



Report of the

**32nd Public ICANN
Meeting**

Paris

22-26 June 2008

Prepared by the CENTR secretariat



Table of Content

Executive Summary.....	3
Workshop: New gTLDs – Shaping the Future of the Internet?	5
ccNSO – ALAC meeting	7
ccNSO meeting	8
ccNSO – ICANN Board breakfast.....	10
Protecting IP rights in new gTLDs	11
DNSSEC Public Meeting.....	12
Workshop: Internet Governance and International organisations...	14
ICANN Board of Directors Meeting	16
ICANN Board update.....	18

Executive Summary

At the 32nd ICANN meeting (June 23rd to June 26th 2008) we saw continuing discussions on the 4 major themes: New gTLDs, .IDNs, eIANA and DNSSEC. With the exception of the tasting issue, no final conclusions were reached.

This was an excellent meeting to network with a record attendance (1600+) and a perfect organization by the local host and AFNIC!

This is an overview of the major points of interest:

eIANA: While the test phase for the public testing group is now closed, testing continues within IANA. There seems some divergence in opinion between the testers and the IANA team on how the current status should be described. While the testers suggested changes, have asked additional questions and generally consider the software still to be “under development”, the IANA team seems to have the impression that the software is almost ready to be deployed.

Confusion reigns as well on the level of automation: while some feel that the authorisation required at every step makes the whole idea of automation somewhat pointless, IANA states that the authorisation for the whole process will be done in one step. *(CENTR will work with the IANA WG and IANA to get clarification on those issues in the coming days)*

.IDNs: The .IDN ccNSO working group has done significant work and has simplified and clarified the guiding principles for the fast track. In a meeting with the CENTR Board, Peter DT and Paul Twomey stated that the timeline for the introduction of (fast track) .IDNs will run in parallel with the timeline the introduction of new gTLDs.

The expectations are that the first .IDN names will be introduced in the root by the first half of 2009.

DNSSEC: The public discussion on DNSSEC showed a steady growth in initiatives preparing for implementation of DNSSEC (ccTLDs and gTLDs). PIR has asked and received Board approval for the implementation of DNSSEC for .org.

New gTLDs: The Board has accepted the gNSO policy proposal and instructed the ICANN staff to develop and complete the implementation plan. Potential applicants will have access to the necessary information (such as application fees, requirements and timing) by August –



September 2008. The following flowchart gives a good overview of the process: <http://icann.org/topics/gtld-evaluation-process-16jun08.pdf>

Budget: On several occasions concerns were raised about the significant increase in the budget and these were voiced during the budget discussion as well. At the Board meeting the operating plan and budget for 2008-2009 were approved without any changes. The high increase in IANA spending was actually a confusion created by the combination of IANA and infrastructure in the same budget item. The actual IANA increase is 600k (still a 90% increase) not 1700k (219%).

Tasting: The Board adopted the GNSO policy recommendations on domain tasting which contain a motion 'to prohibit any gTLD operator that has implemented an AGP from offering a refund for any domain name deleted during the AGP that exceeds 10% of its net new registrations in that month, or fifty domain names, whichever is greater'.

CENTR: Our booth was well visited and used as a meeting point for members and non-members. An excellent boost for our brand recognition!



Workshop: New gTLDs – Shaping the Future of the Internet?

**ICANN Paris
23 June 2008**

The workshop was organised at the beginning of the ICANN week, so before the Board's decision on the implementation of new gTLDs. The workshop made an assessment of the possible impact and opportunities of the introduction of new gTLDs.

Attendees were asked to answer a series of questions:

- What would be a great idea for a new gTLD?
- What impacts could new gTLDs have on the Internet?
- What's the biggest risk that new gTLDs represent?
- What's the biggest opportunity?
- Who will apply and who should apply?

Several ideas for new gTLDs were brought forward. Geographic names (cities, continents, regions, etc.) were most popular. There were some other suggestions like for example gTLDs restricted to limited business areas.

