later when a few more people have joined us. So, our program for today, we're going to begin with security through cooperation. And at 10:00 we will be joined by our ccNSO Board members, prior to coffee at quarter to 11.

At 11, we're going to go into our every popular ccTLD news session, followed by the regional organization updates, and then we have lunch at one. Unfortunately we don't have a lunch sponsor, I think we used all the sponsorship up for the celebration evening, so it's find your own sandwiches for lunch.

At 2:00 we are back for our panel session, and then followed by the council meeting. So as ever, we have a busy day scheduled. But for our first session, I would like you to welcome Rod Rasmussen, who is going to chair security through cooperation.

The alert amongst you would have noticed he's not Patrick, Patrick has very kindly delegated to Rod who has volunteered to help. Thank you.

Note: The following is the output resulting from transcribing an audio file into a word/text document. Although the transcription is largely accurate, in some cases may be incomplete or inaccurate due to inaudible passages and grammatical corrections. It is posted as an aid to the original audio file, but should not be treated as an authoritative record.

ROD RASMUSSEN:

Thank you Lesley. And thank you all for braving the morning after the music night, rather wonderful music night last night to show up here. Patrick sends his sincere apologies for not being able to make it here today. There is, unfortunately, there is the security presentation, the namespace inclusion, thing is going on at exactly the same time.

And he kind of found out about this at the last minute so I have – I’m going to try and do my best to fill in for Patrick. So we’re going to do a panel this morning, no slides or anything like that. Right guys? No slides. Okay [laughs]. And talking about cooperation and its importance in dealing with security issues and the like.

So cooperation with law enforcement, security firms, etcetera, and setting up relationships, etcetera. I’m going to have each of the panelists introduce themselves, and give like five minutes or so, I think that was what the discussion was on the things that they do in their own ccTLD space, and dealing with local authorities, and dealing with security issues that come up from around the world and how to deal with them, etcetera.

I myself am on – run a security company that often deals with the ccTLDs as most of you know. So it’s really important to establish good working relationships, communications channels, etcetera, so that we understand what’s going on and can work within the rules in the space that you have to work with to be able to provide the kind of information you need to be able to take action.

And understand what kind of actions you can take within your regions. And this challenge for anybody in the space, because there are hundreds literally of different jurisdictions to deal with and different

rules and organizations. I think we can all learn a lot from each other on how we've setup various relationships over the years, and hopefully be able to get some best practices and good ideas that you can take home for your own organization.

So Eduardo, I'll have you go first, and we'll work on down the panel, and then we have one panelist that hasn't made it in yet this morning. So hopefully, she'll run up here when she gets here. It wasn't the music night [laughs].

EDUARDO SANTOYO:

Okay thank you very much, thank you very much. Thank you all for being here for this session. Okay. I'm Eduardo Santoyo, I'm a regional manager for the ccTLD for the dot CO, which is the registry about the Columbia domain name. And we have been in charge of the operations since 2010.

Once the re-delegation process came and since the very beginning, the ministry of telecommunications in Columbia adapted the policy to have an open registry, a registry that could be registered everywhere around the world. And then, just because of the consideration of the – possible misuses of the dot CO from the very beginning, we decided we need to have very strong policies regarding the security.

Operating not only the policies, but also it establish a complete networking or to support the security around the dot CO space because we don't want, at the time, so we don't want now, the registry and the dot CO, we must use it for – or misuse it, we introduce it in bad

proposals. And for that, we adopted some activities and some policies at the very beginning that's just for one example, the price.

The launching price was very high for our raise three about domain names, was about, in a wholesale price, no less than \$20 at the very beginning, just trying to afford people to have these domain – just to execute that, malicious activity.

Since 2010, we also began to run something that we called the malicious monetary activity, which is no more that establish a network of cooperation between our company, which is dot CO internet, and some other organizations within Columbia and outside of Columbia too. In order to monitor the [? 0:08:16] that's here.

And try to keep information of what is happening on that, on the song. How is the song begin used or not for that activity, so for malicious activities. And we are using some lapse of research about – in order to get more information, that information that we are receiving for our sources are true or not true, are really malicious activity or not malicious activity.

And after that, we establish in the contracts that we have that were raised for some specific point in order to get their cooperation just in case we find that some domain names are being used in a malicious activity.

In the corporations that please to include in the terms and conditions, that could be one of the cause of the suspension of the domain until the malicious activity has been solved. Okay, during that... We have

agreements right now, that tier registry. In a country with a national police force, we have a formal agreement.

We also have a formal agreement with the national ISP, IXP in order to have information from the and to give the information about activities from the – on the [song file 0:10:02], with the Ministry of Defense in Columbia, which leads the national cyber security and [? 0:10:09] defenses activity.

And in an ongoing process, we have also agreements with the National General Attorney’s office, because they have the possibility to investigate some criminal activities. And now a days, we are giving them all of the information that we receive from the – from malicious activities.

We are not taking their place by having an agreement with them, we know that – we had been informative that some malicious activity is coming, we give them the information, and we give also the information to the [? 0:10:53]. But also we have a good relation with some [grower 0:10:58] entities, or US entities, or European entities to work –that work in security.

We are part of the activity working group. We are being there just to cooperate and work with others in order to find high can we avoid this misbehavior. We are part of the – we are members also of the US with the National Center of Missing and Exploited Children. In the European Union, we are part of the contact initiative against the cybercrime industry and law enforcement.

We are part of the DNS org, and we have agreements with Microsoft, and we are simply – we signed an amendment to this security and resiliency with the World Economic Forum. That’s just because we need to, we want to show to the world that we are able and we are on our way to work on this, to consider we have some kind of responsibilities in this entire world of cyber security.

And that we can do something. Just having information, procuring this information, and sharing this information could be good enough at one time of the cyber security general process. And of course, we are not taking the role of law enforcement agency for ourselves.

We respect their fields, and we are working with them, we are providing them with information but we are not taking their role. But okay. That’s it for now.

ROD RASMUSSEN:

Quite impressive. That’s a long list of things you’ve been working on and groups you’re involved with. That’s very impressive. Tarik turn it over to you for your bit.

TARIK MERGHANI:

My name is Tarik Merghani from Sudan, from dot SD registry. It’s a Sudan Internet Society. It has been established on 2002, then we became a chapter for the ISOC, and we also became the registry for the ccTLD of Sudan, and many [? 0:13:38] before it.

And SIS is NGO. It’s a multi-stakeholder organization. And we have a representative from everywhere, from the government, from NTC, from

companies, of teleconference community, from other organization you can find in our board and in our members.

In fact, we have more than 400 and something, maybe 500 members. 100 of them are active. We have many work group, one of these work groups is information and security work group. it's very active work group. It's in fact have many projects in the formation security, like a clinic.

It's a very short clinic for websites, if you have problem – if you are an entity, or government, or even private company, so now you have some problem in your website, you can bring it to our clinic. We will investigate it, we will give you recommendations. Then if you are happy with that, we can do more, and the forensics will be free. Then you have to pay for it.

I think we are doing well in SIS. When we start progression with security agencies or law enforcement in Sudan, first of time – when our first meeting, we sit with one of the security agency. You notice that you are NGO, and you were thinking that or they come now. They want... They will talk and you have to listen, that was [? 0:15:40].

As they will ask and you have to answer, they will order, and that was our thinking, you know. That there is always part of the problem between NGO and government entities or security agencies. They also come with some ideas like this, and our thinking is that people come and they don't know anything about domains, and they want to control it.

In this meeting, they don't know anything about our ccTLD. They want to mitigate and [? 0:16:08]. So our first meeting was not good for, but after two, three more meetings, and knowing each other, we start really correction.

We found that what they are asking for is what they need, in fact it's the same, it's what the community wants. They don't want to enforce something for us that we don't want. And so everything go since it's a good collaboration, maybe in some many regions, so many fields, we have collaborated now for information security, for hackers attack, for DOS.

We collaborate together where they always need information, need to trap some resources, need to get information about – what is in honor of some set domain, information about. You know that, we – our ccTLD and we have not kind of big ccTLD. We don't have online WHOIS information.

It's not detailed information for each owner of a domain, so always they seek to get this information if some [? 0:17:33], some attack, somebody come a certain website, they want to sit together with me. And also it's about domains. In fact, we create a list of reserved names. We know Sudan is Africa, Arabic, from Mid-East country.

So we have our traditional, our culture is maybe different, something maybe acceptable in other countries, not acceptable in Sudan. Porn websites, other things like that, if you put something your site is something not acceptable for the community.

Sometimes not accepted from security agencies if it's about a government entity or development repair, some organized not that they want... So we collaborate on such things. We create, as I said, reserved names for geographical names in other area, so that no one in Sudan, inside of Sudan – for the countries for the CTs.

Sometimes, many of these are not accepted by some people. When we create this for your geographical areas in Sudan names, my idea was that you will not use it... This collaboration is not direct with the security agency, it's with NIC, National Information Center, so that which it has collaboration with the security agencies, it represents the government ICT section.

What can I say? It's... So when we create this list, we... Our idea was to give to not to make a blacklist or reserved names we want, every city, every small village to have their website, they say now yes but they don't want someone to control it, to say to many [? 0:19:41]...

They don't want and we are... I think now we don't have an agreement in anything, it's just collaboration, sitting together what you want, what we can provide, what we cannot provide, something like that. Also in domain suspending, it happens a lot of the time, suspend domain for some reason and some may steal a domain by a common registry, by wrong information something like that, represent other entities.

We also collaborate on these issues. Also, we don't, in our ccTLD, we don't care about the content on the website, but they care about it so we don't investigate, or we don't even – content you put on the website.

Many times we sit together about, they have some issues about some website and the content of that website. If it's a common sense, by culture for instance, that this content is not accepted, we will collaborate other things it may go even to call something like that if it some people don't like, some entity, someone don't accept content or some website is making harm for it [? 0:21:17] in some way.

Also, as I said, that NIC body is the body which represent the government. We sit together, so we have a big collaboration with dot GOV, especially in the subdomain dot GOV. When it started, we were seeking some government entity to give us how to say if this entity, this institute, this body, can have dot GOV domain or not.

This is the only agreement that we have signed with... And we end up that they have to bring documents from NIC saying that you are able to get dot GOV domain. And there would be, NIC, the body or the government, or the security agency, which tell us – give document to verify that this institute, this body can have a dot GOV domain.

And that's a type of collaboration that we are doing. As I said, they don't have agreements as dot ZA did, but now we are starting and it's new for us, so everything going right. Thank you very much.

ROD RASMUSSEN:

Thank you. That's very interesting. And I'm sure a lot of us have not been exposed to what's going on with Sudan, and it's really interesting to hear all that you have accomplished with that. Cath, over to you.

CATH GOULDING:

Hi. Yes, so my name is Cath Goulding and I'm head of security at Nominet, working fair, lastly. So before I start talking about the UK, I did just want to bring it back and talk about, sort of have three points of reference or clarification. I think number one, law enforcement is a really broad spectrum.

To some people it's just to stop selling counterfeit goods such as illegal pharmaceuticals, or how we might protect trademarks. On the other end of the spectrum, it might be how we deal with malware such as botnets or DODS attacks. So it's quite broad.

And then number two, cybercrime is a global phenomenon [laughs] pretty obvious, but it's also of concern because it's increasing at an alarming rate. On Monday I read an article in *The New York Times*, that two guys in Malta had found an exploit, a zero day exploit for the IOS, which is the operating system for all of these iPhones and iPads that many of us use.

And they sold it for half a million dollars. So basically that's just like a bug in the code that went for half a million dollars. And these two guys, it was all completely legal, they say they only say to companies or organizations that abide by the law, but I think it's clear to see that there is a huge underground market for this kind of thing as well.

Even though it's not directly applicable to sort of the domain name industry, I think it just shows how big a problem this is becoming. And then number three, again, pretty obvious, but registries and registrars, are not law enforcement. So we really don't want to be the judge and jury in deciding what should – what is lawful and what isn't.

But one thing that we do have in common is that we all want the internet to be safe and secure. So how do we do that? In the UK, because it is a growing problem and the method of using warrants or court orders isn't always the most efficient, they have a strategy of disruption.

And as a consequence of that, at Nominet we receive a fair number of suspension requests. So rather than just sort of saying, taking their word for it, we only suspend on the basis of our own terms and conditions. And if even criminals can abide by our terms and conditions, so if they do, we then assess each individual request to see if we have any exposure to criminal liability, such as benefitting from the proceeds of crime.

So over time, we've tried to improve this process. And one of the things, rather than getting all of these requests from the hundreds of different law enforcement organizations in the UK, down to individual police forces, we channel these requests through four organizations in the UK.

That's SOCA, the Serious Organize Crime Agency; the MHRA, the Medical and Healthcare Products Regulatory Agency; our local trading standards office in Oxford; and the National Fraud Office. So with them, we've worked very closely with them so that they can understand our limitations but that we do want to help them out.

And we've also said, we've expressed our concerns that this is just like taking down the sign post to criminal activity. It's not actually, it may not actually stop the crime. And we do have it in our future roadmap

that we do want to firm up our abuse policy and talk about potential legal framework that we can conduct this kind of thing under.

So as well as suspension, we're also dealing with law enforcement and sort of look to mitigate cybercrime in a number of ways. Firstly, we have – we undertake lots of efforts to improve our WHOIS data quality. We take a number of phishing feeds, malware feeds, and we send those out to registrars.

We have a website called Noble Net dot ORG dot UK, and that's a sort of educational website for end users as to how they can keep themselves safe and secure on the internet. As part of the Nominet trust, we give money to – they are involved in internet activities, and one such as the e-crime reduction partnership in Wales, so we're giving money to that.

And then lastly, we do share information particularly on our infrastructure, the risks that we see to our infrastructure. With the UK critical national infrastructure. So the UK has a sort of framework with a critical matter infrastructure, so whether that's the sort of nuclear area or power or telecoms. And so we sit on that and share information with the community, but also law enforcement and government.

And as an example, we see DDOS attacks all the time on our networks, and generally it's sort of the gaming community and things like that, but it is a concern that their capabilities are increasing, and also other people are understanding that the damage that DDOS attacks can do such as in the US with the banking industry.

So we fell it's our duty to really share this kind of information. And I just want to finish by sort of posing a question to the audience. So if we can, on our monitoring and detection capabilities, if we can detect spam runs, or DDOS attacks, or botnet activity, what should we do with it?

Should we report it? Should we block it? Should we sinkhole it? Or should we just ignore it? And I think it's a question, as a community, it would be good to come up with a common framework. Thanks.

ROD RASMUSSEN:

Great, good stuff and an excellent question. You actually stole a couple of mine [laughter]. Very interesting stuff, a lot of relationships you've got, especially with the UK, these organizations, there is quite a bit to manage, I imagine. Andrei.

ANDREI KOLESNIKOV:

Good morning. Well I'll try to answer this question. I am presenting the dot RU and dot [? 0:30:25] ccTLD, which is Russian definition on domain name. And so far, Russia now is becoming the largest European internet market. And according to the different research, the cumulative input into the GDP of the internet related technologies is up to 4%.

So it's a lot. I mean, the internet is a real thing, and a lot of things depend on how we operate our domain space, and what do we do with malware and criminal activities, etcetera, etcetera. So we have about 4.6 million domain names in the dot RU, and 800,000 in our IDN.

I'd like to say that this is – we have a very interesting observation because our IGN is probably one of the clearest domain large TLDs. And when we started to discover why, 800,000 domain names and zero malware, etcetera, is because it has no email. There is no email support of the IGN.

And even though we're trying in IGN acceptance, universal acceptance group, to convince all the vendors and the big platforms to provide email support for the IGN, already I'm not sure that's it's a good idea [laughs]. Because this is really clear on the domain space, it's very interesting.

Well, it's not so good with traditional dot domain name, dot RU. We have about 300,000 bad domain names in our database which I'll tell you about a little bit. We have a very interesting, and I think unique, operation.

There is the index, the largest search engine with 60% of the market share on the search market. Dot RU whose portal is over 50 million Russian speaking users. Conspiracy Lab, antivirus is over 150 million installations worldwide. Root search, our company is feeding us with a global search data.

And the group IB, the professional investigation company, dealing with professional crime investigation. Technical center of the internet is our TLD operator, and finally these days we are about to sign an agreement with [? 0:33:18], which is the largest internet operator in the Russian Federation.

So what we do together, we have a database, okay, and all of these participants which I just mentioned, they feed the data into the database. We do the data mediation into the, even for [? 0:33:39], and based on the data feeds coming from all of those companies, we actually – it's like a lance, it works like a lance. So we can see which domain name, Russian domain name is bad or listed in the different databases.

So the malware, phishing, etcetera, etcetera, and it's very efficient. Our cycle, work cycle is about 24 hours, so it is only 24 hours when we say that this domain name in this particular page has a certain kind of illegal activity. So what we do, all these companies which we listed is basically covering almost 100% of the internet users in Russia.

For example, the search engine, the blogs, the search results for this resources, [? 0:34:40] dot RU, blocks the emails coming from this sites. Conspiracy Lab updates their antivirus database, etcetera, etcetera. So and the postal, we hope that we will deal with Mozilla – it's a bit hard to deal with Microsoft, because we have to go to Seattle.

All operations related to the security is not managed by the local guys, it's all managed by the headquarter, but I will hope they will listen to us sooner or later. And it's very efficient, we don't need to run for the court orders, or do some legal paperwork, it's just blocked on the user interfaces limiting their access to certain resources for the Russian users.

And it's very, very efficient and it works. So we also help to find a way to deal with the browsers, because they also have certain access list management. Also with the [? 0:35:43], which is our operator, now

we're in talks and conversation to... They are the registrant, and the largest IP block allocation, and we wanted to see how we can deal with the IP numbers related to the open relays and botnets, in order to help, to minimize the botnet impact from this side.

But so, this is just an example of how different countries can cooperate for the – to make the internet safer without being heavily involved to deal with officials and court orders, etcetera, etcetera. But let's talk a little bit about the state, okay?

As I said, we are a non-commercial company so it gives us, in our government, it gives us a certain benefit because – like we're not talking about commercial interests, or – we're completely neutral. So that's a good platform to talk and it was officials from different areas.

For example, we have two – if we talk about law enforcement, we have police and we have a federal security services. And dealing with them is basically a daily business with our registrars, who is involved in domain name business. And how we do, we set the framework, and setting the rules, and giving advice.

But also we carry a very important part in this relationship, totally education. We have a regular seminars and conferences where we invite basically the officers, and the guys who are dealing with the criminal investigation in the internet. And we talk a lot about only the domain names.

We invite experts from the different areas, and they give the basic knowledge of how the internet works, how to find the criminals with their IP address, how to deal with a lot of files, etcetera, etcetera. And

we found it very useful. And it's also extending, there were very few people who came to listen at the seminars, and now we have a huge demand [laughs] of the people from the academy.

They have academies, like the Police Academy [laughs]. So they need this data, so we're involved in this activity. And what else? That's probably it. Thank you.

ROD RASMUSSEN:

That's quite an impressive program, especially the cooperation you've got with the – combination of the industry and the email and all that. Really quite a program to protect, at least, the Russian populace. That's very impressive.

So our last panelist is Becky, and I'll pass it on over to you.

