



Report of the

# 38<sup>th</sup> ICANN meeting

Brussels, Belgium  
20-25 June 2010

## Table of Contents

ccNSO Meeting .....	3
Financial contributions .....	3
Session with the ICANN BoD member, Chair and CEO .....	4
IANA update .....	4
Anti-Phishing working group report .....	5
Law Enforcements Agencies update .....	5
Wildcard Study Group Final Report.....	6
Incident Response Plan Working Group Update.....	6
Delegation and redelegation Working Group .....	6
Roles and Responsibilities of ccNSO Councilors.....	6
Marketing session. ....	7
ccNSO Review Results .....	7
Update from the ROs.....	8
DNSSEC session chaired by Ondrej Filip (.CZ).....	8
Strategic issues session .....	8
ATRT – AOC review .....	9
ccNSO BoD meeting.....	9
GAC meetings .....	10
Role of the GAC within ICANN.....	10
New gTLDs .....	10
GAC/GNSO .....	11
GAC meeting with ccNSO .....	11
Law enforcement Due Diligence Recommendations .....	12
GAC meeting with the Board.....	12
GAC Secretariat .....	12
Appointment interim Chair .....	12
ICANN Board meeting .....	13
Other meetings.....	14
DNSSEC Workshop.....	14
Whois Data Accuracy Study.....	14
Internet Governance Forum.....	14

## ccNSO Meeting

Tuesday June 22 / Wednesday June 23

### Financial contributions

Chris Disspain introduced the discussions with a historic overview.

ccNSO drafted guidelines that suggested ccTLDs could on a voluntary basis, self-select their fee based on what similarly sized ccTLDs are paying.

<http://ccnso.icann.org/about/files/guideline-cctld-contribution.pdf>

This has stimulated more ccTLDs to pay (and some ccTLDs to pay more). Today totals amount to 1.8 million.

The key question is: assuming the ccNSO would want to fund part of the budget (The total of all amounts that the ccNSO believes could be attributed to ICANN activities that directly address the needs of the ccTLDs (such as part of the IANA costs, or part of the meeting costs, ...) how would we pay that amount? Which key should be used to spread the contributions across all ccTLDs?

The fact that this is “Voluntary” is carved in stone. So dividing the total budget ccTLDs are responsible for by 250 will not work.

The FY2011 budget should be adopted at the Friday board meeting.

Kevin Wilson: summarized and highlighted some aspects of the operating plan and budget.

Revenue growth FY11: 3%

Reserve fund is 45 million USD - Conservative investment choices

Revenue FY11: 65.5 million

Kevin also explained the new proposal to change budget process.

Now: 6 months strategic plan, 6 months ops Plan/budget

Future: 4 months strategic plan, 4 months financial framework (attaching resources to the plans), 4 months ops/budget plan

As discussed before, due to the uncertainty in timing and the need to make the new gTLD process completely budget neutral, the new gTLD budget will be dealt with in a separate budget.

<http://ccnso.icann.org/workinggroups/presentation-fy11-op-plan-budget-19may10-en.pdf>

Expense area group budget will first be shown to a smaller group to gather comments before posting.

Comments from the audience:

Lesley Cowley stressed the need for long term cost-cutting. Her question on what the long-term cost-cutting initiatives were was not answered.

Chris Disspain asked why extraordinary expenses (such as .XXX legal costs) are not taken from the contingency fund instead of cutting in the business.

Chris Disspain urged Kevin to give clearer answers to the questions he asked as Chair of the ccNSO before the period for comments close. (Kevin stated that there was no money spend on the planned television studio)

2-3 million spend in FY2011 on Legal fees – details in the budget

## Session with the ICANN BoD member, Chair and CEO

Mike Silber encouraged the ccNSO to take the lead in setting the policy for ccTLD related issues. He pointed out that the Board is not a policy making body.

Chris explained that ccNSO cannot set global policies.

Mike fully support the initiative by the SOs to get organized and tackle the DNS-CERT issue.

Contributions: Peter DT stated that ccTLD-attributed costs are 9.6 million USD. He wants the ccNSO to form a group to review this number, remove what is not relevant, agree to a number. Divide that number. He claims that the reason why there is no solution yet is that the ccNSO has not taken its responsibility by coming up with a distribution model.

Hilde Thunem (.NO) asked about the process for the geonames issue but did not really receive a meaningful answer.

Asked by Mathieu Weill (.FR) Rod denies there is a staff issue. Made the claim there is only 7% staff turn-over. He mentioned that it wasn't even discussed in the ICANN Board. (Which seems in slight contradiction with comments made by a Board Member that they are watching this but are confident that this is the natural flow in an organization of ICANN's size)?