Concerns were raised about the number of new gTLDs. The audience asked questions such as: 'Should one opt for the few new gTLDs as possible?', 'How many new TLDs you need to break .com?', 'What are valid factors to determine the success or failure of a TLD?', 'What if the owner of the new gTLD just wants to protect his name/brand? Is the TLD than unsuccessful?'

Some participants saw opportunities for a viable new .com, new branding possibilities for example for companies that can present all their (new) services and products under the own TLD. A participant also pointed at the potential security benefits (eg with regard to phishing) if the registry is run by the company (for example the bank or brand owner).

Participants also warned for increased consumer confusion after the introduction of a huge number of new gTLDs.

Will new TLDs change the way people search on the Internet?

This question was answered in two ways. Some said that numerous new gTLDs will not change the Internet (for example will not threaten

the dominant position of .com) because there will be too many of them. Others were convinced that a huge number of new TLDs will raise awareness of the existence of alternatives, 'something else than .com'.

Biggest risks?

- Trademarks / UDRP proceedings with costs mainly for trademark owners;
- Risk of failure (with consequences for the registrant);
- Thousands of new gTLDs will drive consumers to search engines;
- There'll be an exclusive community of groups and companies that have the (financial) means to create a TLD;
- 'How to avoid that existing registries (have the technical and financial means) will, eg via shadow registries, dominate the market? – How to ensure competition?;
- New gTLDs will not have the means and capabilities to fight abusive practices (spam, fast flux).
- Risk that only the large brand owners (for brand protection) and cyber squatters (for profit) will apply.

Current status of the new gTLD implementation plan

<https://par.icann.org/files/paris/gTLDUpdateParis-23jun08.pdf>

Kurt Pritz (ICANN) gave an overview of the new gTLD implementation plan and reminded that the goals of the plan were to launch a transparent, timely and predictable process that maps the GNSO policy recommendations.

He outlined the proposed process which is to be a five-step inquiry with objective criteria. The process will be simple for normal cases but also robust if needed.

The process will include procedures to resolve situations where applicants apply for the same gTLD.

He went into detail on the different stages in the initial evaluation of an application and focused on amongst other the algorithm to examine confusingly similar TLD strings and the evaluation of the applicant.

With regard to the timeline Kurt Pritz expected the draft version of the RFP to be published in September or shortly after, followed by a public comment period. The draft of the final RFP for approval by the Board is expected to be released three or four months after the initial document.

During the Q&A Kurt Pritz expressed the opinion that IDN and ASCII gTLDs should be considered equally and that the same criteria should be applied for both.



ccNSO – ALAC meeting
ICANN Paris
23 June 2008

The ccNSO was invited by ALAC for an information exchange on pending issues in both organisations.

The topics discussed at that meeting were:

- geographic regions: Bart Boswinkel gave an overview of the practical implications of the ICANN regions structure. This division in regions exists since the 2000 Yokohama meeting. The current cross-constituency review will lead to a new and more realistic structure. ALAC's interest will probably speed up the timeline.
- Public consultations: ALAC expressed concerns on both the timing and the format of public consultations. The timeline is way too short and papers should be more bite-sized and use simple language.
- ALAC reminded the ccNSO members that the at large structures can and should be used by the ccTLD to forge local coalitions.



ccNSO meeting
ICANN Paris
24 June 2008 – 25 June 2008

The presentations *_will_* be available here:

<http://ccnso.icann.org/meetings/paris/presentations.htm>

ICANN Awareness

In an effort to keep the ccNSO members closer involved in other ICANN issues, the Council decided that there will be an "ICANN Awareness" session at every ccNSO meeting.

The following issues were discussed: JPA, new gTLDs, DNSSEC and ICANN meetings.