BECKY BURR:

Thank you very much. Becky Burr from dot US. I apologize for being late, I was sure this was at 10:00. So but, so I missed one of the presentations....

ROD RASMUSSEN:

It had nothing to do with you...

BECKY BURR:

Pardon me?

ROD RASMUSSEN:

It had nothing to do with music night last night [laughs].

BECKY BURR:

Dot US is, despite having been delegated quite a number of years ago, it is a relatively young ccTLD because it was largely ignored until transferred in 2001. We work under a contract with the US Department of Commerce, for operation of dot US.

Up until this point, it's been very hard to operate dot US as a multi-stakeholder environment because we have very strict contractual requirements and very limited ability to effect new policy without getting sign offs from two different government agencies.

The dot US contract is now, will be... We are expecting a RFP for its re-bid to be issued any day. And we had encouraged the Commerce Department and they were inclined to insert into the RFP a requirement to move into a multi-stakeholder model.

So we're very excited that we will actually get to become sort of part of the more represented ccTLD community in the coming years. And that will gives us a lot more flexibility to involve community in these kinds of issues as well.

Having said that, the dot US environment is very policy rich. We have a nexus requirement that requires a US presence to be registered there. And we have affirmative, pro-active obligations to check that and to respond to any complaints or reports. We have a very... New Star has is one – it provides several cyber security DDOS attack and mitigation services, so we operate that on dot US and we pro-actively look for malware, spyware, botnet, DDOS activities and the like.

And act directly on those. I mean... We also have a pro-active obligation to audit WHOIS data for accuracy. We belong to the Coalition

for Safe Online Pharmacies, NIC MIC, the National Center for Missing and Exploited Children. And our basic policy is that if some activity involves immediate harm to people, or the DNS, or the internet, we are going to look at that and we're going to make a decision sort of on the spot, whether to take it down, act appropriately.

With most other... In most other cases, we will typically require some sort of process, but there are exceptions to that. For example, we had a case where a court issued an order to take down several names in COM and that were registered by a group of people engaged in counterfeiting.

And when the attorneys came to us for the exact same names in dot US, registered by the exact same organizations, we made a decision to take those – suspend those sites rather than that they go to court all over again. It was like exactly the same stuff.

So we'll do that. Otherwise, and with requests for information or the like, we generally require some form of process. But we have very close, because of our work in the cyber security area, we have very close relationships with law enforcement and we are learning about attacks as they are going on, just in the nature of our business.

So with that, we work pretty aggressively and proactively. And we essentially apply a common sense rule, a common sense within the rule of law, approach to those kinds of things. As I said, this is one of the areas where when we are able to act on sort of community input, we'll be looking for community input on these kinds of policies as well.

So we're expecting to have some changes, although I suspect that the changes will be more formalized policies as opposed to any substantive change to behavior.

ROD RASMUSSEN:

Excellent, again, impressive work being done by all of the TLD operators that are represented on the panel here, through a wide variety of things. I detected a lot of common themes as well.

Just from a logistic perspective, we have about 15 minutes left. I have a series of, I don't know, about 10 questions here, which we're not going to get through [laughs]. And I also wanted to make sure that people in the audience had time, or had the opportunity to ask some questions as well.

So I was just going to ask one question of the panelists and then we get some from the audience. Cath already asked a question, which we should address as well. But my question to you was around, all of you have a good relationship, it sounds like, with your local law enforcement, very formal setups for pretty much all of it.

How do you... Do you have standard processes for dealing with foreign law enforcement and foreign requests from operational security people on a regular basis, an ongoing basis? How do you handle a request from somebody you never heard of from a different law – who claims to be law enforcement, etcetera?

Just if you can take a few seconds, whoever wants to respond on that. As many panelists that wants to. What were the processes used there?

CATH GOULDING: So it's pretty. If we get a court order from a foreign entity, then yes we'll make sure it is legal, and then we'll act upon it. However, if it's just a request, then we will ask them to go through the four organizations in the UK so it comes by them.

ANDREI KOLESNIKOV: There was a recent deal on the Microsoft, on the domain names, which we received a copy sealed and signed by the American court.

ROD RASMUSSEN: Federal judge?

ANDREI KOLESNIKOV: Yeah. A judge. And what we do in this case is we just put in an envelope and send it to the police so they can deal with that, because we aren't supposed to do anything for that, they put into the legislation. So but we don't throw it away, we send it to the police.

BECKY BURR: Because of our nexus requirements we don't often get those, but our policy and I think it's interesting to note that the new registrar accreditation agreement embodies this principle. We would not act on process from a law enforcement agency that we couldn't authenticate, whether it was in the United States or elsewhere.

And we would direct anybody coming in with something like that to local law enforcement. So our view is everybody should have an established relationship with local law enforcement that clearly has

jurisdiction. And that... Because the authentication problems are just too great, there are too many law enforcement – I mean, there are too many local sheriffs in the United States to be able to authenticate that very well.

EDUARDO SANTOYO:

Yes. Proving our case is... We give more information that we get information from them, yes, it's very important because we collect information from many sources for the relationship. It's more information than we give them in order to have a more in terms of what's happening in the namespace.

And of course if we receive a court order than we execute it. That's all by that.

TARIK MERGHANI:

I know that if something comes from court from a judge, I would accept it to be already executed. But in fact before a judge make any decision, he would seek our information or expert, he would seek one from us to get more information to get him. And that's a normal, happens always, send us a letter for an expert on some problem from some case, so on, so on, so on.

So we helping them from the beginning. So if anything comes from a court, from a judge, it will be executed. If it's just coming from other person, or company, or entity, it will be – get the decision signed by our board, our special entity inside. And they well get what to do.

ROD RASMUSSEN:

Thanks. So Cath, you asked a question of the [? 0:50:03], why don't we have our panelists answer it. So basically I'll re-phrase it, or to review, if you're detecting botnet activities, or you see activity coming in to domains within your TLD, which is something that you can do if you're watching for germane generation algorithm domains, or weird activity and things like that.

You've got several options. One is to ignore it. One is to suspend the domains that maybe involved. One is to report it to either law enforcement or perhaps security company or something like that that can help mitigate that.

Another is to sinkhole it, which sink holing it is capturing of the traffic that is coming towards those domain names and determining what machines maybe asking questions, maybe looking at the traffic. There is different kinds of sinkholes.

One of the things you can do is inform users that they actually infected with things. So what are... So I guess there are two questions to that. What do people do today? And what would they like to do? And Cath why don't you start?

CATH GOULDING:

Hi. So yes I guess the answer is that it depends. So like I said earlier, yeah, we have reported various activity, and sometimes we'll pass that information up to our registrars, like the phishing data. And yes, occasionally we'll not necessarily block it, but indeed of the attacks we'll rate limit it so they'll go away.

But I think it's something that the ISPs have been grappling with, with content and making them liable for what goes over their networks. And I think it's becoming more of an issue for us. And one of the concerns is we could block things, but if we make mistakes, because mistakes happen, who is then liable?

Because I do know law enforcement would like us to do it, but that's where we would like a legal framework that would support us if anything was to go wrong.

ROD RASMUSSEN: And some sort of process to verify that it is in fact botnet activity?

CATH GOULDING: Absolutely. Yeah.

ROD RASMUSSEN: Yeah.

EDUARDO SANTOYO: I'm trying to answer the question. We should do the pre-actions that I mentioned in my re-cap. Absolutely we have to do something. And we are having good experiences doing things. Most of the time, some domain names are used by criminal activities we doubt the consent, we doubt the knowledge of the domain name owner.

It's been used by another, hacker, something like that. That's been using domain name of another in order to make a phishing activity, making a botnet activity. And one thing that has been result, very

useful for us, is to try to get the registrant and to inform him what is happening under his domain name.

And in most of the cases, we were really surprised that the registrant was a very normal company, a regular company, would just not aware of what was happening on their – his domain. He correct the situation. He implemented more security on his website builder. And now, after that, he replied, “Thank you very much for giving me that information because I didn’t realize that was happening.”

Give the information to the registrants is very important, but for that you need to collect information. And the other point is that you need to do something in order to get information on what is happening on the area, what is happening on the [? 0:54:14] where you are working.

You respect, your feel of game. And of course, it’s from the large [? 0:54:27] support. In Columbia, we have a lot of games, phishing, alarming defacing, and some of the [? 0:54:34] of course. And every single information that we collect from our different fee access, we pass to them along.

You have the process, you have the possibility to act.

ROD RASMUSSEN:

We’re running short on time and I see we have at least one question from the audience. I would like to give the audience a chance to get a couple in so go ahead sir.

BYRON HOLLAND:

Thanks. Byron Holland from dot CA. And this is one that we wrestled with some of the issues that have been brought up. And I would just like to know if anybody has done any work or started unpacking some of these issues around legal liability?

If I know there is a bad actor doing something naughty in my zone, and I have that knowledge, what do I do with it and am I liable for not doing anything? Because I mean it's not, in our case, it's not particularly in our mandate to go hunt down bad actors doing bad things on domains.

But if we know it's happening, what is our liability?

CATH GOULDING:

So I can say I had a five minute conversation with Patrick a couple of days ago, and I understand that they are trying to do exactly that, take it to court. So they are refusing to do something just to test the case to see if they are criminally liable.

BRIAN HOLLAND:

The challenge is we see data but then it's like, uh-oh, I know about a problem, but we don't really have a framework or infrastructure to actually do something about it. And the other thing about is just on a purely practical operational level if there are in a two million plus zone, a couple hundred bad domain names on any given day, operationally, if we're going to actually do something about every single one, calling a registrant times 200?

Walking, as a registrant, getting a surprise call saying, "Hey, your domain, bad things are happening on it." I mean there is the whole

operational side to it as well. And I'm wondering if anybody on the panel has worked through some of the kinks or issues with that?

BECKY BURR:

It depends on what the nature of your relationship with the end user is. That's generally going to have an effect on your legal liability, but I think we are seeing increasing, and even within the ICANN environment, seeing increasing pressure on registries to be involved in safety issues for end users.

In the US, our consumer protection laws create liability for – if you have a relationship with the end user for unfair practices, and something like knowing about a problem and not having sort of competent security measures in place could create liability.

I don't think we've seen... We haven't had an instance where we needed to communicate massively with the registration, registrant body. But I do think that this is increasingly an issue, and it's a very, very difficult balance because at a certain level, some kinds of proactive behavior can tip you into a place where you do have more responsibility, and where your immunity as a deliverer of pipes can basically be eroded.

EDUARDO SANTOYO:

Just a short notice. We too have this mechanism. At least not to be liable for certain cyber activities in our domain zones. In our partnership, which I was mentioning, there is a mechanism and a workflow which delivers the knowledge to the certain actors within the cooperation framework, and it's not very efficient but it works.

ROD RASMUSSEN: We've got just a couple of minutes left. Norm, do you want to finish us off here?

NORM RICHIE: Oh, yes, sorry. I know we're running short on time. It's Norm Richie, now with Crowd Strike. I've changed hats yet again. But I'm also here representing the Secure Domain Foundation. If anyone is interested, I would love to talk about that by the way because the whole idea is about cooperation amongst registries and registrars.

Andrei, the question is actually for you. The database you have is very interesting, it's actually quite similar to what we're trying to do with the SDF, but an open base rather than country specific. Is it possible for other people to have access to your database inside of Russia or the current participants?

ANDREI KOLESNIKOV: We are now considering this question. Should we open this data to the public? Well, at least on the individual level, check the domain name, the whole history, if it was listed in the databases, that will be visible for the user.

I'm not sure about API to the database because it's sets a lot a lot of trans-border legal questions. Let me put it like this. Thank you.

ROD RASMUSSEN: Thanks. Okay, so... Okay. All right. The next panel isn't quite here yet, so we get to fill some time. Are there any other questions from the audience? Yeah, Roelof?

ROELOF MEIJER: Yeah, Roelof Meijer from dot NL. Why do you mention that you have contracts with various government institutions on security measures? Could you explain briefly what the essence of those contracts are? Please?

EDUARDO SANTOYO: We have an agreement with some Columbian government institutions, which is the National Police in order to exchange information. Then when we receive information about some bad or misuse of domains [? 1:01:22]... we pass that information to them in order for them to investigate what happened on that.

When they receive some information about some claims about that TL, the domain name has been used, and who is the registrant of this domain, we are going to give them information about the registrant. And then we also have an agreement with the National Ministry of Defense because they run the national security policy in that they don't – that CO is considered for Columbia should be brought up in many other countries as part of the critical infrastructure of the – from the cyber security perspective.

Then they need to be sure that their technical procedures and there are adequate, their management of the information that we have is good enough for them in order to be sure that the governmental sites in Columbia has been using dot CO as their domain.

And also, we are having conversation, and this is an ongoing agreement, with the national general attorney in order to provide them

information, the same can be said that we are collecting – collecting information about misuse of domain name.

Then they have the opportunity to investigate it, they are using this in criminal activities are not. They are going to analyze or make a specification of the activity, they are going to give them information and collecting. And this is the agreements that we have with them.

ROELOF MEIJER: Let me check if I understand correctly. So those agreements are not about that you are obliged to provide them with certain information, but the agreements are more about how you handle that information. For instance, from a privacy perspective.

EDUARDO SANTOYO: Those agreements are just to share information. The information that I collect, I am free to select the sources that I use, but the agreement as far as – once I collect information is up to them.

ROELOF MEIJER: Okay. So your... There is an obligation to share that information once you collect it.

EDUARDO SANTOYO: It's an agreement to share information, that's not an issue. I'm free to sign or not to sign that.

ROELOF MEIJER: Thank you.

ROD RASMUSSEN: Thank you. Good question. So it sounds like we're about ready to go the next panel. Did anybody have any very brief closing comments they wanted to share? Okay. I would like to thank our panelists very much, it was great information, lots of interesting programs going on.

A lot of common things, but I'm very happy to see that there is a lot going on and we're all thinking about the various risks, etcetera, that are out there and doing something about it. So thank you very much. [Applause].

LESLEY COWLEY: Thank you. Thank you very much to Rod for facilitating that session on such short notice. Okay. So we move on now to our session discussion with the ccNSO ICANN Board members. And in true just in time tradition, Mike is now joining us. [Laughs]

So whilst he is joining us, we were just going to start with a brief update from each Board member as to what they have been up to, and then we have some questions already prepared that we thought about asking you.

We have also asked members, we have also altered members there will be an open mic for additional questions, and we've got to quarter till 11 for this session. Chris.

CHRIS DISSPAIN:

Thanks Lesley. Good morning everybody. Good night last night? Yes it was really good. I think the response indicates that people had really good night. And we've got a big room for a change.

So look, I'm not going to take up any time really. You are pretty much aware as to what's going on as I am. New gTLD stuff, I've been shepherding the GAC advice, I know you want to talk about that in a bit and that's fine.

And I've just, I spent the last two days thinking, it seems like a really short time between Beijing and this meeting and I woke up this morning and realized, it is a very short time between Beijing and this meeting. It was a really quick turn around because the Beijing meeting was so late.

The Board is good. The Board is operating effectively and efficiently. But we're off, to be honest, answering your questions I think. The briefing kind of comes in the answers.

LESLEY COWLEY:

Mike?

MIKE SIBER:

I think that I concur with Chris. I actually feel like we are running pretty much for the first time since I joined the Board, it feels like some of the stuff in the background is just working. Not always perfectly, of course there can be improvements, and it's always useful to understand the touch points of the legal points, the areas where it is sticking, so those areas can be improved.

But I feel a commitment from the staff, from the organization, towards continuous improvement to fixing areas. Hopefully you're feeling it as well. And then it's just the bigger issues while in the background, things like staff, finance, systems processes are either working really well, or where they're not working really well getting the attention they deserve from management so that they do work well.

So that you should have a pretty seamless experience.

LESLEY COWLEY:

Okay. Let's move to questions then. So the first one we have had submitted via Peter van Ross from CENTRE who is unfortunately unable to be with us. But I know the question he is asking is shared by a number of participants.

So Peter's question is around the lack of measureable goals in the operating plan and in the current strategy. And he's making a point that without smart goals, as in – and I'm going to forget the acronym now – but specific, measurable, achievable, and time bound, and so on.

If both of those lack smart goals, the community is increasingly is feeling that there is little point in commenting, the perennial comment is they lack smart goals. Is this on the Board's radar? Do they see this as a problem? And if so, what are you going to do about it?

CHRIS DISSPAIN:

So this is going to sound like a cop out answer, but actually – I mean, you are right, and the current exercise to come up with a five year strategy, which we all acknowledge is going to take a little bit of time, is

built around a number of principles. One of which is to be able to have measurable goals.

And the five year strategic plan will then lead to three, excuse me, a three year operations plan. And in respect to that, so we're kind of stuck in this loop of having made a decision to do it and not actually just say we're going to do it, but doing it, really doing the strategy. Really doing the operations plans.

It seems kind of a waste of time to spend time worrying about what we've currently got, given that what we've currently got is going to be very quickly superseded. Having said that, and acknowledging completely that it's probably not measurable, from a purely how does it feel point of view, this is much the same the other day about the governance thing.

From a purely how does it feel point of view, I'm certainly comfortable that the staff operating within what they've currently got, and doing the best that they can, they're actually doing a pretty good job. So I guess my response is, acknowledge completely the criticism, the feedback, and it's going to be fixed in the strategy and the operations plan.

And you're all involved in that. I don't know how many of you stuck around in the room. I know you were there, because you were running a group, right? That exercise is incredibly useful and I think that we're getting there.

LESLEY COWLEY:

Okay. Mike?

MIKE SILBER:

I hope... I think the reality is Chris is entirely correct. Strategic planning within ICANN has not been the most effective up until now, for numerous reasons which I don't think we need to go into now. Now is the time to make a real change. Yes, I think the Board is aware of it, I think senior staff are aware that we don't have the best calls, but we're building on it.

It was what I was talking about in terms of continuous input. Something that's not perfect, but instead of hiding away, or denying, or getting upset with the community and firing people who should have been responsible, recognize, accept, move forward, and put steps into place to try and improve it.

LESLEY COWLEY:

Okay. So if I can summarize the, is this on the Board's radar? I think the response is yes. Do you see this as a problem? I think the response was yes. What are you going to do about it? Ensure it is in the next round, I think I'm hearing.

CHRIS DISSPAIN:

We're already doing it. It is flagged as whatever we come up with needs to be measurable.

LESLEY COWLEY:

Absolutely. Okay. Cool. That's good. Okay. So we have a series of other questions. We have a question on outreach from Carolina. Then we'll move to Byron and Becky, I think, also had a question, and then

we'll open up to the floor more generally. Gabi are you on mic there?
Carolina.

CAROLINA AGUERRE:

HI. Good morning. Carolina Aguerre from LACTLD. I wanted to know what is your current perspective on the outreach program and how ICANN is dealing with all of this sort of global movement in terms of... And spending nearly 10 fold, I think, in outreach activities for next financial year.

And how that relates with the role and vision for regional organizations, not just ccTLD regional organizations, but the other regional organizations and IP addresses, etcetera. I mean, how does all this with regional outreach more activities in that respect and the current role with regional organizations. Thank you.