Asked by Peter Van Roste (CENTR) Rod explained that there are no plans to reinforce the regional offices. No big plans or changes envisaged as there are no financial means to support that.

Rod also underlined that hiring different nationalities in the central office support the internationalization.

Lise Fuhr (.DK) pointed out that there is some contradiction in stating that there is no money for a foreign office while at the same time opening a new office in California. Peter DT claimed this Palo Alto office was just a formality. Mike Silber strongly reacted to this, referring to intense Board discussions and pointing out that while there was a logic behind the idea to agree to Rod's demands during the negotiations, it creates a wrong perception and ICANN should address this concern.

## IANA update

Welcome of new IANA VP: Elise Gerich

Update from Kim focused on the following keypoints:

- IDN ccTLDs: 11 Test TLDs + 4 introduced under the fast track. Delegation happens within few weeks (even though standard request processing time is 3-6 months)
- No dialogue during the application process for IDN ccTLDs – contrary to delegations for ASCII ccTLDs
- One delegation happened on Wednesday night 18.00 EST – this is a Verisign decision, not an IANA one.
- 12 IDN related delegation requests out of 46. So there is a significant workload increase due to IDN Fast Track
- WHOIS server: lookup server for TLDs: IANA is adding a few new features. Data remains the same but added IDN support. More machine-readable. Easier to process. DNSSEC support.
- Now it is also possible to look up second level domains – this will result in a referral to the relevant server.
- Also added is full IPv4 and IPv6 lookup.
- Signing the root: DNSSEC enabled TLDs can submit DS records. Key ceremony. Root zone currently in “deliberately unvalidated” state.
- Key ceremony: generating the private key that will secure the root in a way that is trusted by the community
- There is a revised template for root zone change for DNSSEC enabled zones on the iana website

- Thanks to David Conrad for the hard work over the last 5 years.
- Fahed Batayneh (.JO) pointed out that there is a mismatch between the info IANA needs and what's indicated on their website. This leads to delayed delegations... Kim responded that this is due to the differences between the different applications and the fact that a one-size-fits-all approach is not possible. Improvements are underway however.

More info on the External Review of Root Zone Change Request Process and how the recommendations have and will be implemented is available at:

<http://www.icann.org/en/announcements/announcement-16jun10-en.htm>

Kim's presentation:

<http://brussels38.icann.org/meetings/brussels2010/presentation-update-root-zone-management-21jun10-en.pdf>

### **Anti-Phishing working group report**

Rod Rasmussen gave an update on the Anti-Phishing Working group report.

The main reason for the increase in DNS abuse in ccTLDs is related to the Avalanche phishing operation.

80% of the abuse is related to someone's PC getting hacked, not through malicious registrations at the ccTLD.

<http://brussels38.icann.org/meetings/brussels2010/presentation-ccnso-members-phishing-report-2-rasmussen-22jun10-en.pdf>

The full report is available at:

[http://www.antiphishing.org/reports/APWG\\_GlobalPhishingSurvey\\_2H2009.pdf](http://www.antiphishing.org/reports/APWG_GlobalPhishingSurvey_2H2009.pdf)

### **Law Enforcements Agencies update**

Law Enforcement agencies from across the world have together drafted Due Dilligence recommendations (first released in Seoul)

<http://ccnso.icann.org/meetings/seoul/law-enforcement-recommendations-oct09-en.pdf>

In Brussels they are following up on this initiative and reaching out to the different communities that they would like to implement those recommendations.

UK Police: Paul Hoare, SOCA e-crime: Suggests to implement the recommendations to improve the cooperation with the national law enforcement agencies around the world.

CH Police: New policy that payment for the domain was due before the domain became active lead to a significant decrease in abuse in the Swiss domain.

Another mechanism that was successful is the provisional take-down of the domain with the right to appeal the decision.

Also in T&Cs of the registry: registry can ask registrant an address in CH and therefore enter into due process under Swiss jurisdiction

Brazilian Police: Good relation with registry authority. Things get solved faster because there is good communication between the registry and LEA.

Comments from the audience:

Martin Boyle (.UK) cautioned for the use of proxy service as it allows people (for good and bad reasons) to hide their data.

Paol Hoare responded that some proxy services are used as de facto anonymisers as they can't be traced. So the suggestion is to accredit proxy service to make sure LEA can trace them if needed.

Byron Holland (.CA) pointed out that data accuracy comes at a significant cost. Estimated at 3 USD per name, for the Canadian domain that would amount to 4 million USD.

*[For the joint ccNSO/GAC session see to the GAC section in the report]*

## **Wildcard Study Group Final Report**

Ondrej Filip (.cz) and Young-Eum Lee (.kr) provided an overview of the draft report.