As the other topics are covered more in detail elsewhere in the report it is only worth mentioning that there does seem to be a majority in favour of reducing the number of ICANN meetings from 3 to 2. Issues raised are the need for well organised conference calls to ensure work is being done between sessions, the concern that non-native speakers might be restricted in participation. The ccNSO Chair Chris Disspain asked whether it was necessary to start organising regional ccNSO meetings. Quite a few attendants pointed out that this was unnecessary as Regional ccTLD Organisations are already doing this.

Participation WG survey results - Hilde Thunem

Hilde gave a status update of the structure and accomplishments of the group.

One in four ccTLDs answered the survey (56/243), about 50% of ccNSO members answered the survey. In particular the LAC region had very active respondents... over 70% responded to the survey.

Some of the main findings:

- Maybe ccNSO should be clearer on what ccNSO can do for the attendants
- Most value is seen in ""networking" and exchanging information through presentations.
- Barriers to participation are cost of travel, lack of time and resources, legal structure.



Next steps:

- report will be published on the ccNSO website
- Participation WG will develop proposals for actions
- ccNSO decide whether to implement or not.

https://par.icann.org/files/paris/ccnso-participationwg-web_24Jun08.pdf



ccNSO – ICANN Board breakfast
ICANN Paris
25 June 2008-07-03

At every ICANN Meeting the ccNSO council is invited by the ICANN Board for an exchange of views. In Paris the main topic was .IDN implementation:

- Chris Disspain gave an overview of the work done by the ccNSO IDN working group
- It was raised that some ccTLDs are concerned that the new .IDN delegations will go hand in hand with contracts and fees. While Chris Disspain expressed in his personal capacity that he sees no real obstacle in this, the majority of the ccTLDs that are interested in a .IDN do. The Board gave the strong impression that they see it as a given that there will be some sort of formal relationship between ICANN and the registry running the .IDN. The issue was not addressed in the 7 guiding principles as that would trigger scrutiny from the GAC. It is expected that the GAC would refuse any reference to a contractual tie between ICANN and the .IDN registry.

Protecting IP rights in new gTLDs

**ICANN Paris
25 June 2008**

The Intellectual Property Constituency (IPC) organised an open session on Protecting IP rights in new gTLDs.

The IPC presented a booklet to guide new gTLD applicants to identify and assess different models of pre-launch rights protection mechanisms.

The booklet gives an overview of the rights protection mechanisms used in five gTLDs (.aero, .asia, .biz, .mobi and .museum).

A copy of the booklet can be found at

<http://www.ipconstituency.org/PDFs/A%20Perfect%20Sunrise.PDF>

Jeff Neuman (Neulevel) was convinced that IP claims were the right way to work as this mirrors the situation in real life where nobody is prohibited from using a name or brand and claims are always filed afterwards.

Edmond Chung (.asia) gave an overview of the .asia launch. He explained that when developing the policy, it was felt unfair to give trademark owners for 100% the right to register first. Therefore a 'pioneer programme' was set up: before the beginning of .asia registrations anyone could propose a domain name if they provided a business plan as proof that the name would be used. During a 'challenging phase' trademark owners could check the proposals and challenge them if needed.

Zbynek LoebI (Czech Arbitration Court) concluded from his experiences that the consistency of the sunrise policy has an influence on the efficiency of the dispute resolution. Therefore he advised to take good care of the preparation of the sunrise.

Bart Lieben (Lawyer, Laga) who was involved in the launch of .eu and now of .asia said that the inaccuracy of the application data is one of the key reasons for potential disputes. He advised that providing the possibility to correct the data is an important aide to avoid disputes afterwards.



DNSSEC Public Meeting

**ICANN Paris
25 June 2008**

The aim of the meeting was to let people actively involved in the deployment of DNSSEC to present their activities and share their experiences with registries, registrars and others who plan to deploy DNSSEC services.