CHRIS DISSPAIN:

Can I maybe pick that one up? I think the CO and his team have recognized that this was a space that presented an incredible opportunity for ICANN. And one we weren't possible doing enough and we're letting an opportunity for [? 1:13:14]

MIKE SIBER:

The intent as well is to partner with local organizations. The intent is to always run things in partnership. And I think that if that's not the perception, you need to let us know, so that we can gently tweak and guide.

But I'm incredible encouraged that with minimal prodding, the CO and his team get that the regions that the ccs are the most important partners. The g's are tainted by money in many cases, and while they are a very important partner, there is always that question about self-interest.

Most of us in this room, run either a purely non-profit public service, or we run a combination of some profit maybe through the backend registry, and then the non-for profit in the front. So we're the ideal embodiment of the multi-stakeholder model in an individual country or in the region.

So the intent is to partner with... You may have seen the CO initially wanted to have a series of roundtables, and there was a few mutterings that were heard in the community about these being exclusive or exclusionist in how people were selected and things like that. And what I really enjoy about our current CEO is a brief conversation, and I'm sure that others had a similar conversation with him, just to say, it is causing some disquiet, maybe you just need to think your strategy for invite, how you do it.

Or if you're going to have an invite roundtable, invite other people to come and sit in the room and watch it, even though they may not be at the main table. And he accepted that in the last one that took place. It was exactly on that format.

So he is a man who listens to feedback, and if there is a feeling that we're doing too much, too little, we're spinning in the wrong ways, we're taking over, or we're minimizing the role of the organization, let us know.

It's just a word to say, there can be a little bit of adjustment over here, you're causing some unease. Again, the team at the moment is not ego driven, so people are willing to accept, yes, that makes sense, let's see how we can tweak it or work with local partners to improve.

LESLEY COWLEY:

Thanks Mike. Just to ensure that colleagues are all aware, there is a meeting letter on today with the regional organizations to talk about exactly this topic, and how you might work closely together or more effectively together rather than reinventing too many engagement hubs or whatever, for example.

Okay. So...

MIKE SIBER:

Lesley, what I should indicate is that we as dot ZA have offered to host a regional engagement center. I have no doubt that it's – most people around this room could find a place in their office to put somebody that they would be more than happy to have a desk, even if it's a hot desk, for an ICANN staff member in the region.

And it might be worthwhile again rather than us doing it individually to rather coordinate through the ccNSO as part of the – then you add to the [? 1:16:47] you're discussing to actually keep a roster of who is willing to host and where it is available so that ICANN has a central place that they can look to say, "Okay. We can go here or there. There are hot desks available in these places, if we need a meeting room or a cup of coffee."

LESLEY COWLEY:

Okay. But recognizing as a danger, you'll have 240 plus invitations for offices, and then we might have another comment about cost, and people. So I guess we don't have sight of the overall endpoint of that engagement strategy, and the extent to which it involves regional organizations.

And to the extent in which the engagement hubs will be a propagated model, because you can have an awful lot of invites. Okay. Which lies me still to money, doesn't it? So Byron.

BYRON HOLLAND:

Thank you and hopefully this will become one of the final money questions. But given the overview that we provided yesterday to the Board, I was wondering where the Board is at in terms of its thinking of this subject.

Overall can we anticipate that we have satisfied, constructively, the requirements of the Board? And realizing that this, at the end of the day, it's essentially going to be done a deal done with senior ICANN staff, is the staff going to be getting positive vibes and messages from the Board?

So that's part of the question. And the other is, as we – as this arrangement filters out into the broader community, do you have any thoughts, comments, concerns about how we should socialize this within the broader community?

CHRIS DISSPAIN:

Okay. You can judge how well these things are accepted in broad terms by the fact that very little gets said about it, if there was a problem you can pretty much guarantee that someone would say something by now. The only question that I've been asked is, will we need the Board, need to pass any formal resolutions in respect to this?

And I said, "Probably, but not until we have a model that can be endorsed." And when I said the model I mean the banding stuff you're talking about, not the model of contribution that you're currently working on.

I think there is a general acceptance and in fact, a sigh of relief in many quarters to the Board for the fact that we actually got the end of this, all be it without not yet having the bands. I have not yet a single person say, "That doesn't sound like enough money."

And so I think it's fine. Now in respect to the rest of the world, I think we just have to – just get out there and tell people that it's a done deal. I think you'll get a fair bit of support from the staff. The staff are now far more empowered than they used to be.

I think you'll get a lot of support from the staff to back up what the ccNSO says. So I don't see any issues with, other than the fact that we should tell people when that time is. I'm not 100% sure whether it is better to say, we've reached this point in the road and now we're looking to the final point, or if it is better to wait.

But it's going to get out there anyway, so you might as well start talking about it I think. That's pretty much how I see it.

LESLEY COWLEY: Absolutely. Mike?

MIKE SIBER: What he said.

LESLEY COWLEY: So I guess, from discussions thus far, Byron maybe we should come in on this, the communication is starting already. I think we are looking for your support on the communication around the value exchange proposition.

If we can socialize, or normalize, or whatever thing we can think of, to establish that as fact, that that would be immensely beneficial before we hopefully agree or otherwise on the whole banding thing. So it's...

We had a very long discussion about that yesterday, and a number of issues were raised on that. But I think the whole value exchange as a principle that governs that, it would be helpful if we could ask for your assistance in socializing that, both with the Board and others. Byron, come back?

BYRON HOLLAND: Yeah. I just wanted to make clear that while we're almost there, and the proverbial one yard line, we did get a lot of good feedback yesterday as we took kind of next final iterations of the work, and put it out to this whole group and had a robust conversation.

We did get some good feedback and some good points that will help us really fine tune the final product. So we're not quite ready to put it out for primetime, but we're almost there.

CHRIS DISSPAIN:

Just really quickly Byron, I absolutely... And you're getting to the point now where we were down in the detail and that's where, as we all know, where the devil is. I don't actually think that the value exchange piece is difficult or problematic.

Every time I talk to anybody about it, it kind of goes click. There are always going to be people who say that's ridiculous, but I think it's going to be okay from that point of view. But yes, we're happy to get out there and talk about it as much as we want.

BYRON HOLLAND:

Thanks guys.

LESLEY COWLEY:

We were hoping you might say that. Okay so I think we have Becky next on the list, and then we'll be open to any of you, or all of you, to ask questions.

BECKY BURR:

I think that all of us in the cc community have been watching the increasingly active and assertive GAC with interest, and I think we're wondering sort of what your take on this is, and where we're heading. And whether there is a message for ccs that we should be paying

attention to or engaging with GAC in a different way, or any of those things.

CHRIS DISSPAIN:

Okay. So I think that in as much as the IDN fast track taught the GAC some stuff, right, on how you can actually work outside, so on and so forth. Pretty much the same sort of thing is now happening with new gTLDs because they're coming up against a firm, united Board saying this won't work.

To take a specific example, the category one advice, this won't work. Let's try and fix it. And only a very few of them are coming back and saying, no that's not our job, we don't do that. But there are still some that are coming back and saying, we don't do implementation.

Which is actually bizarre because in fact, that's exactly what they do in their day jobs, politicians make the – they do the implementation. So... And I think anything that can happen from any quarters that come to help the GAC to modify its working policies, and a greater understanding of how the model works would be great.

Part of the problem for them is that, they are expanding and they're getting new governments, and new governments are not necessarily understanding the way this works. So the guy from Iran, whose name I've temporarily forgotten, who is incredibly experienced, been around forever at the ITU, etcetera, is learning now how to do it and so on.

So I think they've had a couple of wakeup calls lately. I've been impressed with the way that, not necessarily publically but certainly quietly, they've said, yeah, okay, let's see if we can fix this. On the IGO

stuff for example, they have listened and they stood up to the IGOs and said, we are not going to do this.

I think they've also learned that they need to be careful what they advise. That people are, it's going to get analyzed, and we will come back to them and say, this does not work in this way and by the way, you're being inconsistent. They don't like it, and in fact Mark Carvelle gets very disappointed when he wakes up in the morning.

But they don't like it, but it's the truth so there is nothing much they can do about. I'm not sure there is nothing specific that you want me to cover Becky, because I'm happy to answer any specific question. That's my general over all view.

BECKY BURR:

No. I think that was very helpful, just... Is there any takeaway from this, that the ccNSO should have? Is there something that we can do proactively with the GAC?

CHRIS DISSPAIN:

I'm not sure. I think in respect to... I do know that the ATRT II, or ATRT as well, is looking at what they can say about the GAC, and I've suggested that some sort of recommendation about the GAC's working methods would probably be useful.

And I think any of us who are in contact with our governments who come to the GAC, pushing that point I think is the key, rather than pushing the point about, we want this, we want that. Pushing the point about working methods make this stuff so much easier.

And we understand the constraints you're under, but you do need to have some processes in place to deal with the stuff and you currently don't.

LESLEY COWLEY: So the other [CROSSTALK 1:26:50]... is the role of the GAC, going forward. The role of the GAC going forward is, I think, of concern to some. Sorry Mike.

MIKE SIBER: I would not want to pontificate specifically on the role of the GAC, rather the impact of ccs in the role of the GAC. One of the things that we've seen throughout this process is that by and large GAC members are well intentioned.

They have the interests of the security and stability of the DNS at heart. The goodwill of consumers generally as well as specifically in their country, and then they do have some specific national interests which is understandable. We've seen only very few of them actually becoming sock pockets to self-interest groups, and lobbied to where the advice is almost unrecognizable as their own, and that is shaped from somebody's hand, manipulating it.

I think that the role of the ccs is really to try and engage their GAC representatives as well as national departments, is what's clearer is that people get busy during the intervening time and some of them seem to forget what they learned. At the last meeting, and we have to re-teach them, and go through answering some of the same questions repeatedly.

And sometimes we're just a lack of understanding. I don't mean a lack of understanding in the negative sense, but rather it's not their area of expertise. They need some assistance to understand how some of these things work.

And I think the most valuable place that ccs can participate is actually engaging with their GAC reps between meetings to say, how can we run a workshop for you and your team and your department? Who can we explain some of these things so that you're better informed coming into an ICANN meeting so that you're not asking the same questions over and over, but rather having background information that you can now move forward, and hopefully educate some of your colleagues.

Because maybe their ccs aren't able or willing to educate them, or maybe they're not willing to be educated and it needs to happen in that closed room.

LESLEY COWLEY:

Okay. Thank you. So next in the queue I had Roelof, and [? 1:29:19] I can see you're in the room, I know you were thinking about asking a question. If you still want to do so, I'll be happy to take it afterwards. But also, if anyone else would like to ask a question, if you could make sure I notice you, that would be great. Thank you. Roelof first.

ROELOF MEIJER:

Yeah. Chris, Mike. First, Roelof Meijer, dot NL. I would like to draw your attention to the present strategic planning procedure. Although I applaud ICANN's approach in the very early stage, including community input, in my opinion now, we've gone a bit too far in the direction, in

the sense that we are now in the second open discussion round on eight topics where we're not very clear on how we arrived at those eight topics.

While the community has not yet received any feedback on the previous, let's talk about strategy round, which started in Beijing. And I think the Board is to be a bit careful as to not give the impression that neither the organization nor the Board have a clear vision on ICANN's mission and the core of ICANN's strategy.

Because at the moment, they're just only open questions.

MIKE SIBER:

Roelof, I think you're entirely – that's more of a statement than a question, and I think there is a lot of...

ROELOF MEIJER:

Oh yeah, I forgot the question. Maybe you can clarify this approach [laughter].

MIKE SIBER:

I think there is a lot of truth to what you're saying. And some of us have been looking at each other in this process, and up until now, our approach has been that this is [? 1:31:14] crisis, and we'll let it continue for a little while longer.

But I think you're right, at some stage we actually need to see some consolidation, and we need to see some real results coming out of this that we can interact with rather than really a high level discussion. I'm

waiting for it too, as much as we would buttering positive as to improvements on previous years, yes, I think your point is well made.

At the moment, we're just seemingly to discuss in the air while there are things that are happening at ground level and it touches on regionalization and some of the other issues, which aren't in the strategic plan. And we're seeing somewhat of a disjoint between a discussion happening up here and actions being taken at the practical level which are quite not at the plan at the moment.

So I'm willing to give it a little bit longer, but yes, I think the Board as a whole –Chris maybe you can agree or disagree, I think the Board as a whole has got a finite amount of patience for this.

CHRIS DISSPAIN:

So thanks Roelof. I... Maybe just to give it a bit more color, I mean, you are right and it isn't an open ended process, there is a timeline because Fadi is committed to the operational, three year operational plan will be complete, but I forget the date, but by a date the strategic plan has to be completed [AUDIO INTERFERENCE 1:32:53] before that, so there is a timeline.

Just to very quickly re-visit what we know, is that we started in Beijing with the first meeting, the first discussion, right? And then the Board had its frame working session – it was the whole effectively of the Board retreat. And the explain guys who were the diagram drawers and so on, came and...

Mike is right in the sense that some of the Board members are just letting it run because they don't actually believe that it's possible to

work this way. When we started the two day process, the explain people told us what we were going to do and we then spent an hour while some Board members asked questions to try and get clear in their minds why we bother to do this, etcetera.

But at the end of the two days, everyone without exception went okay, now I understand why we did it. And what happened at that retreat and what has fed the discussions here. And there is a next step. So I completely understand what you're saying, and Mike is right, we're watching it, we're making sure that it doesn't just run around and disappear of its own fundamental....

LESLEY COWLEY:

Okay. Thank you. Let's move on so I have [? 1:34:18] and then [? 1:34:19].

UNIDENTIFIED:

Thank you Lesley. I have an observation, it's not really a question. I just saw the information to our two Board members, you don't have to respond. In the process of fast track of IDN ccTLDs, I feel ccTLDs have benefited from the ad hoc variance TLD approach, of course, it's just not very accurate observation because the variance TLDs are only to their own understanding.

ICANN delegated the two strings separately, especially in the case of dot China, dot Taiwan, and dot Singapore. It was very considerate, but now you're approaching new TLD and this variance TLD issues are critical, are coming back.

And they're quite strong argument that should be equal, similar treatment between ccTLDs and gTLDs even though they are different [? 1:35:27]... and shouldn't be mixed up at the various TLD issue that's really coming up. So that's one of the argument is that one of the ad hoc approach could be analyzed to the new gTLD program. Thank you.

LESLEY COWLEY: Thank you. Chris? I know you are IDN guru.

CHRIS DISSPAIN: We made a lot of compromises, if you like, in the fast track to get it done. And we were dealing with a very small group of names. In respect to the new gTLDs, we have significant and clear advice that in fact we shouldn't even proceed with IDNs at all at this stage.

Because of the problem with actually sorting out the variance. Dennis Jennings's panel, his advice is that this whole thing is doomed to failure. We've chosen to listen to that advice but to move on anyway. But the reality is that we do not know what a variance is. We don't know – we have no definition.

We know what you think a variant is, and we know what other countries think – other countries think differently. We are not going to proceed with doing what China is asking because we don't think it's appropriate at this stage. We think that... We accept that that may be politically challenging for you, but we just don't believe that we're ready.

And so if you are so concerned about it, and I don't mean you personally, but if you as in the applicants are so concerned about it,

then put your application on hold until such time as the variant problem is solved. Thanks.

LESLEY COWLEY: Okay. Thank you.

UNIDENTIFIED: Yes. Thank you Lesley. I would just like to ask your opinions on the question that I posted to the Board yesterday, I don't know if you remember. The question had to do with ICANN's awareness of the processes occurring elsewhere, like the ITU and the fact that in the [? 1:38:19] in 2014 it is very likely that they will be dealing with the role of governments, how to operate and analyze the role of governments.

And that was the seventh opinion that Brazil had proposed to the WPTF. But my feeling after speaking with some of the Board members seems to be, well we're fine with GAC. And yes, within ICANN, I think most of us would agree, but so my question is, how aware do you think the Board is of those other processes?

How serious do you think the Board considers those processes?

LESLEY COWLEY: Mike? It's [? 1:39:07] ccNSO question.

MIKE SIBER: I think... Let's recognize that the Board is a district Board. I would say that most people are at least vaguely aware of it and some people are

very intimately aware of it. I think that staff performance in this area has improved dramatically.

We're getting far better briefings, we're getting far better interaction and information from staff. What we haven't done, and be allowed to drop, is follow some of the question that we had in Beijing, is being a little more transparent to the community in terms of what we're seeing, what's on the horizon.

We're not necessarily going to go into detail in public as to exactly to how we're going to approach each and every topic, I think some of those need to be close door discussions. But at the same time, an opportunity to interact, to understand where you're coming from because I think one of the critical elements of it, yeah, is that these processes could be either extremely dangerous or incredibly benign and possibly even helpful, if approached correctly.

And one of the elements is making sure that we have the right mix of actors taking the right approaches. That is something that we haven't done yet. After your question was raised yesterday, it's something that there was a fair amount of recrimination and finger pointing, and something that we're very aware that we need to do better.

LESLEY COWLEY:

Chris?

CHRIS DISSPAIN:

Yeah, Mike is right. There are people on the Board who are intensively engaged in this, and there are others who perhaps are less engaged.

Accepting completing the conversation that we had yesterday, I think, about the fact that there is a bit of strategy and so far.

Let me see if I can tease out four or five things that, if they were written down on a piece of paper and laminated, you would call a strategy. The first strategy is diplomacy, is coddling. So Fadi and [? 1:41:34] are currently having this love in, and that's great.

But there is a reason for that, right? That's all about building bridges and diplomacy. Secondly, there is an intensive amount of work going on behind the scenes to establish good relationships with intergovernmental organizations.

One of the reasons for having an engagement office in Geneva, is not just because Tariak wants to live next to a mountain, but actually because it's worth having that there. On the other side of that coin, and this is how complicated it gets, we're also having a fight with the IGOs about what rights they have for their acronyms.

The third thing is that we have our plants, our spies if you like. We've got me in the CSTD, with Bahir, we've got – in the MAG, we're pretty well represented. We have Keith who goes to a portion [? 1:42:28] go to the ITU stuff. So that's... Whilst that's not an ICANN strategy as such, it's out there and everybody knows it exists.

And then when they go to the ITU stuff and things like that, Paul would have caught up with the ICANN people who were around and so on. So there is that as well. All of those things, if we actually wrote them down on a piece of paper, you could kind of make into a strategy.

And what I try to say is there is a heap of stuff happening, you don't necessarily see it. One final point which is, with all of the greatest plants in the world, you could – we spent, in Geneva for the WT – that thing, WTPF, we had a huge number of ICANN, couple of Board members from ICANN, me, Steve Crocker, and Fadi, huge numbers of bilateral and including, for example, with Brazil.

And things are actually going really quite well with Brazil. Nothing we do can take account of suddenly it being revealed that Americans have been pulling information out of the internet, and so now Brazil is really upset.

Now are they actually upset with us? Not particularly, but we just happen to be an easy target. So with all the strategies in the world, you can't actually allow for that sort of thing when it happens you have to be able to move really quickly and try and fix it. And I think we are in a position to do that.

And I certainly think that having some feet on the ground in Geneva will help as well. Thanks.

LESLEY COWLEY:

So I guess from those responses, and from Burt's response yesterday, I think we finally surfacing what it is we've been asking for. So I've got, to the extent the strategies at the moment, it's about establishing good relationships and lines of communication.