Due to the work in this group, 4 out of 11 ccTLDs that use wildcards have decided to change their approach and stop using them. Ondrej underlined that good constructive discussions could solve most of the issues. Often wildcards are used to solve technical issues (or perceived technical issues) in a IDN environment.

<http://brussels38.icann.org/meetings/brussels2010/presentation-ccnso-members-wildcards-report-lee-22jun10-en.pdf>

The full report is available at:

<http://ccnso.icann.org/workinggroups/wildcard-study-draft-report-21jun10-en.pdf>

## **Incident Response Plan Working Group Update**

Jörg Schweiger (.DE) gave an update on the work of the Incident Response plan working group.

One of the main elements in the work planning for the group will be the outcome of the initiative by the ccNSO, gNSO, SSAC and ALAC to look into the need for a DNS-CERT. If that initiative takes off, the working group could be useful in the selection of the participants.

<http://brussels38.icann.org/meetings/brussels2010/presentation-ccnso-members-irwg-current-status-schweiger-22jun10-en.pdf>

## **Delegation and redelegation Working Group**

Keith Davidson (.NZ) and Bernie Turncotte presented the drafts reports from the working group. The purpose of the working group is to advise the ccNSO Council whether it should launch a policy development process to recommend changes to the current policy for delegation, re-delegation and retirement of ccTLDs.

Draft analysis report:

<http://ccnso.icann.org/workinggroups/drd-analysis-report-14jun10-en.pdf>

Progress report:

<http://ccnso.icann.org/workinggroups/drd-progress-report-14jun10-en.pdf>

## **Roles and Responsibilities of ccNSO Councilors.**

In an effort to encourage more members to get involved in the work of the ccNSO council, a session was dedicated to explaining what a Council Member does, how the Council functions as a group and what talents/skills future council members could add to the group.

Patrick Sharry lead a session on the roles of the ccNSO councilors, and why they believe it is important to participate.

This also fits into the larger efforts of the ccNSO council to do succession planning and have a better spread of the workload in the group.

## Marketing session.

Hiro Hotta (.JP) chaired a marketing session with contributions from Vika (.ZA) and Yeo Yee Ling (.MY).

The .ZA market survey presentation covered the key outcomes of the inaugural market survey of the .ZA namespace conducted by ZADNA in late 2009 to early 2010. It showed what key questions were asked and how the survey audience overall feel about .ZA as a brand and South Africa's online identity.

<http://brussels38.icann.org/meetings/brussels2010/presentation-ccnso-members-za-market-survey-report-mpisane-22jun10-en.pdf>

The Malaysian ppt covered the challenges and opportunities in implementing effective marketing strategy from .my DOMAIN REGISTRY's perspective. It summarised .my DOMAIN REGISTRY's experience and strategies in an effort to market .my domain names to the public and also looked at the role of channel management and the new media.

## ccNSO Review Results

Jean-Jaques Subrenat, ICANN Board and Hervé Rannou and Thomas Mackenzie from ITEMS International (the external consultant) presented the review process and the recommendations to the ccNSO.

Alejandro Pisanty explained the background and the process that lead to the review.

Jean-Jaques Subrenat explained the timeline: Comments by July 30<sup>th</sup>, Board approval of the final draft by October – November 2010, implementation of the recommendations in 2011.

The presentation is available at:

<http://brussels38.icann.org/meetings/brussels2010/presentation-organizational-review-ccnso-23jun10-en.pdf>

The 12 recommendations are:

- 1) The adoption of a CENTR-style comment/position paper process. (We're setting best practice here! ☺)
- 2) Translation of key documents in the UN languages
- 3) Making language groups responsible for translating papers, discussions etc. in a wiki style interface
- 4) Staff should do more outreach to members and non-members.
- 5) Join forces with other SO's and AC's to boost membership and participation across all organizations in ICANN
- 6) Take on board registrar and registrant input where relevant. Cooperate with gNSO on this.
- 7) Improve website and add online collaboration tool
- 8) Add community manager to supporting staff
- 9) Consider introducing a limit to the terms a councilor can serve
- 10) Clarify respective roles of Council, its members and its Chair in the ccNSO guidelines
- 11) Consider appointing a permanent Finance Liaison
- 12) develop and publish annually a policy road map for the next two three years

The comments from the audience showed that these might be more controversial than expected: the main problem seems to be that there is no clear line between what was said by participants and interpretation by researchers.

**!! CENTR will submit comments, please send any input you have to [wim@centr.org](mailto:wim@centr.org) before 9<sup>th</sup> June 2010.**

## Update from the ROs

AFTLD update:

<http://brussels38.icann.org/meetings/brussels2010/presentation-aftld-update-23jun10-en.pdf>

LACTLD update:

<http://brussels38.icann.org/meetings/brussels2010/presentation-lactld-update-23jun10-en.pdf>

## DNSSEC session chaired by Ondrej Filip (.CZ)

ENISA Study on the Cost of Implementing DNSSEC

Panatiotis Saragiotis from ENISA presented a study on the cost of DNSSEC implementation. It was similar to the presentation he gave in Warsaw at the CENTR GA.