The agenda consisted out of two series of presentations focussing on 'DNSSEC in the field' and on the use of 'DNSSEC tools'

Steve Crocker (ICANN SSAC) presented a DNSSEC status report. The status report covers a range of reviews and evaluations by different entities. Some of them, he said, were well along (eg RFC published for the key rollover process, a white paper on trust anchor repositories) others were still ongoing. Steve Crocker was very pleased about the 'survey on the availability of DNSSEC on commonly used DNS server platforms' and a survey on 'what are some of the limitations of existing small routers and firewalls in processing DNSSEC responses that come back'.

The DNSSEC status report is available at <http://par.icann.org/files/paris/CrockerDNSSECAgenda.pdf>.

Deployment of DNSSEC

Alexea Raad (.org) explained PIR's motivation to apply with ICANN for the permission to deploy DNSSEC for .org. 'PIR wants to do the right thing for .org and the internet at large' she said. The presentation dealt amongst other things with PIR's risk analysis of DNSSEC deployment. PIR plans a controlled launch between 2008 and 2010.

Eugenio Pinto (.pt) showed how the use of dynamic updates and signature on-the-fly solve the processing power consumption issue.

Pavel Tuma (.cz) gave a presentation on the deployment of DNSSEC for ENUM in the Czech Republic.

Barbara Roseman (IANA) covered IANA's plans to create and maintain an Interim Trust Anchor Repository (ITAR) to publish keys of TLDs that implement DNSSEC and Richard Lamb (ICANN) gave an update on DNSSEC at ICANN.

Asked for her opinion on the time frame for the full implementation of DNSSEC in the root, Barbara Roseman answered that she wasn't



expecting the existing procedural, political and other issues, to be solved quickly.

Other presentations gave an extensive overview of tools available for DNSSEC.

All presentations can be found at <http://par.icann.org/en/node/77> .

Workshop: Internet Governance and International organisations

**ICANN Paris
26 June 2008**

The workshop on internet governance was chaired by ISOC and looked at the two main events in 2008: the OECD Ministerial meeting on the Future of the Internet Economy (Seoul, June 2008) and the Third meeting of the Internet Governance Forum (Hyderabad, December 2008).

OECD Ministerial meeting on the Future of the Internet Economy
Sam Paldrige (OECD) summarised the discussions and outcome of the OECD Ministerial meeting and referred to the url <http://www.oecda.org/FutureInternet> for all relevant information and documents on the meeting.

The Seoul declaration is the main outcome of the Ministerial meeting (available on the aforementioned url). It's a political commitment from the governments, not a binding document. The declaration sets a roadmap of shared values and principals.

Key message that came out of the Ministerial were:

- the internet economy is the key economy for OECD countries;
- the internet is critical for creativity and innovation;
- the internet has a huge potential for addressing global challenges.

Ravi Shanker (Ministry Communications and IT, India) illustrated the importance and potential of the internet by means of an overview of the recent developments in India.

Paul Twomey (ICANN) remembered the audience that ICANN was one of the first multi stakeholder organisations ever. He recognised the importance of the internet governance discussions. Even though, he said, ICANN's function focuses very much on technical and policy issues related to the domain system and the Internet's unique identifiers, topics that are mostly not the main topics in internet governance discussions.

Paul Twomey further invited participation from the community in the discussions about the transition of ICANN after the conclusion of the Joint Project Agreement with the US DoC in September 2009.



Markus Kummer (IGF secretariat) gave an update on the preparations for the third meeting of the Internet Governance forum in India (Hyderabad, December 2008). He explained that this meeting will not have the same set up as the two previous meetings. Sessions will be grouped in a different way, bringing together topics that are closely linked.

Initiatives such as the European dialogue on Internet Governance (Oct 2008), the European Internet Governance Forum (2009) and the UK Internet Governance Forum were brought forward during the discussion with the audience.