It's about gathering and sharing information. The strategies to engage activity in the processes, with a view to what? With a view to ensuring

the multi-stakeholder model sustained and enhanced? If the strategy is just all of those things, that for us would be progress.

We're not interested in the detail because we understand that there will be... I finally achieve something [laughter]. I think that's the thing that we've been seeking is the lots of activity, much more activity than previously, which is great, towards what their action.

Because is that is surfaced and transparent, then that gives us a much better route to supporting, engaging with that, or even disagreeing with that. We've been missing that iteration. I'll let you have a bit of paper, excellent. Okay. [Applause and laughter] Sorry. One of my pet... No. I'll send you a note.

Anyone else? We have a few minutes left if anyone else wants to ask, Roelof.

ROELOF MEIJER:

Seems you mentioned to Ray and the ITU Chris, during the opening ceremony to Ray announcing this in a video statement, that the ITU would like to formalize the relationship between the two organizations. Does ICANN have any idea what he meant with that? And what way he would like to formalize it?

CHRIS DISSPAIN:

Yes. Sort of... It was actually quite significant because he's moved... Because in the past...

MIKE SIBER: He was sort of, and not sort of, right?

CHRIS DISSPAIN: Sort of, yeah. In the past, his statements about engagement have been built around us becoming a member. And he's actually moved away from that now and acknowledged I think that us being a member is really not sensible, it's more to do with us having some kind of understanding with each other.

What shape that takes, I'm not 100% sure. He and Fadi have committed to talk it through, to see if they can come up with something, either something exists in the sense that they already have a memorandum of understanding with ICANN and various different organizations.

Whether something has to be created in order to make it work, but there seems to be a willingness on both sides I think to try and find something. And rather than just having a discussion where we say, let's get closer, let's get closer, and the response from the ITU is yes let's do that, just become a member. I think we've moved away from that.

So that's pretty significant.

LESLEY COWLEY: Okay. We need to close. We're having coffee and then back at 11. In the meantime, if you can join me in thanking our Board members.
[Applause]

UNIDENTIFIED: Audio timestamp for hall 1B, this is post break starting up at 11 AM local time for the ccNSO members meeting day two, extensively part two. Recording and streaming live.

LESLEY COWLEY: I'm not sure if we've got you all here, but if you're presenting in the next session, could I invite you to the front please?

LESLEY COWLEY: Okay. I have my sign that says we're ready. So we are going to restart. We seem to have lost a few people at coffee, I'm sure they will join us in a moment. So we are going to restart with our ccTLD news session. And Barrack has very kindly agreed to chair this session and then run on to chair the regional organization news session, and so over to you Barrack.

BARRACK OTIENO: Thank you Lesley. [OPEN MIC 0:05:35 – 0:05:51] So, Vika? You can take
Okay. So the first presentation is the ZA host presentation. We own the ccTLD news station, so the president, Vika, is already here. You can take the floor. And then we'll proceed with Adrienne.

VIKA MPISANE: Thank you Barrack for this opportunity. Good morning to everybody. I'm presenting a presentation, an update on what's going on dot ZA, just focusing on the central registry, which is the project in the last two

years. And especially we focused on a great deal for registry excellence purposes.

Just the background on this ZA central registry. We conceptualized it in 2008 to nine, and we felt as ZADNA, the ccTLD manager for the – that we needed a centralized platform on which the second level domains like the net za, and co za, and others, could run on. And that would help us to invest in automation in registry services in ZADNA.

So we felt also that back in the band of many stealth communications, that this was going to be the best way to go, and we started working on it. We already send ZADNA central registry project as a key for us to improve the infrastructure in ZA. And to make ZA more competitive, to be able to offer a complete registry automation service, which will allow registrars to have pretty much the same experience when they register names in dot UK, Columbia, and others.

So it also has an important milestone that will help us separate the registrar and registry of those within the ZA domain. ZA being the focus because it's always been the part... That's where the powerful ZA names are.

There will be some stats that will show as I go on, but the central registry is also one of those key companies that will help us separate registry function of UniForum from the registrar function.

We then started working on the central registry, the launch, in 2011. Obviously there was a close collaboration and working partnership between ZADNA and the UniForum with time. We are now designated to service the central registry.

We appointed UniForum as a central registry. And the initial second levels that we decided that they should operate in addition to co dot za, net za, org za, and web za. Org is the second largest second level domain behind co dot za. And we'll continue as an open domain once we complete the migration to the ZACR.

Just a brief point, ZACR is a non-profit organization, already operating – well, it's operating with more than 880,000 registrations. There are some stats that will show again as we go. And there are present around 96% of the ZA domain names.

There is just a little more than 43,000 names, and being the second, second level domain in ZA stats. ZACR has also been tasked with applying to ICANN for the rights to establish and operate three local gTLDs, Durban, Cape Town, and Joburg. With the blessing of ZADNA and also of the Department of Communications to which we account to ZADNA.

And also of the city council's consent. In terms of progress, we are currently focusing on ZA central registry excellence. Investment in infrastructure, the investment of domain services, customer relations, so that the experience of registrars who access this particular facility is as best possible.

That is even more important considering that we have always have a fairly accessible number of international registrars who come some Africa, others from Europe, America. So excellence is one of the important focuses for those areas of central registry.

We're accrediting registrars for ZACR is continuing to show some slide later that shows how we stand in terms of register figures. In the work of migrating these three others top level domains, net, org, and web dot ZA to this [? 0:11:32] is continuing. And we will be opening net and web to accept new registrations, something that hasn't been doing at least almost the last decade.

We also finalizing our policies, and there is also a two layer policy development process here because there are two different players. ZA and the ccTLD manager regulate in terms of – to our second level domain registry operator.

There are some policies, operational are what we call the supplemental policies that they are developed as they are submitted to ZADNA for approval. And if we approve, we approve, if we don't we approve, there is a reason why we don't approve. They may require some few tweaks.

But the number of policies always come into play. They are also high level policies that fall on the ZADNA side that are we sorting out on WHOIS, pricing, and other general policies.

We are also working on education and awareness because we are required in ZADNA, by law, to educate and make at least the public aware of the importance of domain names. And we are also focusing on marketing for all the clear reasons of new gTLDs coming into play as well.

The current focus of ZADNA gTLD as mentioned earlier, is on the dot cities, and then on the dot Africa project which is an AUC project, and

they have no control over ZADNA. ZADNA does not come to us primarily as far as that is concerned.

Some of the stats on this is the reason for registry. 875,000 names registered. I think the focus here, as I said earlier is a little more than this figure, but it's mainly the register, paid up registrations. They own and operate a couple of thousands of names that are sitting on [? 0:13:33] pending suspension and all of that.

So those are the number of connectivity with the stats, the last 36 of paid up for names. It's important to point out that within the central registry, there is what we call legacy registrar and then the EPP registrar.

The EPP registrar pending new registries were not so new now, with – older than two years. That was introduced to in 2011. The legacy registrar is the old email based system that was used on of course when UniForum was for some serving as board registry operator and the registrar was then, as I said, the purpose of the central registry project was to separate the [? 0:14:22] so that this particular entities own the registry and not the registrar.

But because of the central registration, there are still names on the legacy interface and there is a process that we are implementing, that dot ZA is implementing, of pushing names from the legacy site to the EPP site.

And if I may simply explain, it is a process which requires that from now on, if you want to transfer or name or whatever, you can no longer transfer [? 0:14:51] ... transfer means you must select an EPP registrar.

So over the next year, you will see the legacy registrar site decreasing in numbers while the EPP registrar site increases because we are proud to be pushing people away from the legacy registrar site.

We've also implemented measures that are encouraging people to move away from the legacy registrar by using price increases on the legacy registrar site and using price decreases on the EPP registrar site.

In terms of growth, that's what you see there. I want to go through those, it shows how the space has been growing month to month between 15 to 20,000 domain names in CO ZA alone.

That's pretty much what we have the registrar accreditation on the ZACR. Want to say 18,000 accredited registrars. The process for registrar accreditation has been such that ZA had to open a window for publication and then close. The reason being that since this was launched last year, there has been a good interest from registrars local and international to get accredited.

And it's put ZACR obviously in that pressure of processing all this application, not just recommendation as you will know. It involves the technical tests and all of that stuff. So they are going to do it in form of windows open for a month, open for two months, and then close.

So 289 accredited registrars on the APP [? 0:16:31] platform, we've only been serving 10 currently in test, and then there are those that applied in the last window, 826 those as well will have to be processed. In terms of local verses international registrars as of last week, you can see the difference, 238 registrars are local, which is a good sign because it

tells us that the local guys are active within the ZA namespace, especially with dot ZA.

And then you'll see that there is a little more than 17% are international registrars, 51 that we have in total. That's pretty much the current registrar distribution graphically. As you can see, some in Australia and others pretty much in Asia, and others in Africa, and we have some also in Europe and the UK.

In terms of market share on the ZACR [? 0:17:32] system, local versus international registrars, as you can see, that almost 50 present on the EPP site local holding around 435,000 names and the legacy is holding almost the other half, and then a small portion so far by international registrars, more than 50,000 names.

This is the outline of how ZACR is implemented the new second levels. It's pretty much new in the sense that they will be new on their platform, that's org za, net za, and web za. But the research shows that the default RAR, let's say for org za, where the current names will be processed gradually into EPP accredited registrars, who will then interface with the EPP system and be able to enter – to make names there.

This is the in case of new gTLDs. I thought, let me just mention that because it – ZACR being involved in four gTLD projects, there was for locally a question or a view that, you already have people on the EPP system and you make sure that they get – they take advantage of the fact that you have an EPP registrar system without having to probably go through the ICANN accreditation.

So that has pose the ZACR to provide what we – to consider implementing what we call the Proxy ICANN registrar, which will be a registrant that will see the ZACR itself becoming a registrar and then providing it to the local, well to the ZACR other accredited registrars who may not want to be accredited on the ICANN platform.

That will be all. Siyabonga.

BARRACK OTIENO:

Thank you Vika. A request the other presenters to come to join us on stage. We'll take questions after the presentations. Do we have Dimitry? Please join us on stage. Thank you. Next we are going to have Yuri. She will talk to us about marketing of prefecture type JP domains. The floor is yours Yuri.

YURI TAKAMATSU:

Hello. I'm Yuri Takamatsu from JPRS. And today I would like to talk about marketing of prefecture type JP domain names, which we launched last year in November. Mainly about what we have done to promote it by having many materials.

So before going to the prefecture type JP domain name itself, I would like to explain about the geographic type JP domain names, which was the past one. So before having the JP prefecture type domain names, we had the geographic type domain names.

And it has the features like having long in the registration at fourth level, and domain name structure is not so simple. And this domain

name was up to one domain name per registrant, and registrant must reside in this geographic area.

So having this geographic type JP domain names, we had the voice from the community to have more easier type JP domain names. So we decided to reconstruct the geographic type JP domain names. So the main purpose of the reconstruction was revitalizing local community activities by making it simpler to use an existing geographic type JP domain name.

So the basic policies in reconstruction was registration as third level domain, and any organization or individual can be a registrant. And local presence in the prefecture is not required, and we create the domain name spaces for all 57 prefecture in neutral and homogeneous way.

And multiple domain names can be registered by one registrant, so everyone can register several domain names. And we named this type of JP domain names as prefecture type JP domain names. So to promote this JP domain names, we have several publications.

First one is about the first releases. We give the press releases at several times after each period, when we created the prefecture type JP domain names and when we launched at sunrise current registration period in the first come first serve registration period started. We have 31 articles which were placed on news sites.

And also we had the promotional leaflets, and this leaflets are distributed to registrars, at events, and so on by mainly the service department gives these leaflets to the registrars. And on each

promotional leaflets, registrars can put their name and contact information at the bottom side of the leaflet.

And also we had ads on newspapers, magazines, and banners. And the newspapers, we put both national and local ones. And push the word local to each advertisement. At the banners, we had at the Google RSS, Yahoo targeting ads, and Yahoo brand panels and so on. And also, we had the brochures, interviews with local influences. We had these seven person – we interviewed seven persons and had one brochures.

We also give this to the people who are interested in the prefecture type domain names. And other than the publication, we had a copywriter contest on prefecture type JP usage. And we got the prize winning copy was the prefecture name for life for your region.

Having this copywriter contest, we can give the information to the copywriters about the prefecture type JP domain names, and promote them to subsist when they want to give new information to their customers.

And also we had the promotion campaign to registrars. We had 60% cash back to registrars November 19 to February 29 2013. To have this campaign, registrars had to promote prefecture type JP domain name by special promotion pages, or banners linked to JPRS promotion site or so on.

These... The registrars don't have to do everything, but have to do one of them. And as a result, we had 7,700 were registered in the promotion period. And these are one of the special promotion pages that registrars had. And we had the marketing research for these

promotions and the result of the survey of the intention to register is this one.

The ratio of internet users who know prefecture type JP was like this, 20% of general internet users were aware of it, and 44% of domain name registrants under any domain name spaces were noted. The registration trend is about the trademark application, many national brands were apply for this.

Current application has many common known. And now we are the first come, first serve period and many names of specialty products responsible [0:27:10] are being registered. And this is the number of registration of JP prefecture domain name.

When we had the cash back campaign, the number of it is increasing. After we launched this prefecture type JP domain names, we have the voices of these four – these are the main voices from the, each community. And having this, can promote the local businesses so it's really good to do it.

And these are the samples of the actual users. [OPEN MIC 0:27:50 – 0:28:20] And these are the domain names for the local foods, and it has like *maguro wakayama* dot JP is like, the *wakayama* is one of the prefectures name, and it's the – they had good *maguro* so they had this kind of domain name.

And also they had for the local events, and also we have the IDN domain names for it. And one of the things is the [JAPANESE 0:28:53] guide to Kyoto dot JP is one of the examples, and it is a guide for the cherry-

blossom viewing. And this page, picture is at the top of the Kyoto but also we had the all prefecture in Japan.

So JP main page for the prefecture to promote IDN and prefecture type JP domain names. So having this, we focused not only on the big prefecture but also for the old prefecture in Japan. That's all. Thank you.

BARRACK OTIENO:

Thank you Yuri. Next we're going to have Thomas, his presentation is about how ccTLDs can take advantage of the trademark clearinghouse.

Okay, Thomas, can proceed.

THOMAS BARRETT:

Hi. My name is Tom Barrett. I am the contact for dot PW, but we're also an ICANN registrar, and we're also a trademark agent to the trademark clearing house. And what I want to talk today is about how country code TLDs can take advantage of the trademark clearinghouse.

So I'll give you a little bit of background about the trademark clearinghouse, which is having a session down the hall as we speak, then talk about how ccTLDs you can take advantage of that. So real quickly, the trademark clearinghouse was created as a repository of validated trademarks.

In the past, every time there was a sunrise period, trademark owners would have to provide their trademark data each time to dot info, dot [? 0:30:59] dot Asia, etcetera. The idea of having a clearinghouse is they

only provide it once, they get validated, and then they receive a token that they can just hand off to each of the new TLDs that are launching.

The vendors that ICANN has picked today, Deloitte has called the validation for trademark owners and trademark agents, and IBM is running the backend that interacts with registries and registrars. So how it is going to be used is that trademark owners will submit their trademarks to the clearinghouse, with an optional proof-of-use specimen.

And that, the trademark clearinghouse will then do two things with that. They'll either have a list of domain names that match those registered trademarks, which will be used for the trademark claim service, or they will issue a token called the SMD file.

And the way that trademark claims service works, is it's a watching service. It only last for 90 days of a launch of a new TLD, and it only looks for exact matches of a domain name to that trademark.

So every record in the clearing house is automatically enrolled into this trademark claims process. And the way the process works is, if you go to a reseller and you say, "I want Microsoft dot music," they will see if any claim exists against that, and if it turns out that there is a trademark in the clearinghouse with a Microsoft, it will warn the registrant, do you want to proceed?

Because there is already a trademark owner out there. And if the registrant decides to continue and register that name anyway, then the clearinghouse will send an email to the trademark owner saying, someone has registered a domain name that matches your trademark.

So that's basically what the clearinghouse is doing today for new TLDs. That's the claim process. For the sunrise process, they get this sunrise token that contains all their trademark information, it contains all the domain names that they are eligible for, and they hand that off to a Go Daddy or a Mark Manager, saying, "I want to protect my trademark during the sunrise period. And proof of my eligibility is contained in this special token called the SMD file."

So that's just background information about the new TLDs. This SMD file is worth noting, is truly a file that's portable, and when it's portable it means that it is entirely self-contained, and it can be used for other applications. And that makes it a pretty powerful tool for registries who are not part of this new TLD rollout.

So we just finished... We have a trademark agent validation service, so we just completed the dot PW sunrise period. We did the radio AM and FM sunrise periods. And in each of those cases, trademark owners had to provide us with their trademark data. If you're a country code thinking about running your own sunrise period, I would strongly recommend that you don't follow that model going forward.

So if you do want to run a sunrise period, instead of asking for trademark data, instead you can ask for the SMD sunrise token that was issued by the clearinghouse. So this is the first service that any country code registry can take advantage of. If you would like to...

Perhaps you're relaxing some policies for your ccTLD, or you're expanding from the third level to the second level, and you want to make sure trademark owners have a chance to protect their rights, and then you can start a sunrise period and say, "We will accept as proof of

your trademark rights, the SMD file that was issued by the trademark clearinghouse.”

And ICANN philosophy right now is that it is essentially usable by any registry that wants to use it. We have very simple technical steps that you need to go through in terms of verifying the digital signature in this SMD file as a public key, private key encryption that is very easy to unlock.

You have to make sure the SMD is not on a revocation list, so it’s still valid as far as the clearinghouse is concerned. But then you’re free to read the XML in the file, review the trademark information, and the trademark owner information, the jurisdiction, classes, goods and services.

You can see all the domain names that they’ve been declared as eligible for. So you can conduct a sunrise period, just like these new TLDs are conducted today. So that’s available to any country code registry. In addition to that, the trademark clearinghouse is making the trademark claims service available to country code registries as well.

Now it’s going to roll out in three phases. Phase one is simply going to be the notice to the trademark owner, so obviously most of you already have a registry that’s been up and running for years. You can introduce this service today for all new registrations. There will be no warning to the registrant initially, but you can have – you can sell this service so that trademark owners in phase one would get an email if a domain name is registered that is an exact match to their trademark.

This is not just for a 90 day period, you can offer this continuously going forward. Phase two of that service will allow your resellers to query the clearinghouse to see if a trademark claim exists against a particular domain name string. So it's basically a yes or no, there is no additional trademark information but it does allow the registrar to communicate back to their end user.

“There is a trademark claim against the trademark string you're trying to register. Are you sure you want to continue with this?” And then phase three, will be the full blown trademark claims service that new TLDs are using today, you can also offer that under your ccTLD as well.

So this involves more work for your resellers, obviously if your reseller is already an ICANN registrar, they've already would have done that work for you, but this involves the registrar checking for the claim, if they get an indication back that a claim does exist, then they display a message to their customer saying, “One or more claims exist for this domain name that you want to register, here is the trademark information. Are you sure you want to proceed or not?”

If they decide to go ahead and proceed, then an email gets issued to the trademark owners of that claim. So it would work just like it works today in the new gTLDs. So that's my overview of how ccTLDs can take advantage of the trademark clearinghouse. And this is just a few months away. Any questions?

BARRACK OTIENO:

We'll take the questions after the presentations.

THOMAS BARRETT: All right. Thank you, thank you very much.

BARRACK OTIENO: One more presentation to go.

BARRACK OTIENO: Okay. So Dmitry will make the next presentation on recent policy changes and transition to EPP protocol in dot UA.

DMITRY KOHMANYUK: Hello everybody. I apologize for the little delay while I load up the slide up data version. So we had been working on this process for some years, and... Is that good? Okay. Fine.

So essentially we had decided to update our very old registry, and we as I said in my first slide, that we work much more on the policy side than on the implementation side. I'll try to run through the background of the UA TLD. We had... We started in 1992 and for the first 10 years we had an essentially free operation, we had a small group volunteers.

Similarly to Japan and of South Africa, we had multiplied second level domains, organized by geographical designations, we have 26 regions. And some of those generic names like com dot UA or dot UA, etcetera. We had developed the custom system and it was a commercial operation since 2001.

It had its own share of problems like separate registration of [? 0:41:30] for of unique handle, mixed up RRP and email requests. So many issues, and at some point we just decided to overhaul it all. We implemented

technical system but apparently no one wanted to use it as a test platform because they felt like just changing the protocol was not enough.

So essentially we just got stuck. We then went to the small change, it was actually instrumental to see how the local multi-stakeholder process would work. We decided to add IDN registrations to our existing system, even though it was such a small change, we had to run through about three months of consultations with our registrars to see how exactly the process would work.

We implemented many land rush sunrise and land rush process for trademark holders in Cyrillic, and it took us, I would say, to that level of mutual understanding how we can work within our small community of about 180 registrars, and work further to do bigger changes.

We as of now, we have about 3% of all our domain space to be an IDN, which is essentially a mix of IDN name, prefix, and Latin name suffix. Let's say, my company dot com dot UA. So the 2011 is when we started the actual policy process.

It took us about six months to get to the first draft, and we took one of our existing regional domains, PLA is [? 0:43:02] region, and we treated that as we called that pilot. So out of our registrars about one sixth signed up, it was free. So essentially they can fully test with the EPP with no financial impact.

And while after that experiment, we saw about 50% growth in the registrations, and then we decided to take over the regional domain

which is still free because we had some of those and can [? 0:43:30] first.

We also implemented pricing changes and other things that I will go through the data later, and again it took much longer to do the implementation. We went live in September last year, there was 44 registrars, if you compare with the previous slide, okay not a significant growth but still it was showing us the validation that our processes is working.

Right now, we have converted all of our commercial, meaning that our pre-domains to EPP. We still have one or two domain that are small enough and they are still free registration. So 69% of all of the domain space which is about 700,000 now is managed by new system. We have 114 registrars, which I think is a pretty good number.

Some of the old registrars dropped out the system, decided to become a reseller. For those of them who did not want to use EPP, we offered a web-only option. They essentially login to our portal, and essential use web EPP proxy, that was a good option.

That carried a 10% markup on the EPP prices because we felt like people who did not [? 0:44:46] ...EPP system, well, should somehow pay for that. And now I will outline briefly the policy changes we did. So the previous system had a mix of what they called active/passive model.

So registrars will directly contact our registry, registrants to register their contact information. And then the registers only do the actual domain changes. They had problems, like for example, change of

administrative contact of the domain would have to be run directly through us and involve the paper work.

And sometimes it was not clear to us whether the party had the contractual relationship with the registrar. So we have changed all of that. It also impacted the transfer policy because likewise it transferred registrars with EPP system. If the registrar every goes out of business, it actually happened a few times, we adopt all of their domains to what they call the [? 0:45:44] register, so we have a kind of technical register which is part of our company that register is a placeholder for all of those domains – well, not – dead registrar domains, they're orphans, you know?

That would be used to hold to those registrations until they expire, after that it will be deleted. The only thing that this registrar can do is to issue the transfer code, and with the EPP system, the registrant is free to choose the – well, one of the remaining registrars that is being used, say with the free domains...

When there was no registrar system before, we used that placeholder to essentially move all of those free registrations to that system. And I think we gave them three months period to choose the registrar. So essentially like make them all feel the next part.

The benefits of the EPP are well known in the industry, but I just underline those that are important for us. We had been tasked with changes to the data and implement the local law that will protect the private information of people.

That allowed to do because we can individually – actually, the registrar can individually open and close any part of information such as even name, email address, mailing address. So people can open and close... That only effects physical persons, but actually companies not disclose their information if they want to.

We have full IPv6 support. We have IDN support, and we register our table with IANA, we support all Cyrillic characters, from Russian Ukraine, and other alphabets, Serbian.

We can also support the so called reservation of domain names when the name is registered without any name servers, of course I think it would not be functional on the DNS level, but it would be functional as a protection of domain name registration.

The 30 day grace period after the expiration allows people to not lose their domain name in case of some financial issues. So that will allow the registrars to have flexibility with the domain name registration policies that implement with the registrant.

So for example, they can give them a renew notice in a 15 day, they also helps to handle business transactions with that 30 day delay domain payments. If the domain name is deleted, there is a restore operation which has, I think, four, five times more expensive than regular renewal.

But it would again, allow the registrations their domain name service if there is some – if they forgot to make a payment, or if it is some issue like that. So our goals now are to finish the conversion, so essentially do the last 30% of the domain database by the end of 2013.

We plan to implement DNSSEC, I really hope that should be live by the end of this year, at least in some of our domains, but I'm not holding my breath. They've been signing the UA domain itself since last year. We can retire completely our old legacy system, and our RRP registration and the contact database.

We have our new meeting, which is another form of outreach, it's in December of this year. I invite everybody who is in the region to come to that. We have people from Russia and Latvia, and Belarus, and [? 0:49:05] on our previous meetings.

While I hope reach a million domain marks, I hope that will be actually thanks to our outreach and multi-stakeholder model we employ in the local level. Well, I know this is probably not very useful, but as you can see the major retail registrations is under the com UA domains. Com UA and then the rest of those are regions that roughly correspond to the economic development level in the particular region.

I open up to questions, but as Yuri setup we have separate question section. So thank you guys. I'll pass it on to the next speaker.

BARRACK OTIENO:

Thank you. Actually we are moving on to the question and answer session. So the floor is open if you have any questions for the presenters. We have about 20 minutes or more for that. So this is your time. Questions to the presenters?

Okay. No questions then I would to thank you again all for listening to the presentations. Thank you. Okay. Let's give them a round of applause if there is no questions [applause].

Thank you very much. The next session is the regional organization update. I'll ask the speakers to come to the front.

BARRACK OTIENO:

Okay. So I'm going to start so that I can continue leading the session. I'll give an update for AfTLD, which is the regional organization for Africa. From 6th to 9th, May 2013, in collaboration with the Nigeria internet registry association, AfTLD held an advanced registry operators course. We had about 30 participants from different African countries, participating in this training.

During the last ICANN meeting in Beijing, the 46th meeting, AfTLD signed a memorandum of understanding with ZA central registry, supporting the African Union's bid for dot Africa. We also organized jointly with CENTR, LACTLD and APTLD, a roundtable in Beijing that brought together board members for all of the regional organizations.

And our objective was to enhance cooperation among the regional organizations. And then on 12th and 13th July, we co-organized the African DNS forum with the Internet Society and ICANN here in Durban. Most of you participated, and we thank you for finding time to come and present and to also participate in the forum. It was a great meeting.

And then latter today, at 6 PM, together with the other regional organizations that is CENTR, LACTLD, and APTLD, we'll have a roundtable with ICANN, the ICANN CEO and staff to discuss greater engagement among the regional top level domain organizations, so that we can contribute more to the ICANN community.

And then we have an event coming up, the secure registry operators course, AfTLD in partnership with NCRC is organizing this in [? 0:54:14], Madagascar. Thank you. That's our update. And last, but not least, we also had our annual general meeting and the board was reelected to continue.

You should receive more updates, but this is our current leadership structure as it stands. We'll be updating you as we go along. So Carolina?

CAROLINA AGUERRE:

Okay. Thank you. Since... [OPEN MIC 0:55:25 – 0:55:36] Since Beijing, and our last update on behalf of LACTLD, we had our fifth policy workshop and GA in Medellin. This took place on the 7th and 8th of May. And this is of course one of the most important meetings that LACTLD organizes on a yearly basis.

And it's the meeting where all general managers attend from the region, and we had a discussion... Basically we ended up discussing security issues from a policy perspective. And I'm going to develop this a little bit later on, on why we choose this subject.

We had elections of one our board members, by-laws changed a couple of years ago and this means that we will be having board members re-elected on a yearly basis approximately. So Frederico Neves from dot BR was re-elected as board member for the next period of three years.

And an interesting highlight of this overall meeting is that on the first day of that week, we organized for the first time ever a joint opening

session with LACNIC, which is the local area on the future of the internet governance agenda in the region.

And this was an interesting event in terms of cooperating with another regional organization. Well, another highlight is that we have of the second issue of the LACTLD report, this is a bi-annual publication, every six months we are publishing an edition of sort of magazine publication that reflects some of the interest of registries in the region, and also internet governance from a Latin American and Caribbean perspective.

And we also run a perception survey amongst members to see sort of how is LACTLD doing in terms of – I mean, accomplishing some of its objectives. We have a strategy that is 2011/2015 strategy and we try to sort of see whether, how we are managing with that, and how that reflects in our work.

And one of the most interesting findings, which wasn't surprising, but still is our meetings of the most highly valued activity. So what we have to keep on doing the job and doing it even better to add mobile U to our members.

And the last issue is that we are heavily involved in LACTLD with the chairman Eduardo Santoyo, and the other board members in the ICANN Latin American Caribbean strategy. We are devoting a lot of our time to make this strategy come true. And in that respect, there is a definition now of 10 projects out of the 70 that have been finally defined to be applied for a region.

And we are starting with five. And the first five pilot projects will have some kind of – they will start before the next ICANN meeting in Buenos

Aries, we will be providing some updates then. But the really good and positive message out of this is that we are getting more and more involvement of other ccTLDs into this ICANN Latin American Caribbean strategy.

And so we have the participation of these registries who are volunteering the work of many of the staff to follow up this projects. So what are the projects? The current projects of the current ICANN-LAC strategy which I would like to sort of mention very briefly. That our community, regional community evaluated as the most relevant ones.

Firstly, a road show on different topics that ICANN address. Secondly, a communications plan to engage more effectively the Latin American and Caribbean region with ICANN's key areas of interests, and how that fits in with the registry, their agendas as well.

But particularly its projects three and four, capacity building and security, stability and resiliency workshops, and emergency response teams for ccTLDs which are attacking the heart of ccTLDs and this is where LACTLD and a lot of the ccTLD effort is being placed these days.

Because, I mean, ccTLDs are highly central in this strategy, and we are seeing other actors, other stakeholders in the regions a lot of – they have their own interests as well, and they want to sort of help cooperate and do something about these issues.

And so yes, that is also where we are working and devoting a great deal of energy. And the fifth project is related is having a Latin American and Caribbean space in ICANN meetings. I mean, how to formalize some

kind of space where regional actors who usually do not attend or do not have a voice can participate and engage more effectively.

So what will be doing in the following months? Okay, we have technical workshop in Panama from the 3rd to the 6th of September, so there is a full week workshop, two tracks. And this is in November, it concerns a lot of attention from our technical community.

We expect around 40, 45 participants, and we will run two tracks. One is a security registry operations course which will be delivered by John Crane here in ICANN. And then we will have a more technical LACTLD tech workshop going on different – attending different issues such as DNSSEC, bind to have the request to have most certifications combined in many registries in our region.

And we need to develop the key issues of the SSR agenda from a ccTLD viewpoint in the LAC region. We are also getting involved in this Latin American Caribbean DNS meeting on the 15th of November in Buenos Aires.

This is something that has been a project that has been circulated for some weeks already, and here in ICANN it's already beginning to take a little bit more of a shape. And the Africa DNS Forum held as an example, as a very good idea of what we can do in the region in that respect.

And we are getting involved in it. And we will have our legal workshop of the GA on Saturday, 16th November just before the commencement of the ICANN meeting in Buenos Aires. So thank you very much.

BARRACK OTIENO:

Thank you Carolina. We'll have our presentation from APTLD.

HIRO HOTTA:

Hi. My name is Hiro Hotta, one of the directors on the APTLD Board. As our general manager, [? 1:03:48] is not in Durban, so I am presenting this. I am removed control device, yes. Okay. The first pages.

The first content is about our big challenges we are facing. The first one is future membership eligibility. To ensure that the APTLD continues to be of value in the changing environment, since the emergence of many new gTLDs, some research has been done.

Based on the members survey and the result, board made the recommendation, in February that goes like, to create a new member's category for IDN ccTLD managers. And to welcome new gTLDs as associate members with additional membership rights, and review them in one or two years term.

And in our two recent members meetings, there are very long discussions about this. We are still thinking about whether this is a good way or not. So looking at that, year 2013 will be a critical and challenging year for APTLD, with a changing environment of industry.

We must rethink our long term strategy with a particular focus on the types of membership, and their eligibility, and their rights. We also need to review our mission and our objectives and decide what direction APTLD wants to go.

Currently, our working group is working on possible new mission and objectives of APTLD. [? 1:05:59] the new future. The second big

challenge is the regional diversity within APTLD. As you know, the AP region is very diverse, huge. For example, recent member's meeting venues mostly in Eastern Asian countries, and currently most board members are from Eastern Asia, although the region covers is very huge.

So we are investigating how to involve ccTLDs from diverse regions, or sub-regions. So we are, with increased coordination with other regional TLD organizations and ICANN, on outreach to ccTLDs in the AP region.

Recent changes. Our secretariat has changed from Hong Kong to China, CNNIC as of July 1st. And as many of you may know, our general manager Jian will leave APTLD at the end of July. So her involvement will be missed. We will soon start for a new general manager. We are going to have a meeting in Xi'an, China on August 22 and 23.

So are we are very open so join us. And the meeting host CNNIC is very kind to offer up to three, four fellowships to participate in the meeting, in addition to the regular APTLD fellowship program. So interested ccTLDs, persons, are most welcome to apply.

So lastly, let me read words from Jian here that goes, "My dear ccNSO colleagues, it has very been a pleasure to work with all of you. Thank you for your support in the past. I have so many fond memories of colleagues and friends within and outside of APTLD for memories here.

I hope our path cross again in the future." Thank you.

BARRACK OTIENO: Thank you Hiro. Any questions for the panelists? Oh, sorry. Apologies Wim [laughs].

WIM DEGEZELLE: I think that was Barrack's revenge for sending the slides really at the last minute [laughs]. Hello. I'm Wim from CENTR. Like Leslie already said this morning, Peter cannot be here so I will do the CENTR update. I will focus on two or three things, three topics that happen the last two months, and three of our plans for the upcoming months.

So 1, 2, 3, the Jamboree, ICANN Brussels update, and EuroDIG. First the CENTR Jamboree. I'm sure that these were already announced at the last meeting. We had that for the second time, we organized all our CENTR workshops together in six weeks – I'm sorry, in one week. That were six different meetings spread over three days.

And we managed to have roughly 170 all ccTLD people sitting in the same office, sitting in the same hotel, coming to the same meetings, going to the same direction. And all we needed for that was one great host, so I think thank you again, I think to [? 1:10:34]...

Because organizing a Jamboree, I think, practically speaking more difficult than it would seem at the first moment. But I think it was a great opportunity. Where we see that people from the technical workshop, normally come to the CENTR technical workshop, speak with the people that go to RND.

We had also legal meeting, administrative workshop, and also the marketing and communication people where there. Since the Jamboree, we will do again next year. I don't know if it's already official,

but we will stay in the neighborhood, the same distance from Brussels, but we might head up to the other direction.

So if you are coming up, you will probably see what options we have left there. Second point that happened, it was a CENTR update at an ICANN meeting in Brussels. We were informed, we got an invitation that ICANN came up with the idea to have regular updates in Brussels for what I say, while I'll say the crowd in and around the European Capital.

There were a lot of institutions. As you know, we have the European Parliament, European Commission, but also other institutions around there. Although it was aimed partly for the people working there, but also ICANN briefing for... There were some registrars, there were some other IT organizations.

And my opinion it was really useful for CENTR to be there so that we, as regional organizations, would say looked what is going on in the ccTLD world. My colleague Peter gave a presentation on which he gave an update on the growth, market position, and security.

I remember a lot of the people in the room were kind of surprised when they saw how well ccTLDs were doing in Europe. He showed one slide, one map, where he showed the penetration period of the ccTLD in the country compared to the GTLDs.

And I know it was for a lot of the attendants were surprised to see that basically the local ccTLD was – sorry, is still and will remain of course, but it's very strong in its own country. Well, I don't know if ICANN will continue, I expect it to continue.

They will continue and I think it's good that we are good and can represent the – or can give an overview on what's happening in the ccTLD, European ccTLD community. Third highlight, we had a EuroDIG meeting in June, in Europe. EuroDig is the – basically the European Internet Governance Forum.

I was approached to one of the CENTR members, well, how come you Europe, they have to give everything another name? I mean, you would expect that it's just called Euro IGF, but no it's EuroDIG.

But then you say, no, you have AfTLD, LACTLD, but why does it have to be not Euro TLD but CENTR. I say, I mean, should look into it. I don't know. I never thought about it. But we had EuroDIG. EuroDIG is basically the same as I did for the larger ITFs happening.

A lot of stakeholders from different regions, sorry from different areas within the internet within IT and IT related stakeholders together, and have them discuss about the future of the internet governance. CENTR was working together with RIPE on a panel on governance challenges in the technical space.

It was nice to... I gave a short update to DNSSEC and there was a person from RIPE giving an update on IPv6. It was very nice or very never great for me that I could present the – another map we made at CENTR. We showed okay, this was the situation in 2008, where we had three ccTLDs ready for – well, ready to provide to the DNSSEC names.

If you see the map, the map of the situation at the end of 2013, you see that almost all European ccTLDs are ready. And that was a nice start for the discussion with the people in the room on the question of, well, but

what's initiative should governments stake, or can they do something to help with the deployment.

And this was both the deployment of IPv6 in Europe or DNSSEC. One of the main messages we gave, I think both RIPE and CENTR gave while the government, one of the things they should do is look at their own services and see how they are performing and be the first ones to say, "Okay, we have IPv6, we are using DNSSEC."

And they should then start and see if they can support other projects. I hope the message came through. So a little preview of the future. In a couple of months, in the beginning of October, we will have our 50th CENTR General Assembly. I looked it up, we had the first one apparently in Paris, 16th of March in 1999.

I'm tempted to ask for people that were there to raise their hands, but I wasn't. I know that there were probably a couple of people that were already there. I had a quick look at the agenda on our website, and it's remarkable they are discussing how they should work together with the GAC, and how they should, well, have good cooperation with ICANN and the predecessor with the ccNSOs.

So that not that much has changed. But, none the less, I'm really looking forward to – I mean, it will be in Brussels, the 2nd and 3rd of October, we have our 50th CENTR GA. Party link to us, is a new initiative that we started up, that are the CENTR awards.

CENTR awards, we selected four categories and said, okay, members, CENTR members can select projects in their own registry or from

colleagues from other registries, and apply – send them in. The nomination period is open until the end of August.