ICANN Board of Directors Meeting
ICANN Paris
26 June 2008

The most relevant resolutions approved by the ICANN Board:

GNSO Recommendations on New gTLDs

The Board adopted the GNSO policy recommendations for the introduction of new gTLDs (<http://gns0.icann.org/issues/new-gtlds/pdp-dec05-fr-parta-08aug07.htm>) and instructed the ICANN staff to develop and complete the detailed implementation plan, communicate with the community, and provide the Board with a final version of the implementation proposals before the new gTLD introduction process is launched.

IDNC / IDN Fast-track

The Board directed staff to:

- (1) post the IDNC WG final report for public comments;
- (2) commence work on implementation issues in consultation with relevant stakeholders;
- (3) submit a detailed implementation report including a list of any outstanding issues to the Board in advance of the ICANN Cairo meeting in November 2008.

GNSO Recommendation on Domain Tasting

The Board adopted the GNSO policy recommendations on domain tasting (<http://gns0.icann.org/issues/domain-tasting/domain-tasting-board-report-gns0-council-25apr08.pdf>) which contain a motion 'to prohibit any gTLD operator that has implemented an AGP from offering a refund for any domain name deleted during the AGP that exceeds 10% of its net new registrations in that month, or fifty domain names, whichever is greater'.

Approval of Operating Plan and Budget for Fiscal Year 2008-2009

The Board adopted the Fiscal Year 2008-2009 Operating Plan and Budget (<http://www.icann.org/en/financials/proposed-opplan-budget-v3-fy09-25jun08-en.pdf>).



Approval of PIR Request to Implement DNSSEC in .ORG

The Board approved PIR's proposal to implement DNSSEC in .org (<http://icann.org/registries/rsep/pir-request-03apr08.pdf>).

Appointment of Independent Review Working Groups

The Board established the ICANN Board Independent Review Working Group, the DNS Root Server System Advisory Committee (RSSAC) Independent Review Working Group and the Security and Stability Advisory Committee (SSAC).

All the adopted Board resolutions are available at <http://www.icann.org/minutes/resolutions-26jun08.htm> .

With regard to the resolution on the introduction of new gTLDs Dave Wodelet expressed some concerns about the number of new gTLDs that could be supported in the long term. Janis Karklins made a statement on behalf of the GAC to remember that ICANN needs to facilitate new entrants (registries, registry services, registrars) and avoid favouring the existing players.

Some remarks were made with regard to recommendation 6 (strings not contrary to morality and public order).

With regard to the 'IDNC / IDN Fast Track' resolution Board members underlined that it is up to the applicants to chose a meaningful representation of a country name and that an internationally recognised third party should authenticate the meaning. Susan Crawford reminded that there are still some open issues such as the nature of the agreement between ICANN and the operator.

ICANN Board update

Paul Twomey and Peter Dengate Thrush gave an ICANN Board update

➤ New gTLDs

This was the main topic of the discussion. The policy for the introduction of new gTLDs has now been under development for 2 years. Board plans to give the go ahead for implementation plans on Thursday.

Main open issues and discussions:

- *dispute resolution/arbitration.*
 - cost-recovery procedure: most likely the applicants will be able to recover part of the application fee in case their application fails. Currently an external consultant is helping ICANN with drafting the application procedure. (Deloitte)
 - Can registrars own registries and the other way around? No: there should be a Registry/registrar functional separation.
 - non-discriminatory use of all registrars: Trademark owners successfully applying for eg. .eBay will have an issue with the obligation to use all registrars
 - There is currently a lack of information: no one can draft a businessplan. Paul Twomey confirmed that the price for the application and other necessary information will be available within 4-6 weeks.
 - There is still no clear definition of what should be considered a gTLD and a ccTLD, Peter DT stated that in his view only the abbreviations on the ISO 3166 list give guidance in that respect.
 - One of the questions for the root server committee will be how to reassign a root server if the current operator wants to cease operations.
 - Concerns were expressed from the room that there is no strong plan to protect registrants in case of failure of registrars and new registries.
- *reform process in the gNSO*

Currently the gNSO is undergoing a reform. The reorganisation should tackle issues of representation, democracy and competition.
- *JPA*

Three documents have been published and are awaiting comments from the ICANN community:
"Transition plan"

"Improving institutional confidence"

"Fact sheets"

- *add-grace periods in gTLD space*

In response to the abuse that has been made of the opportunity to deregister a domain name within a given period of time (to correct typos and other mistakes) the gNSO has tabled a proposal to reduce the number of changes to 10% of the total requests of any given registrant. This still allows for corrections of mistakes and to reduce the bad-debt issue in case a credit card used for payment turned out to be void.