To apply for a CENTR award, and then a jury will decide – will look at the projects and decide who can get the award. We selected four categories: research and development; marketing, PR, communications, all together one; security; and the contributor for the year.

That's not the person that gave the best presentation at CENTR, but it's really contributor of the year, the person, or the project, that really did something remarkable or that something that really helped the ccTLD sector in Europe or globally.

It is the first time we organized this, so again, I think in the Buenos Aires meeting, Peter will be able to give an update and say, okay, this and this projects were selected. It is an award ceremony, but I think it's really very much in – well would be really good for us for the ccTLD sector, if you can come up with good examples of, look, we actually are doing more than just doing our day to day business.

Or really have some great projects that we can show to the world. Things that our colleagues, our project teams are working on, and are kind of examples of excellence. This brings me really nicely to my next topic, because on the same idea, or closely linked to the same idea, CENTR is again – or, I'm happy to announce that we passed the selection for an IGF workshop in Bali later this year.

We do that again with the other regional organizations. So I have to thank my colleagues. Also have to thank Giovanni who is basically the

chair of our IGF working group, and who came up with the idea and helped steering the concept of the workshop.

But what's important is it's basically the same there. We go to the IGF, we've been there now five, six times explaining what the ccTLD sector is doing and how good we are in our main business.

The topic of the workshop in Bali, is while we should show – it's time for us to show that next to our day to day business, that next to being in the registry for the country code of our country, we are so active. And we have a lot of other projects, which we also help to develop the internet, or develop the local internet community.

So that's why, that's the topic of the workshop. And we will have a couple of, at least from each region, we will have an organization saying, a registry saying, okay, this is the project we did. This is the way, how we helped developed the internet community.

Well, you can say okay there were three presentations, but we also launched, or going to launch a survey to all members of the different organizations, where we're also asked for examples. Okay, what kind of projects do we have? What do we think is really good to show and that we will make also, put together in one presentation?

We not only have four voices or five panelists, but also can show that it's not something for – we didn't pick and choose five countries that we know, okay, these are with examples. But you can say, these are just examples and here we have an overview of what the others are doing.

So that was my short update. If you want to have more information, sorry you can see to our website, you can follow us on Twitter, and

there again, also @CENTRnews updates. You know we publish statistical updates so you can be interesting just to follow us on the Twitter website.

And you will get an update at the next meeting.

BARRACK OTIENO:

Thank you Wim. Any questions to the panelists? Now it's question and answer time. Comments or contributions? Okay. Then let's appreciate our panelists for [applause] wonderful presentations. I would like to hand over the meeting back to the Chair. I think we are way ahead of time.

LESLEY COWLEY:

Thank you Barrack. We are indeed well ahead of time. Maybe that gives us an opportunity to get the front of the queue for lunch. I'm afraid that there is not a sponsor for lunch today, so it's find your own sandwiches or lunch somewhere.

So actually having some more time gives us a proper opportunity to go and do that. We restart at 2:00 in this room, where we have our panel discussion on capacity building. So I'd love to see you all back at 2:00. Thank you.

UNIDENTIFIED:

This is the audio timestamp for room, hall 1B, this is the post-lunch continuation of the ccNSO member's meeting day two, start time will be 2:00 local time, 14:00 hours. Stream and live recording are all live.

LESLEY COWLEY:

Good afternoon everybody. We're going to make a start in two minutes-ish, because we're a bit short of people in the room. Having giving you an extended lunch hour, they've all gone off site or somewhere I suspect. I think we're also short of a few panelists. If we have anyone else that we're waiting for, let's encourage you to come up front.

And we'll start as soon as we're ready. Thank you.

LESLEY COWLEY:

Okay. So good afternoon everybody and welcome back. This is the ccNSO panel session, which is our final main session for the ccNSO meeting. And this time around we have a discussion on cross regional capacity building. Maybe we should retile that as happy regional capacity building.

I think we mean cross, across regions. Anyway. So the kind of theme around this is that the need for capacity building has been a topic of ongoing interest. It's at the core of some of the regional strategies, and we often talk about technical capacity building, operational capacity building, and so on.

And also, we talk about this context of the need to strength the multi-stakeholder governance model. And there is loads of initiatives out there. There is loads of initiatives that can come under this heading. They range from hands on operational training, to sharing best practices, and sharing experiences.

And also initiatives and exercises to strength the multi-stakeholder model. So. What we would like to talk about this afternoon is whether

there is a need for coordination of capacity building efforts. And actually there is two words in that sentence which are probably to varying degrees of interpretation.

So what do we mean by coordination? And what do we mean by capacity building? Capacity building in what? I'm hoping that those areas can be explored. So we'd like to talk about what level of coordination might be needed.

Do we have a goal? What is it? And then what level might there be coordination? At regional level? At global level? And so on. Do we have any short term goals or long term goals? Should we focus on a very narrow area or a very broad spectrum?

I'm very much hoping that we get some answers to those questions this afternoon. So the format for this afternoon, in just a moment I'm going to ask the panel members to introduce themselves. And then we are going to have an opening, brief presentation from Baher, who is going to talk about the Middle East strategy particularly with regard to ccTLD capacity building.

We're going to open for a panel discussion, which is going to be moderated by one of my vice-chairs, Byron Holland. I am going to endeavor to keep us with time. And the more serious challenge will be to summarize, if I can, some of the views over this session.

So let me start by asking for some introductions. Paulos, would you like to begin please? Who you are and where you are from.

PAULOS NYIRENDA: Thank. I'm Paulos Nyirenda. I'm from Malawi. I run the Malawi dot MW ccTLD. From the Africa region. I chair the Africa top level domain organization, AfTLD. And I'm the organization is doing quite a bit of work in capacity building... Thank you.

CAROLINA AGUERRE: Yes. Good afternoon. I'm Carolina Aguerre from LACTLD. I'm the general manager. LACTLD is the regional organization of ccTLDs in the Latin American and Caribbean region. And definitely capacity building is one of our main objectives. It's one of the main, as I would say, services we provide to our members.

And we really... We are working on this and we would like to engage even further in these activities.

KEITH DAVIDSON: My name is Keith Davidson. I'm the vice chair of the ccNSO council. I'm contracted by internet NZ, the operators of dot NZ, amongst other things, to look after some key international relationships. I'm a member of the ISOC board, ISOC being a body truly seeking capacity building.

I'm a former chair and director of APTLD, the Asia Pacific Top Level Domain Association. I'm the convener of the inaugural Pacific RGF, and I want to concentrate what I'm discussing today on my neighborhood, the Pacific area. So thank you.

SCOTT EVANS: Good afternoon everyone. My name is J. Scott Evans, and I am an attorney at Yahoo, INC. I'm head of the global brand domains and copy-

write division. I manage about 36,000 domain registrations for dot
Flicker, for Flicker, Yahoo, and Tumblr.

I am also the owner of many country code top level domain
registrations. And Yahoo would like to reach out to this community in
order to bring some of its commercial expertise in marketing and
security in order to help country code top level domains deal with the
changing ecosystem that they're going to face when it's no longer 271,
273 domains, but it's 1,400 and your competition is a lot more fierce
than it's ever been in the past.

And so that's why I'm here today. Thank you.

PIERRE BONIS:

Good afternoon everybody. My name is Pierre Bonis. I'm the CEO at
AfNIC, the registry for the dot FR. AfNIC has a tradition of working with
its African counterparts, and we have [? 0:11:47] which gather between
10 and 13 ccTLDs, mostly from Africa, and work with them. There are
members of our Board, because they have one representative in the
Board.

I would maybe add that that's before being in AfNIC, I've been involved
in international cooperation with ICTs for the French government for 10
years.

BAHER ESMAT:

Hi. My name is Baher Esmat. I'm with ICANN. I'm part of the global
stakeholder engagement team. I'm the regional VP for the Middle East,
and I'm based in Cairo, Egypt.

ABIBU NTAHIGIYE: Good afternoon everyone. My name is Abibu Ntahigiye from Tanzania, East Africa. I work with dot TZ registry. I'm also on the ExCom member of FTLD. I have a little experience on capacity building at regional level and at national level as well. Thank you.

DEMI GETSCHKO: I am Demi Getschko from dot BR, Brazil. I run the NICBR, Brazilian NIC, we are a non for profit organization. We begin in the internet in '89. Where we get the re-delegation of dot BR. I am the administrative contact in the IANA database since then.

And we are closed registry just for Brazilians or institutions that are located in the country. And we are a very, very thick registry. We don't have optimized registers, and we use the surplus of money we get from the registry for other activities, we will explain this after that. Thank you.

LESLEY COWLEY: Okay. So thank you for those introductions. Let me hand over to Baher just to set the scene. Thank you.

BAHER ESMAT: Thank you Lesley. Good afternoon everyone. So I'm going to briefly talk about the ICANN engagement strategy in the Middle East. And this is just an example of other engagement efforts that ICANN has been undertaking in the past year.

It started with the Africa strategy that was announced in Toronto as part of ICANN's new season and the commitment made by our CEO to go to

the world and get closer to stakeholders. Similar efforts started afterwards in Latin America and the Caribbean as well as the Middle East.

And currently Asia Pacific as well. The Middle East is quite peculiar in the sense that it's not really a region, it's not one of the ICANN's geographical regions. It's countries fall within the Middle East. They geographically fall into different continents, Africa and Asia. The countries are technically responsible for – are the ones with the red stars.

And when we started, and this spans from Egypt in the west all the way to Pakistan in the East. When we started talking to community members like eight, nine months back, about engagement in region feedback, we got from some people was that we need to also include North African countries in the strategy, even though they belong to a different region.

So we included those countries. And the working group that was established to work on the strategy, we had 22 members from 11 different countries. This was an entirely community driven effort. People were volunteers coming from different stakeholders.

We actually have about six or seven members presenting, who are coming from ccTLD operators in the Middle East and they were participating actively, and actually they are still participating actively in the working group.

They have worked over the past six months, they had the strategy finalized in early May, and today, this morning we presented the implementation plan for year one, which has started July 1st this year.

Just in a nutshell, the strategy identified, it was a three year strategy and it identified three main overarching goals. To foster engagement between ICANN and the Middle East region, and by the Middle East we mean all stakeholders in the Middle East.

And to build strong and competitive DNS sector. And also to promote multi-stakeholder internet governance models. The group identified three key strategic areas with specific objectives and recommendations for each area. DNS security and stability, domain sector, and internet governance ecosystem.

The document, I mean the entire strategy document is posted online you can go and check it. The implementation plan for year one is also posted on the ICANN community website.

So this is a snapshot of the, what you can see in the implementation plan. I'm not going to go into the details, but you can notice that there is a large part of the strategy or the plan is focusing on engagement, outreach, and capacity building.

With capacity building, we not only talking about making or organizing trainings or workshops and of all this, but we're also talking about having programs to train the trainers and to build trainer capacities in the Middle East.

So if we have any activities in the future, we can rely more on resources that exist in the region. Also a good part of the strategy focused on

developing the domain name sector, including ccTLD registries, including future gTLD registries, registrars.

Also the IDN element is very important in the Middle East. While the few common factors in the Middle East region is that the whole region uses the same script, it's the Arabic script. Even though we have different languages in some countries like Pakistan, Iran, but they still use the same script.

So IDN is very important. This is the timeline. The group specified a number of activities over the year divided onto the four quarters. Again you can see that capacity building is very important, we're talking about areas like DNSSEC and ccTLD operations, IDNs and so forth.

Some activities will expand over the year, like with the IDN regional task force. There was a recommendation to have a regional taskforce to provide input to the different projects within ICANN or IDNs variance and registration data and so forth.

And currently, the group is working on the next actions that we're going to be undertaking to get the feet on the ground. And with this, I'm going to stop here and would be happy to take any questions. Thank you.

LESLEY COWLEY:

Okay. Let's gather up questions in the discussion as we go. Okay. So I'm going to hand over to Byron. Who hopefully has a working mic now, yup, that sounds working. Let's open up for discussion. Thanks Byron.

BYRON HOLLAND:

All right. Thank you very much. I think we're going to have a really excellent discussion today, and one of the things that I think is always wonderful about this particular panel session is we tend to get a lot of folks from a variety of communities in this panel, not just the traditional cc folks who are always here in the room.

But we have ICANN staff here from different perspectives, private sector actors, regional organizations, ccs, etcetera. So there is a good opportunity, I think, to have a very fertile discussion about this issue, which touches all or most of the communities within the ICANN space.

So I also want it to be a conversation, not a monologue or a basic dialogue. So please, there is a wealth of perspectives, a wealth of organizations here at the front of the room, but also here in the rest of the room. So please don't be shy to ask for the mic, to ask questions, to offer your perspectives.

So just to get started with, we're talking about capacity building, but also primarily collaboration. And collaboration on capacity building is the thread that we really wanted to pull through this whole discussion. And I think one of the first things to think about is the actual word itself collaboration.

We talk about it. Or coordination rather. We talk about it. But what does that word actually mean to different people and different actors within the ecosystem? So I thought just to start with, I would ask the panel in terms of when they think about coordination of capacity building, what does that mean?

Because of course it is a spectrum from fairly passive... Should somebody write a list? Keep a list up to date? Up to much more active. Somebody could... Are we going to operate this thing? Is somebody really going to take charge and own it, and run it, and make it go, and coordinate it that way?

So what does that mean to us? And then hopefully by the end, do we find any agreement on what that might actually mean? So over to the panel, maybe I could just... Is there anybody that wants to take a shot of what their version of coordinating capacity building would look like? Keith [laughs], I think you're just scratching your head, but your hand was up [laughter].

KEITH DAVIDSON:

No, I was scratching my head. Okay. Reflecting on my area of the Pacific, for example, coordination might mean something more than a group of people coming together in a forum like this and saying, "We're going to introduce some capacity building, and we're going to run some events in that part of the world, and can we work together?" And leaving it at that.

I think where you might find that getting somebody from the remotest part of Pacific might involve them jumping on the twice a month mail boat for four days, to get to [? 0:23:58] to get on a plane to come to New Zealand. Where you are conceivably taking someone away for three weeks to attend your one day meeting, you actually do really need to coordinate, and you really need to maximize the entire exposure.

You can't move forward for a tiny, small island, developing states, you can't just look at one issue in isolation and say, that's all we can do this time. You have to maximize what you're going to do in every way to warrant bringing people together and building their capacity.

BYRON HOLLAND:

So, listen to that, that's a fairly, what I would say without a doubt, on the active end of coordination. I mean, you're really taking charge of the whole thing, driving it, and running it.

Any other versions? Jay Scott?

SCOTT EVANS:

I would have to agree with you. And the reason I say that is that I always find that in volunteer organizations, organic driven initiatives seem to falter, and fall off a cliff, and fall out of people's minds, the day to day part of living goes on and you're dealing with your day job.

So I really believe that an active coordinated effort that is focused and has buy in, and has someone responsible for driving it and meeting goals and metrics, is something that would be of great value to everyone because, as you say, for some people it's a great investment of time, and money, and effort to participate and they need to be able to maximize that.

BYRON HOLLAND:

Pierre?

PIERRE BONIS:

Thank you. The... Maybe we have to ask ourselves the question, why do we need to coordinate first? Is it to avoid overlapping? Is it to avoid waste of money and energy? Maybe. But before coordinating we have to assess and to know what other needs in terms of capacity building.

And the coordination comes at the end to me. First we need to have a bottom up approach, and knowing what are the needs of the people who seek capacity building. Otherwise the coordination is going to be, we think that you need that, and we'll organize ourselves to give you that.

And it has been done that way for years, and years, and it's not really working.

BYRON HOLLAND:

Well I think that's a great segue, because one of the next questions is going to be, what are the objectives of it? What are the objectives of capacity building? What's the end goal? How do we know what we've go there? When we talk about capacity building, what does – what do countries in Africa need versus the Middle East need, versus Asia.

I know when I started at dot CA, I sure could have used some multi-level, multi-level. Bottom up governance capacity building personally, as a CEO of an organization who didn't understand it. So different regions, different needs.

SCOTT EVANS:

From my perspective, I don't think you every get there. I don't think you ever get there. The technology just moves too fast. And because it

does, there may people that need more assistance at the beginning, but I don't think that is ever completely at capacity.

I just, I know at Yahoo it certainly has never happened, the technology changes so very fast.

BYRON HOLLAND: Paulos, did you want to say something?

PAULOS NYIRENDA: Yes. I think picking up from Pierre, I think it's important to first of all ask what it is that needs to be coordinated, and capacity building being such a wide-ranging area, it involves things like skills development, things like tools, things like resources.

And things like policy making. So it's important to see what needs to be coordinated and then we can go down to the coordination itself. In Africa, the various ccTLDs, for example, have a varied range of names in this area.

And we try to share our programs accordingly. We have partnerships that we need to coordinate for example.

BYRON HOLLAND: Could you break it into the very highest level, both the technical and non-technical, they have equal weight or equal needs in your region?

PAULOS NYIRENDA: In our region, technical is by far the biggest need. We invite the DNS forum over the past week, and one of the really top on the list is automation, for example. Which is a basic need for almost all registries in Africa. There are very few...

There are 54 registries for ccTLD and only about two or three of those are fully automated now with EPP for example. So we need a lot of capacity building and skills development for example to be able to run, for the ccTLDs to be able to run automated registries.

BYRON HOLLAND: Okay. Thanks. Baher?

ABIBU NTAHIGIYE: I would like to add to where Paulos ended in terms of capacity building in Africa. Form the assessment, the African ccs are not doing well in terms of DNS operations, and basically the assessment has said very few registries have got very few automated registries.

But again, the capacity building aspect it falls under another aspect of marketing, because if you talk about DNSSEC, you can't implement the DNSSEC if the registrars are not capable to deploy DNSSEC. So you find out at the end of the day, you have the capacity building at the registrar level, but again, through capacity building even the IT guys within local institution, you find that we are branding [? 0:30:44] and therefore promoting the uptake.

BYRON HOLLAND: Baher?

BAHER ESMAT:

Yeah. So from ICANN's perspective, I would strengthen the multi-stakeholder model, and to ensure that everyone has the opportunity and the ability to engagement in this model. Now capacity building simply provides the means for individuals and organizations to get engaged and to participate effectively in the process.

Now, the details of capacity building vary from one region to another, and as Pierre said, we need to have it as a bottom up process and we need to identify the priorities and the needs in each region.

So, but one of the key overall objectives is to strengthen the model and ensure that everyone is part of it.

BYRON HOLLAND:

Carolina?

CAROLINA AGUERRE:

Yes. I'm going a little bit back to the word of coordination, to the first question. Because coordination works well, particularly with respect to a regional organization, if you also talk about a cooperation and you have those together.

Usually networks that cooperate are sort of more advance and those were merely coordinated. So I would reflect on two levels on the issue of coordination. I mean, we need a lot of cooperation, and particularly in capacity building we need to enforce the idea that, we need to have a level of trust among ourselves, and that is an asset that the ccTLD community definitely has.

And that is one of the key issues that regional ccTLD organizations do and accomplish. I mean, we work in an environment where the levels of trust are high. And so because of that, we tend to be able to quite efficient coordinators, and then we are able also to liaise more effectively with other organizations in the region, or of course regionally.

And I think that in order to distinguish those two levels and their interplay is quite an important issue.

BYRON HOLLAND:

And maybe I could just pick up on LACTLD specifically a little bit, as somebody who is very familiar with the whole region, whose responsibility is the whole region. When we talk about the region, the year end, are you saying a wide range of requirements in terms of capacity building?

Or are there some real common themes?

CAROLINA AGUERRE:

Well we are an extremely diverse region, and so we do have extremely different needs. And we feel that in a way we have players within a region that can help us sustain ourselves as ccTLDs, quite effectively. Actually many of the most developed ccTLDs are very much aware of the role they play in helping others.

And that is very much a model that is already at play within LACTLD. But we also know, and we had this meeting two months ago in Columbia, where we discuss, I mean, if we had to sort of develop a list

of security, stability, and resiliency checklist of how we are working and what are we doing, and we thought, okay.

Talking to other ccTLDs in other regions would be an extremely sort of important value to our work. I mean, we think that would add a lot of value and legitimacy to the kind of benchmarks that we need.

BYRON HOLLAND:

Keith, I'm going to come to you in a second. Demi, just before I come to you I'm going to come out to the audience. Are there any comments or thoughts on what we've heard so far? Or even the definition of coordination? Key goals? I'll leave it with you.

I'm going to go back to Demi, from the same region, from LACTLD region, and really on the ground doing capacity building as you've done for a very long time. Your thoughts?

DEMI GETSCHKO:

Thank you Byron. Carolina stalled my [laughs]... But anyway, I think there are two different things, the collaboration and the cooperation – coordination and collaboration. And I suppose the most important would for internet is collaboration.

We are from the very beginning of the network collaborating with ourselves. We are one of – the second [? 0:35:35] of the other and so from the very beginning, the ccs are very collaborative structure. As for coordination, coordination is more to deal with resources or with common resources, like ICANN deals with names and numbers.

It's very important to be coordinated in that area, but we do not coordinate between us. We are ccns, we collaborate. As for capacity building, we need some very specific capacity building inside the ccns, but I think most important than the capacity building is to spread awareness of the things that we are dealing with.

For example, the awareness to the community of what is going on with IPv6 and IPv4, how are you ready to deal with that? What is the real benefit, the benefit of DNSSEC and how it would spread DNSSEC through the whole chain of [? 0:36:41] and not just the register.

It's easy for us to have DNSSEC in our registries and sign it, we are one of the first count to have all the treaties sign. But the real benefit is to have all the chain aware of this benefits. And I suppose it is more or less my first word on this. Thank you.

BYRON HOLLAND: Thanks Demi. Keith?

KEITH DAVIDSON: I think just echoing some of the comments that have already been made about the need to be bottom up. I think if things are cooperative, collaborative, and coordinated, in all regards, you're on to the start of a winning formula.

For ICANN, for example, to say we have a model that works because in the Middle East it worked, and we're going to cut and paste that to apply it elsewhere. That's not likely to work. It is a question of partners coming together in the space and saying, "Here is the sweeter things

that we can deliver, and what is it that you need from us? And what do you need firstly to even make the decision about what you need?"

In order for that help to come. So I think there is also the temptation, the little bit of warning that we can't entertain any concept of a one size fits all, we found a solution that worked brilliantly there, so therefore we can transpose it everywhere else. I think the uniqueness of the ccTLDs, the way they've grown and so on is to be cherished and not to be infringed by any top down approach in that area.

BYRON HOLLAND: So capacity building without a doubt is a global need, but it's got to be very much regionally or sub-regionally delivered and highly tailored not even just to a region, but literally country by country in the cc space.

KEITH DAVIDSON: Yes, but where necessary. Where the ccTLDs can collaborate together and can work across their region to build that, and so the likes of the regional TLD operation is playing their part, and so on, to work on those common threads as well.

So it's vertical and horizontal.

BYRON HOLLAND: J Scott?

SCOTT EVANS: I've worked in [? 0:39:03] and tobacco corporation, through the [? 0:39:06] and then with Yahoo, and I ran my own business for 14 years.

And personally, I think global large global international organization, you find that the regionalization and sub-regionalization, that's when you're the most successful.

The sales people know that market better. The marketing people know that market, they know the culture better, and it's just smart to harness that knowledge and that passion for their region in a positive manner to find solutions. We hear Africa says that they have technical issues, and it may be others it's more about marketing and network coordination.

So I think allowing regions to self-identify and then coming up with the tools that we can then provide them to assist them is the best way to go.

BYRON HOLLAND:

Pierre?

PIERRE BONIS:

Thank you. I would like to give an example of what I meant by the bottom up approach when it comes to defining the needs. When we had this African DNS Forum, that was three or four priorities that emerged from the forum, today's discussion. One of the most important was the atomization, the industries, and the ability they can have to run automatically a registry.

And then we have another priority which is DNSSEC. So I don't have anything against DNSSEC, I think it's very important. But to me this is not at all a bottom up approach. This is a priority, a global one, a very

important one, and one that ICANN is very involved in. But I've never talked to any African cc who told me my priority to deploy DNSSEC.

My priority is to run my registry, to have EPP, to be able to interact with my registrars. So with the word the coordination, we should have the word prioritize, which means that we can fill the need of our counter parts, we have to know what we shall do before.

But on this specific case, I'm very sure that the DNSSEC roadshow is very important, but it's not going to have concrete results because the registries are not technically ready to deploy it. So we have to be very careful on how we prioritize our actions, and for that the world of AfTLD in the DNS forum was very important.

And I really hope that we will start with the beginning, which is atomization of the registries.

BYRON HOLLAND:

Baheer?

BAHER ESMAT:

Just very, very quickly. Picking up on what Keith has said about one concept or one model could not, one size does not fit all. I agree because again, given examples from my region, the level of engagement of, and taking ccTLDs in particular, as an example, the level of engagement of ccTLDs in ICANN and ccNSO is not tangible.

Only a few of them who come to ICANN or ccNSO, even though many of them are members but they don't engage. The level of engagement in regional organizations like in my case, APTLD for instance has the largest

part of my countries in my region fall under APTLD, again they are not participating effectively in APTLD.

However, when we get to a situation where we have some smaller regional activity among the Middle East countries like this project of the strategy, you get more input, you get more engagement, you get more feedback. So I totally agree that one solution wouldn't fit all, one size solution wouldn't fit all.

We need to look for variety of mechanisms and solutions to deal with the different cases and different regions.

BYRON HOLLAND:

One of the threads I wanted to pick up on was something that J Scott mentioned earlier, and that's the notion that in a volunteer centric environment, who really carries the ball on? We're all busy with day jobs, so who is going to really help do this?

Who is going to get it done? And regardless of your definition of coordination, somebody has got to do something. And how does that happen in a fundamentally volunteer driven environment? We have ICANN, ISOC, regional organizations, they all had a hand in it.

There are other organizations that do good work in the DNS space, that don't come from this space at all. Other not for profit type organizations, and how are they fitting into the mix?

And then the other thing that I would ask here, especially if there is not strong coordination going on, is how do we ensure that those

organizations aren't tripping over each other? It's great to do, or maybe not great to do depending on your perspective, a DNSSEC workshop.

But if ICANN comes in and does it, and then ISOC comes in and does it, and then some other not for profit does it, and regional organization does it, is that the most effective way to build capacity? Or are we just tripping over each other? Printing materials over and over again?

Do we see that any kind of coordination happening between ISOC and ICANN? And even on just on the ICANN... I was interested to see your slide, and I'll take this up with you guys in a sec, interested to see the slide in terms of things that are going to be done, which is capacity building from ICANN, ccTLD operations.

And I guess just to be a bit provocative, I would ask the question well, what is ICANN know about ccTLD operations to be giving lessons on it as a coordination body? And that's a very operational, technical field to be in. Why ICANN? Keith and then Paulos.

KEITH DAVIDSON:

Sure. Great points. Well, it's not likely that you'll find ISOC and ICANN tripping over each other to do the same things. I think I can be quite critical of ISOC, for example, is an organization that's been very busy recently deploying ISPs in Africa, which is a great thing to be doing, but it's not being coordinated with other activities.

So for ICANN to have gone and beside ISOC and deployed root server mirrors that at the same time for some collaboration over the choice of hardware and finding hardware providers for that as well, there is a whole host of things that could be happening so that they could then be

some cross-border DNS secondary servers between the ccTLDs being in stored in each other's countries.

And so on, so that we're taking advantage of opportunities individually, but we're failing to see the big picture together, and that to me is the waste of this. Because you keep going back to and go and do another little piece, and it would be better to have a wholesome approach to say, this is what we need to do top to bottom and sideways for this particular opportunity.

BYRON HOLLAND: A little more coordination. Paulos.

PAULOS NYIRENDA: Thank you Keith for highlighting that. Yes, in Africa we see a lot of players who want to play a role in capacity building, and the need for coordination of the various players and partners is really, really great. It's good to see that for some of the activities that the FTLD is involved in, we are seeing maybe a part in rising where the FTLD takes the leading role as the regional organization.

And the others support the initiatives that we see. But this is still an issue on the Africa continent. And especially if money is flowing. When funding is flowing, it is really a critical issue because the partners seem to be tripping over each other, supporting the same country, for the same program when they could collaborate and pull resources.

I wanted to highlight one more issue for the Africa continent, and this is the definition of the region. This is important because, for example, I

saw from the presentation that the North African countries are being treated as Middle East.

Now, when we run programs for the continent, we find that there is very little participation from the North African region. It's because they are in a dual relationship. Sometimes they think of themselves as being in the Middle East, sometimes they think of themselves as being in Africa. And this is quite a big issue for AfTLD, for AfriNIC, for example as well.

So defining the region is also important so that the area of collaboration is well defined.

UNIDENTIFIED:

Hello. My name is [? 0:49:53], I'm vice president for Latin American and the Caribbean with ICANN. First of all, thank you for the opportunity to participate here and sharing this ideas. I just wanted to make a brief comment on coordination with ISOC and the regional ccTLD organization and ICANN.

And highlighting the importance of doing this regional strategies because it's really a matter of coordinating between different initiatives that are going on in the region, to avoid overlapping of course. So in Latin America, traditionally we've worked very well with ISOC and LACTLD, we are pretty much partners.

So we will not overlap the efforts or duplicate with them by no means. We've done that in the past, but now with the regional strategy, everybody is sitting at the same table. More than having a problem of

duplication, we have a potential having synergies and having more recourses for capacity building.

I think yes, you're right, the question of ICANN will be to pretty much coordinate and help and facilitate, as Fadi has mentioned, this regional strategies are not ICANN strategies in the region. The role of ICANN here is to provide support as requested and as needed for the same stakeholders in the group.

So ICANN has developed some expertise in some subjects and either we provide some support in, let's say by providing some third party organization that provides capacity building, or a couple of staff members that are in specific subjects that are professional to share some experiences for capacity building.

BYRON HOLLAND:

Thank you. I go to J Scott first, and then I'll come over here, and then over here.

SCOTT EVANS:

I serve in a lot of volunteer organizations, and just to a more practical level, you said how do we ensure. I think that a lot of your members in the ccTLDs space are members of these various organizations. And I've always found it very helpful to have someone serve as a liaison, and when you have meetings, they present what is going on the agenda in these other organizations.

And that kind of cross-pollination of information allows you to see where there may be a lack of capacity. They're missing an issue, or to

reach out and offer to help them. We do that with the other intellectual property organizations all over the world because they are regional, they are national, they are international.

And so that type of practical, giving somebody a role and responsibility to report back, assist in the information sharing, and I've always found it very useful.

BYRON HOLLAND:

Thanks. Bhaer and then Keith. But first, I just want to pick up on a point that Paulos made and maybe I'll just put you, Abibu, in the cross-hairs here. What I heard Paulos say is that some countries in the African region seem to attract a lot of capacity building.

I sort of heard it's almost like a bit of a flood going into one particular one, maybe at the expense of others. Is that something you see or feel? Or did I misinterpret what I heard there? Is there some reason for that kind of particular attraction...

ABIBU NTAGHIGIYE:

I don't think that is very much true because within the FTLD, first of all I believe that FTLD within the Africa should be the right coordinator of the capacity building initiatives within the region. But again, it depends on in the regions, how active we tease to get connected to various supporting institutions.

Because supporting institutions would like or be happy to see if you have benefitted from their initiatives, how far you are doing, and

reflecting from your performance. They might be attracted to assist you further within the international level.

BYRON HOLLAND: Is there a danger of that, that those who are doing well are those who are going to keep attracting [CROSSTALK 0:54:19]

ABIBU NTGHIGIYE: ...because I check dot TZ as a specific [? 0:54:24] we are collaborating very well with the individual cc, and we do also – we do collaborating in terms of capacity building, and I have quality examples that are TZ staff went as instructors in one of the coordinated trainings, but also they went to neighboring countries and therefore they DNSSEC training.

So basically we are taking down the benefit from these sponsors.

BYRON HOLLAND: Baher? Thank you.

BAHER ESMAT: Yeah I just wanted to clarify that with regard to the Middle East plan, and particularly capacity building activities, we're actually counting on our partners from ISOC community, ISOC and the RIRs and others to deliver. So for instance, anything that has to do with v6, AfriNIC are lead on this.

Anything that has to do with ccTLD operations, training, etcetera, ISOC is key lead on those activities as well. So we're not... ICANN is not trying to neither expand its turf, nor duplicate efforts. We're trying to

coordinate and collaborate with players in the field, whether internationally, regionally or nationally to help fulfill the needs of the region.

BYRON HOLLAND: Thank you. Abibu and then Keith.

ABIBU NTAHIGIYE: Sorry I just wanted to clarify t Paulos in terms of the support within the African continent. Basically he was referring in terms of the supporting organizations, that they should not go to individual ccs for support, if it's not requested by the specific cc. They should give it to the FTLD who oversees overall the training sessions.

I think that is what he meant.

BYRON HOLLAND: Okay. Thanks for that clarification. Keith?

KEITH DAVIDSON: Just building a little on Bhaer's last comments. There is now the I think reasonably well known, I STAR group comprising the RIRs and ICANN, ISOC, and others where the CEOs and Chairs of the board meet periodically, maybe three times a year or something like that.

I don't expect that we should have Fadi or [? 0:56:53] or discussing an individual ISP or ccTLD development program in any detail, but maybe timely to maybe thinking of that I Star vehicle down to another level, so that the staff that are involved in global engagement, capacity building

and so on, could have a level of I Star engagement to really get down in coordination.

So opening the kimono a little bit, saying here is our strategy and our business plan, and then re-mashing that on the basis of where true collaboration can occur, and avoidance of duplications.

BYRON HOLLAND:

That's an interesting idea. And I was immediately going to have to go to you Pierre because when I hear what Keith just said, I meant that's the, if I could say, the top of the food chain at a very global level, thinking about driving coordination down, which in a sense very different from what I heard Pierre saying.

Which is it's got to be really on the ground bottom up. Do you want to clarify anything?

KEITH DAVIDSON:

Well into the fact that you would have the likes of the ccTLD regional organizations involved, and so on. So I'm thinking it's the global concept of everyone being in [? 0:58:16] and I'm talking about which programs are working or not, with what the needs are and so on.

But not definitely, definitively, not top down, still building on the bottom up.

BYRON HOLLAND:

Okay. Pierre and then Carolina.

PIERRE BONIS:

Thank you. But the question of who is coordinating who, in fact. The experience I've seen with the African strategy was very interesting because I don't think you can say that Pierre [? 0:58:52] is coordinating people.

He is facilitating the exchange of information between the various actors that are implicated within this region. And I think that's very good, and as long as it stays that way, it will work.

And the day someone is going to say in ICANN, now I'm going to be the coordinator of everything, then it's not going to work at all. So it works now, it works because for the cc, for instance, AfTLD is the real coordinator, and that's totally logical.

And maybe for other parts of actions we can take, AfriNIC will be the real coordinator. And for others, maybe for the multi-stakeholder model, AFRALO could be the coordinator. And ICANN put all these people in a room and let them talk to each other. This is a good way to go.

And sometime I'm confused when I hear, we are member of ISOC, and we work very well with ISOC, but when I hear, when it comes to cc, ISOC is working on it. I don't know why. I mean, ISOC is not an international body responsible for the cc, AfTLD in Africa and CENTRE in Europe, they are – and ccNSO globally, they are responsible for that.

BYRON HOLLAND:

Carolina?

CAROLINA AGUERRE:

Just wanted to... Going back to the idea of capacity building, and the different kind of issues around capacity building. Okay, in the technical community and the ISOC community, okay, there is... Okay. You say crème de la crème, you've got some big organizations there.

But you have to take into account that there are RIRs, and they have their particular sort of agendas within the region, so they are not global players as ICANN or ISOC. This do sort of have a lot to say in the regions and in the dialogue between ccTLDs.

And there is also an issue when you mention right at the beginning of this discussion, of this part of the discussion Byron, you use the word volunteer. And I'm not so sure at this stage we are talking just about volunteering. Not at a technical level, but among other issues of capacity building, we are getting into more of a sort of mixed market volunteer phase of development of this organization.

So I think there are definitely some market strategies behind many of these organizations providing capacity building, and legal issues, and commercial issues, not so much in technical. But we also have a second outer ring of very complete examples of extremely efficient and hardworking organizations who do have this kind of mixed model there.

So it's getting to be a very sort of complex landscape in that respect.

BYRON HOLLAND:

Just before we go to the back, one of the themes that I'm hearing is the evolution of capacity building, and we talked about... And I would like to break apart a few words, we talked about collaboration versus...

Collaboration and cooperation and coordination, we use those three words.

Collaboration and cooperation, I find tends to be more informal. It's network based. I know you, you've got a problem, we work together, that ring can extend, but it tends to be more informal networks doing that. It can be formalized, but I see that as an early stage, more actors getting in, little more, let's call it professionalized, not that the people weren't professional, but the actual operations of it is a little more professionalized in terms of building capacity, or capacity building.

Which is where I think you were getting to, mixed market type of organizations. And at what point, even if we have bottom up, do we need more discipline coordination between all those different actors. Some who are actually getting paid to do it, and some who are doing it for other reasons. The back. Is there a mic at the back working?

PATRICK JONES:

So at the Beijing meeting, John Crane did a briefing to the ccNSO to talk about the types of technical engagement that we do at the ICANN meeting. And for the record, I'm Patrick Jones for the ICANN Security team.

Before this meeting, we published on the ICANN blog a description of the way that we use within the ICANN, the terminology of security, stability and resiliency, but we also had some explanation of coordination and collaboration exactly to this.

And we say in this piece that a key part of that is the way that we as ICANN staff are collaborating as peers with others in the ecosystem.

And as I see each one of these regional strategies being put forth, each one of them has security and stability as a pillar.

And there is only so much capacity on our team side of what we can help support. So we're going to look to partners, either in the regional organizations, other groups, individual ccTLDs, perhaps even brands and other experts that are out there. Those are going to help support all of the requests that are coming.

So we have to collaborate in order to get a lot of the good work that each of the groups is interested in doing.

BYRON HOLLAND:

Thanks Patrick. And that's actually a good point about just the resource requirements, I think the demand certainly outstrips the supply, so how do we allocate that? And actually, you maybe Demi if I can go to you on this, dot BR has a long and rich history of capacity building, and I'm sure you could do a whole lot more if you had the resources.