- *Questions on the operating plan and budget* were postponed to a session with Kevin Wilson on Thursday.

- Asked by David Archibold, the Board has no timeline for the ICANN regional review.

➤ **IANA Working group Update - Olivier Guillard**

Testing phase is now done. Detailed info available on the IANA WG site.

Amongst the changes tested are:

- account interface
- simple admin changes (telephone nrs)
- technical changes

Implementation of software changes will require update of IANA contract with DoC.

Interim report:

IANA software is still under development

- bug tracking process is established, software requires continued testing, not only bugs in interface but also unexpected behaviour in the software.
- The new software does not change the Verisign and DoJ process flow. So still a question whether the software will improve IANA performance.
- IANA still needs to review each request.
- Software only changes the front-end process flow. The interaction between ccTLD and IANA become more complex. What is the benefit?

There is still lack of clarity about the original specifications of the eIANA software.

Ken Silva (Verisign): the software is ready on the Verisign end and Verisign is ready to go into a parallel operation where both old and new system work next to each other.

Turn around for modification or implementation of changes for Verisign is 48 hours

Ken reminded everyone that every change in the root zone database (with very few exceptions) require authorization.

➤ **DNSSEC**

IANA WG was asked by the council for a paper on DNSSEC and share their views from a technical perspective. See presentation from New Delhi for more info.

Survey on DNSSEC by ccNSO - very few cc have deployed it already, many believed that it will be deployed heavily in the future.

Some ccTLDs have expressed the concerns that there is no clear benefit, that it sends the wrong signal: "DNSSEC does not solve all the problems. Zonewalking is still an issue."

A common concern seems to be the lack of available tools to deploy DNSSEC. At the time of the design of DNSSEC, the context was completely different. DNSSEC will now be less useful than intended by its creators.

A large majority in a poll organised by the IANA WG did not see any problems with the implementation of DNSSEC.

The paper that the IANA WG is drafting will address most of the remaining concerns.

The Trust Anchor repository is considered to be a good initiative for those operators that want to start using DNSSEC without any impact on those that do not have plans for early DNSSEC implementation.

Richard Lamb, Project Manager DNSSEC at IANA provided the ccNSO with an update on signing the root. His presentation is available at:

https://par.icann.org/files/paris/DNSSECRLamb_24Jun08.pdf

➤ **IANA update – Kim Davies**

Kim gave an overview of the IANA work over the past three months. His presentation can be found at:

https://par.icann.org/files/paris/Afilias_ccNSOUpdate_24Jun08.pdf



The main topics of Kim's presentation were: Interim Trust Anchor Repository, the process for implementation of RZM software and Root server hijacking.

Roland LaPlante presented some interesting stats on ccTLD and gTLD growth over the past few years. Check it out at:

https://par.icann.org/files/paris/Afilias_ccNSOUpdate_24Jun08.pdf

➤ **IANA WG workplan**

IANA WG activities for 2009 can be found on the IANA WG section of the ccNSO website. This plan should be approved in Cairo 2008 - Olivier asks everyone to have a look (4 pages only!) and comment.

The 2009 plan is available here:

<http://ccnso.icann.org/workinggroups/ccnso-draft-guidelines-processes-wg-17jun08.pdf>

Pending issues:

- continuity of the working group
- overload due to internal rules (membership protocol)
- some tasks for the WG have no concrete action (eg service level)

Presentations from Mathieu Weill on .FR and Slobodan Markovic on .SR. Jian Zhang gave an overview of the stunning growth of the .CN domain. (Tripled in 6 months!)

https://par.icann.org/files/paris/CN-Zhang_24Jun08.pdf

Gabriella Schitteck gave an overview of the results from the Phishing survey. They are available at:

https://par.icann.org/files/paris/PhishingSurveyResults_24Jun08.pdf

The new Angolan registry presented an overview of the start-up procedure.

The regional organisations gave an update of their recent activities. The presentations are available at:

https://par.icann.org/files/paris/APTLUpdate_Hollander_24Jun08.pdf

https://par.icann.org/files/paris/CENTRupdate_Roste_24Jun08.pdf

https://par.icann.org/files/paris/LACTLDupdate_Glaser_24Jun08.pdf

➤ **ccNSO Processes working group – Dotty Sparks de Blanc and Bart Boswinkel**

This WG was set up in New Delhi by the ccNSO Council. Its members are: Slobodan, Pablo, Dotty Sparks de Blanc, Bart Boswinkel, Gabriella Schitteck

The main goal of the group was to seek clarification of the roles of members and non-members. Only members will be able to participate in formal decision making and voting.

The group came up with guidelines (as opposed to rules) and foresees the possibility to deviate when/where appropriate.

The result is a 30 page document that can be found:

<http://ccnso.icann.org/workinggroups/ccnso-draft-guidelines-processes-wg-17jun08.pdf>

Bart gave a few highlights:

- Plans to send out the agenda two months in advance.
- ccNSO meetings would be chaired by ad hoc chair per session.
- observers are members of other supporting organisations (eg gNSO)
- Liaisons are from GAC, ALAC or regional organisations
- Liaisons can do everything that full members do, with the exception of voting.

➤ **Whois accuracy - Paul Hoare SOCA - UK (serious and organised crime agency) and Scott Aken FBI - DoJ**

Paul and Scott explained the issues LAEs worldwide are facing to get access to accurate data. LEAs are now engaging within ICANN to better understand the process and be able to predict how it will affect their work. 13 countries were represented by a LEA delegation here in Paris.

They strongly suggested that each ccTLD start talking to their local LEA.

Their main problem is to get access to data. A tiered system might not work as there is no proper definition of LEAs – and there are plenty of other agencies that might require access to. They also stressed that even inaccurate data might turn out to be very useful for their investigations.

➤ **Budget session - Kevin Wilson**

Kevin his presentation is available at:

https://par.icann.org/files/paris/FY09Budget_Wilson.pdf

On behalf of CENTR, Peter Van Roste asked three questions:

- What improvements can ccTLDs expect, given that the IANA budget increases with 219%?

Doug answered that the lack of detail to keep it readable has led to an unfortunate combination of both the IANA budget and general infrastructure investments. The IANA budget will increase with 6-700k for 2008. This includes expenses for eIANA, DNSSEC rootsigning, trust anchor repository.

- What are the expectations from the CFO on ccIDN contracts: is there any provision on the income side of the budget?

Kevin answered that there is no provision or expectation of income generated by cc .IDNs.

- On the concerns about mission creep, significant budget increases and liberal expenses, Doug answered that the increase can be attributed to clear and well defined big projects.

➤ **IDN Fast Track Issues Report – Chris Disspain and Bart Boswinkel**

Chris and Bart gave an overview of the work done by the IDN WG.

The report is available at:

<http://ccnso.icann.org/workinggroups/idnc-wg-board-proposal-25jun08.pdf>

The proposal is based on 7 guiding principles:

A: Ongoing Process

B: Non pre-emption of overall policy

C: The purpose of the Fast Track is to meet pressing demand

D: Fast Track only for non-Latin scripts

E: The proposed string and delegation request should be non-contentious within the territory

F: The Fast Track is experimental in nature

G. Criteria determine the number of IDN ccTLDs under the Fast Track.