I'm making that assumption. How do you as a cc who has done a lot of this, prioritize and pick where you deploy your resources?

DEMI GETSCHKO:

Okay. In the beginning, of course, we were running just the registry services, but it was very evident that we have to have some data about the country. Then when the steering committee was created, one of the mission was to make some kind of research of statistics and data on the country.

And the second very important things was also to keep the traffic that originates in the country, and ends inside the country, to be keep inside the country. We can do that using internet exchange points. Then we came to use our money we collect via the registry services to establish two new centers in the NIC PR.

One for collecting data and making the research about the penetration of the internet in the different regions of the country, it's a very big country. And so we have eight years more or less of data collected, and we publish this in an open forum. And the other one was to create the internet exchange points to rationalize the traffic and keep the resilience and the security and stability greater if possible.

The third point that is very important because the community wants this all the time, is to have some kind of an assessment about security. And we have a security measures response team inside, it's quite an old team. I suppose it began the activity in '96, '97. And we collect data about incidents in security, data about spam, data about phishing and so this was another way to in some way help the community to be more secure in building the confidence in the internet services.

Just to make the small addition in the final... We also created some secure areas under the dot BR, that are sponsored areas. For example, for the [? 1:07:43] we created a second level domain that has DNSSEC mandatory.

You have to have DNSSEC in order to be in that domain, and you cannot raise it under this second level except if you are indicate [? 1:07:59] there are – it's a closed area. Maybe this is secure for users to, for example, if you create bank area, banking area just for banks, some way

to provide an area with less phishing or a little bit less secure environment.

There is one of them.

BYRON HOLLAND: So if I could just paraphrase. What I heard is that you took a fairly focused approach to deploying the resources you had, and focused in and around security issues and data and research. But you made a pretty conscious decision, the projects that became available at a given time.

DEMI GETSCHKO: Yes.

BYRON HOLLAND: Okay. J Scott?

SCOTT EVANS: You asked a question, what it should look like, formal or informal. My personal opinion to all of you, I think the situation itself is going to force a more formal environment. And the reason I say that is because of the competition you're going to face.

And as a large company that owns many domains, it's going to be incumbent to get the security issues fixed, it's going to be incumbent to work together to coordinate and share information, so that your space is where we want to be.

We want to localize your content for your markets. We want to use you. And so you need to come together and help each other because you've got a huge amount of competitors hitting the market, and they're going to be try to get people into their ecosystem claiming they're more secure.

So I would urge you, I think it's been informal for several years, and I think now the environment and the ecosystem is changing, and I would urge all of you to try to formalize it a bit more.

BYRON HOLLAND:

Coming from where you're coming from, what do you see... I mean, if you look across our cc ecosystem, there are many different variations on the theme in ccs. What do you see as the critical low points that you would like to see addressed?

SCOTT EVANS:

I think that there are is a need to work with industry players that are willing to capacity build with you to increase security in ccTLDs. Google, Yahoo, and Microsoft face attacks on your ccTLDs all of the time because we are the most famous sites, and if they can divert our site, even for two hours, it is front page news.

And so that's what I would ask for you. I would ask that you get to work, and we are happy to help you, and do what we can to show you where we have problems and what we can do, and to work whether it's through ICANN and do webinars, or come regionally and doing regional workshops.

We're willing to do those things to make it more valuable. We're willing to bring in marketing people to talk about how to market and make it more of a robust discussion so it's not just about security. You're learning sort of a 360 of how you can more effectively work in this new ecosystem.

But security a number one issue and it needs to, we need to all work together because it helps all of us. Me as a registrant, the users who are coming to your site, and you because it makes more users want to come to your site.

BYRON HOLLAND:

Now, let me just stress on this a little bit. You're going to get, whatever we're going to get. Let's say 1,000 new TLDs. [Laughs] That's a good one.

LESLEY COWLEY:

I don't know who that belongs to, but we would be really grateful if you can turn it off. Thank you.

BYRON HOLLAND:

We're going to get 1,000 new ones, there are going to be 1,000 new guys running new registries. There are a lot of operators here who have been doing a good job for a long time, why are you worried about this community? And I'm not hearing you saying that you're worried about that community.

SCOTT EVANS:

We, in my experience, and the six years I've been at Yahoo, have not had any problems, and most of those registries are being run by known players. Right? The people who got in this game in 2000 and 2004, invested in that because they knew that in further rounds they could turn key registries.

Right? I mean, some of the registries only have like nine million names under registration, but they're running country code TLDs, and they are running other TLDs as backend registries. That's where they make, I would say, the lion's share of their revenue.

And so those partners we haven't had a problem with in the past. I'm just going on what has happened in my portfolio in the last two years is increasing more and more, and becoming more and more high profile. I'm having no problem in the legacy gTLDs, I'm having great problems with ccTLDs.

UNIDENTIFIED:

[? 0:12:52] from Costa Rica. I want to say something about the... How the things is built by itself. I think there is a lot of leaders and different infrastructures, and the development of different structure in each country. Each country is very different.

In some countries ISOC, and other countries cc, some other countries the ISP. Then I think... I'm clear about the coordination, the absolute coordination where not possible. Then I think could be helpful if some of these organizations publish or really communicate what they are doing.

But let them do what they are doing because some things I found in the time, there is some organization trying sometimes to block what others are doing, and I think that is worse than trying to coordinate things. Thank you.

BYRON HOLLAND:

Thanks. Any comments? Any other comments or thoughts? Questions for the panel? Maybe we'll just shift gears a little bit here. One of the things, I think, is interesting to me is that I'm hearing... I heard we should go I Star, a little bit more coordination up here, we should stay right down on the ground at a cc level here.

Some really good comments that regional organizations are a natural point of entry. ISOC is off doing something that may or may not have anybody – any other actors participating in it, it might not be the right thing or the right place at the right time. ICANN is saying, we certainly don't have the resources to do it all.

There is a lot of different data points out there that to me are sort of crying out a little bit for some more coordination, not driving it. But some more active coordination saying that all these actors are trying to do stuff, other actors who need stuff, and I'm not advocating for centralized repository or anything, but like some way to bring those together or at least have some more disciplined.

Or to pick up on J Scott's ideas, some more mature way of doing this that is not just based on collegiality or relationships....

SCOTT EVANS:

And I want to pick up something that Carolina said, that I think is fundamental to all of ICANN, and I'm not familiar with your community,

is the issue of trust. That's what makes it work is trust. And we have to trust that we're all working together because it is all beneficial for all of us, if we trust each other, we work together to a positive good because we are the care takers of a system that some in this world believe that it is an inherent human right.

And so I think it's very important that we all learn to trust each other, we build on that trust, and we work together. But you're not going to be able to do it unless you begin to break down that distrust.

BYRON HOLLAND:

Well, I think one thing in this room in particular, maybe in part because we don't particularly compete against each other, we share a set of common experiences and challenges working with domestic governments, etcetera, there is a lot of trust in this room.

Pierre you wanted to jump in.

PIERRE BONIS:

Yeah. I think the situation is not as bad as it seems when you're talking about this various organizations doing the same thing maybe overlapping. I think the DNS Africa Forum was the – was a kind of evidence that the people are engaging in and more coordinating way on the ground.

All the players are now working together. I'll give a simple example with ISOC, ISOC and the AfTLD work on the study of the statistics from the various African ccns, and [? 0:17:30] used to work with AfTLD on the same project. So it was exactly overlapping.

After one of the discussion we joined forces, and that's not complex at all and it works better. So there are really improvements, and it's not the mess that it is.

BYRON HOLLAND: Demi?

DEMI GETSCHKO: I think the main problem you have, if you have any problem, is that it's the lack of clearness of the things. It's a little bit... First it's an item, but it's good in some way else. I don't see much overlap, but there are some overlap of course. For example, ISOC. ISOC began as an organization to be the home of activities like ITF, like IAB and so there would be some kind of support of them. But of course, there are two folders, or more than that, organization.

There is also a place, if you've heard, the civil society bottom up process. Then I think we have to have the scenario, and I am very confident that with this five panels that ICANN has announced yesterday, or before yesterday, we will have really a good way to see the whole item of interaction between these organizations.

The technical people, the ITF, the bottom up from the community via ISOC, and there is also the At-Large within ICANN, that are quite – there is some overlapping on that maybe we can clarify on that. And with the specific actions like coordinating members and numbers done by ICANN.

And so, of course, we also have the infrastructure of you and others, but I'm quite confident with these five panels of ICANN, we can have a better a clearer picture on that.

BYRON HOLLAND: Thank you. J Scott you just want to clarify...

SCOTT EVANS: I just want to clarify when I talked about... You said in this room, I agree, I think there probably is. That's not what I see as an inherent weakness in ICANN's model, it's the trust outside of this room, with other people who are not like minded like you.

And it's not... I'm not saying that you all were guilty of that, I think the organization has that sort of history, and we cannot rid ourselves of that as we mature and begin to trust one another, I think it will be very difficult. But I'm not trying to say that you all are not cooperative and collegial body at all.

BYRON HOLLAND: And I also wanted to... I'll go to Paulos and then Keith. I just wanted to pick up something I heard in the last couple of comments too, is it's not that things are bad or broken, I think it's more, could we optimize this? Could we be more efficient and more effective?

If resources are somewhat scarce and we can't do everything we like to, but we're at least making sure we're doing absolute best we could with what we have. Paulos.

PAULOS NYIRENDA:

Thank you. I think that the... For example, in the African region, the need for collaboration has been highlighted in the last few months. And I would like to agree that things are not really that broken. But the need for collaboration is very key.

And for example, the various internet related regional organizations in Africa, have formed – come under one umbrella... In June this year, and we're calling it the Africa Internet Summit, so it's an umbrella which involves IP numbers, AfriNIC, ccTLDs, and the AfTLD, security, and the Africa set, training, and African Networks Operating Group, ANOG, and so forth.

So we do realize the critical need for collaboration. And we work on the various players that are taking part in this ISOC, AfrNIC and the other ICANN and all the other players. So it's really not that badly broken.

BYRON HOLLAND:

Okay. Well that's good to hear. Keith?

KEITH DAVIDSON:

Just a bit of a side point, but just building on J Scott's comment about the level of trust in this room. I think we probably have to recognize that the trust between us is under considerably more threat going forward than ever before.

The fact that we have been able to sit in this room and share marketing plans and other plans, and they are – the intrusions into our networks, and we can be quite open and honest because we're not competing directly with each other.

But going forwards, there is a number of people in the room who are also operating gTLDs come on board, we may not trust each other so much. So we are probably poised at an interest point of having to reaffirm our togetherness in various ways. So capacity building in that regard, probably is under greater threat going forward than we might realize too.

BYRON HOLLAND:

Well, that's an interesting thread and maybe not germane to this particular panel. But one thing is cc members, when we come into this room, we need to remember what hat we're wearing, no matter what else we're doing, right?

One of the things that – just as we come into the closing minutes here that I would like to try and pick up on is, is there a natural coordination point? It's not broken, things are okay, the resources are scarce and can we do better because we know we have what I need.

I'm just going to leave that with you, and we'll go to Nigel.

NIGEL HICKS:

Yes thank you. I'm not sure what point I was responding to. But just three, very brief points. I'm sorry, Nigel Hicks, vice president for Europe ICANN staff. First of all, congratulations on your 10th Anniversary, it was a fantastic dig last night. I know that's not relevant to this subject, but I thought I would just say that.

Secondly, there was a comment about one of the issues about this whole game, ISOC, RIRs, the world bank, and of course there is a lot of

players, the technology organization. There is a lot of players out there doing capacity building.

One of the things the European Union are doing, and I'm not just saying this because the European Union is doing it, is setting up a global internet policy observatory. Now this is still in the early days, it might be good, it might not be good, but it is a thought, an idea of bringing together in some information resource or whatever, all that's going on.

Now I'm not saying that's going to solve all the problems, but it's an interesting idea I think. And thirdly, Europe in terms of a strategy. As some of you know, we're also thinking of a strategy. We've got a breakfast tomorrow morning, well not a breakfast, but a breakfast meeting, I must clarify of course [laughs] ICANN breakfast.

So this is to look at a strategy and here for Europe in particular, of course, it's a very different environment. It's very diverse. Different environment, lots of things going on especially in your area. The ccTLD space. So perhaps, if we do have a strategy, the focus will be very different from what it is in other regions.

But this is something to think about. Thank you.

ROLLAND HOLLAND:

Thanks Nigel. Maybe we can just take a moment to go down the panel here. We'll start with you Paulos, any closing thoughts? And is there a natural point of entry, and just to throw it out there, would regional organizations be kind of a natural place to rationalize the demand and potentially the supply of capacity building?

PAULOS NYIRENDA:

Thank you. Yes I think there is a natural coordination point. I think once we identify the areas, and the regional organizations are really a good place to start for the coordination, but they can't do everything. So they need to realize that they are addressing a particular sector and for the Africa region this is what we thought that we saw.

That we are talking about area like security, then probably the Africa said would be reached now, organization... I just want to raise one more issue, if you allow me to stay up a little bit. I think that the issue of language is a big issue for coordination.

And this is a big issue for Africa because language plays a critical role in coordination, and we have an English/French speaking division that's very, very clear. So this does affect how we coordinate our region. And just to bring it up. Thanks.

BYRON HOLLAND:

And that's a great point. This is such a rich subject, we didn't even get to touch on that but it's certainly a very relevant point. I just wanted to say, Lesley has a reputation in this room for always being on time. And giving her last few moments of chairwoman ship, I wouldn't want to wreck that.

And I know she's going to sum up, so I'm going to ask the rest of you, one quick hit, 10 seconds, it doesn't have to be on regional organizations, just the point. I'll just put that out there, or it can be but just a few seconds.

CAROLINA AGUERRE: Thank you Byron. Yes I couldn't agree more with Paulos, and I also think we do have the same problems in terms of language issues as well. We are a focal point of contact and of – an external and an internal point of contact. But we also need to be reminded, we need to address diversity and we need to sort of help ccTLDs foster their own initiatives as much as possible.

That there is an ecosystem, both within the territories of each ccTLD and the overall internet ecosystem is essential to keep it sort of vibrant and different from other industries and sectors, so I think that's a really sort of interesting point to bear in mind.

BYRON HOLLAND: Thanks Carolina. Keith.

KEITH DAVIDSON: That was a moment...

BYRON HOLLAND: Yeah, now you have five. [Laughter]

KEITH DAVIDSON: I just wanted to say that the one thing I will take onboard more than anything else was J Scott's comments right at the start that capacity building, I've always assumed you think about that for outreach. And when you actually really think about it, it applies to us all and at all levels.

So I think I'll rethink my view on capacity building a little bit more.

BYRON HOLLAND: On that note, J Scott.

SCOTT EVANS: All I want to say is thank you so very much for having this panel, and thank you so very much for inviting me to participate. I think you're a wonderful organization. I was around when you started, you've grown and matured, and I thank you so very much for allowing me to be here today.

BYRON HOLLAND: Thank you.

UNIDENTIFIED: FRENCH 1:29:32 – 1:1:29:40 [LAUGHTER] No, I just wanted to add that with the regional organizations, there is a new one that has been launched, that is the African registrar association. [? 1:29:53] are working on it, and I think it's going to be an important dialogue with them also.

And there is one organization we didn't talk about, who is very important is directly in the capacity building in Africa, it's ITU. So thank you, you should talk with them also.

BYRON HOLLAND: Good point.

UNIDENTIFIED: Coordination is important. It doesn't have to be central around any specific body or bodies, I think it must be as distributed as the internet itself. There are many actors in the field, so we should continue to work together and improve our coordination among our...

ABIBU NTAGHIGIYE: My last few words would be that I agree with Paulos that regional top level domain organization are the right coordinators of capacity building initiatives, and ccns can take it further down at national level.

But more importantly, individual ccns are encouraged also to collaborate. Thank you.

DEMI GETSCHKO: Okay. I think that ccns aren't really an international part of ICANN. To have this in mind, we are the breach for the governments, we are really the rich part of the internet [1:31:26] of this organization. And as for coordination and collaboration, I think we have to keep in mind collaborations, but to do coordination all of the time. Sorry, exactly reverse. We have to keep in mind coordination and do collaboration all the time.

I suppose collaboration is the center of the internet, and we are all on the same side of the fence. Thank you.

BYRON HOLLAND: Those are some great final words Demi. Thank you. And over to you Madam Chair.

LESLEY COWLEY:

Thank you. Can I run over... It's me running over, that doesn't count, right? Okay. So my task was to endeavor to summarize up that discussion. I'll tell you what I think I heard. On coordination, there was certainly some people talking about what is it that needs coordination.

Then I had a whole load of c words, so coordination needs cooperation, communication, and collaboration. Lots of cs. Then there was a discussion that there is actual problems if there are too many organizations involved, there is the potential for duplication, there is the potential for tripping over each other.

And coordination, you start at a global level, a regional level, a country level, or all of those, but not ideally from a top down way. We heard about the number of partners that are currently working together already on coordination.

And really how coordination will become increasingly important. On capacity building, nobody actually pushed back on the need for capacity building. That wasn't our discussion. Our discussion was about maximizing the opportunities, giving the best results for the investment of time and resource that is often made.

Quite a number of you talked about assessing the needs first, as opposed to prescribing the needs higher, whatever level. And particular we noted that models that may work well in one area may certainly not necessarily transfer to another area.

And particularly we need to think about the issue of languages. Interestingly in this discussion, we only briefly touched on what actually

are the needs. What are the skills and experiences where we need to do this work?

But we did talk briefly about the need for technical skills, marketing skills, legal issues, and security and research potential areas, and the need for greater awareness of developments. But I got the sense from one and several others, that things aren't particularly broken.

But are we really doing the best with the resources and the time that we are investing? Then we went onto the why and I think the bit that I heard was about, we're doing this because it strengthens the multi-stakeholder model. And we're doing this because it helps. It helps ccns particularly, and their operations and development.

I thought that the issue of the who does this was particularly interesting. So certainly there was a lot of work going on to date, and there seems to be a growing number of organizations that either play a role or want to play a role. I heard ISOC, ICANN, ITU, regional organizations, ccns themselves, and now the European Union.

There was some discussion about the respective roles, are those going to change as time develops? And other roles that are currently taken, the ones that will be appropriate going forward.

What is ICANN's role? We heard about the regional strategies, and it would appear to be a role to coordinate, support, and facilitate with partners as part of those strategies. But also assuming the role for ICANN.

We heard about country codes themselves needing to determine what help they need and what there might go for help or for collaboration.

And the big, who is coordinating who debate may be going on for some time we suspect.

But we also heard about how our landscape was changing. How market changes, and potentially high profile security breaches may force a transition from a volunteering model, to maybe a mixed model with more formal roles, and more formal roles of engagement.

And we also touched on the need for trust, and the need to break down any distrust that may exist. And is there actually going to be put under pressure as the market forces take effect. That's what I heard anyway, your mileage may vary.

And I'd like to say thank you very much for a great open discussion, and please join me in thanking the panelists [applause]. Okay. So, thank you everybody. That concludes the ccNSO meeting. We are going to go onto a council meeting, which will begin at 4:00, after coffee.

[END OF AUDIO]