<http://www.enisa.europa.eu/act/res/technologies/tech/dnsseccosts>

The Real Cost of Implementing DNSSEC for a Registry; Luis Diego Espinoza (.CR)

<http://brussels38.icann.org/meetings/brussels2010/presentation-ccnso-members-2-dnssec-implementation-costs-registry-23jun10-en.pdf>

Community Initiatives on DNSSEC; Hiro Hotta (.JP)

<http://brussels38.icann.org/meetings/brussels2010/presentation-community-initiatives-dnssec-22jun10-en.pdf>

## Strategic issues session

Byron Holland (.CA) and Patrick Sharry (ICANN) organized a panel discussion on what our industry should expect in the coming years. How will this influence our business? How will this refocus our attention? How will this influence ICANN's budget and the focal points for the ccNSO?

This was a very interesting discussion and if you missed it well worth your time to listen to the audiorecordings which should be made available through the ccNSO website.

<http://brussels38.icann.org/node/12490>

I have noted some of the remarks and discussion points below:

In the context of the budget discussions: what can we expect in the next three years?

Very interesting discussion on the future of ccTLDs, their relations with registrars, commodities, consumer demand, ...

- Registrars are being wooed by ccTLDs registries to sell their domain.
- Is Joe.pizza more interesting than joe-pizza.CH?
- Alexa Raad touched on the future issues of Security vs. privacy and Security vs. scalability
- Alexa: the user decides whether you are a commodity or not. The user will have alternatives.
- Do new domains make the old cc's and g's more or less useful?
- Robert Hall: less. The consumer will start to understand that .museum, .ebay and others are real normal domains. Search will become even more important.
- Sabine doesn't agree with search engine dominance. Unique identifiers will always be necessary if only for email).
- Alexa Raad pleading for more R&D investments.
- Sabine points out that IPv6 roll-out will even enforce that need as 1 pc will have hundreds of IP addresses.



- Lesley Cowley brings up the risk of failing gTLDs and the need for trust this will create. Drawing the mouse-trap analogy: however improved the mousetrap is, there are only a limited number of mice.
- Fahd: In Jordan, the government is driving development, without pushing rules and regulations on the community
- Lesley Cowley: Political interest is turned up. Using the internet to develop your economy and as a way to save costs has become important for governments. This will be a major driver nationally and internationally. This is the perfect opportunity for ccTLDs to demonstrate their public interest and role. Governments are slow compared to communities but they are catching up. If ccTLDs can demonstrate that they are responsive and responsible they will be able to bring solutions and lead the evolution.
- Rob Hall ccTLDs have a lead over the gTLDs by having the opportunity to introduce IDNs 1 year earlier. USE IT!
- Alexa Raad: be careful with assumptions. Internet governance, commoditization, all aspects might change. Be more efficient. Share knowledge and lower costs. Ask for help to those that have already done what you'd like to achieve. Spend more on R&D.
- Chris Disspain: Governments will ask more and more: Why aren't we running the DNS?
- Rob Hall: we are moving from 200 loaves of bread to 2000 loaves of bread. The store will first pick those that are easily delivered and those from flexible suppliers. But in the end it is the consumer that decides.
- Sabine and Annebeth underline the fact that ccTLDs already cooperate through ROs such as CENTR.
- Lesley Cowley: both registrars and registries should cooperate. This is not a one-way issue.
- Byron: balance of power between NSOs and AC's is changing. Governments are getting more and more involved.

### **ATRT – AOC review**

The people at ICANN running the AOC review are looking for examples of what goes well and what can be improved.

Two examples of where it goes wrong were raised during this session:

- Chris Disspain gave an example of how transparency deteriorates: the Board does not longer motivate their decisions on delegations/redelegations process
- 60% of gNSO participants feel their comments are not being taken properly into considerations, this was confirmed by some ccNSO members as they had the same experience.

Contact Gabi for more info if you want to provide input.

### **ccNSO BoD meeting**

You can find the agenda and (in a week or so) the minutes of the meeting on the session page:

<http://brussels38.icann.org/node/12501>

One of the things discussed is that the ccNSO will ask for an extension of the deadline to submit comments on the ccNSO Review.

## GAC meetings

The GAC met on Saturday 19, Sunday 20, Tuesday 22 and Wednesday 23 June. 60 countries were represented.

Discussions:

### Role of the GAC within ICANN

A joint working group of the ICANN Board and the GAC proposed a draft text in which the processing of GAC advice and the role of the GAC liaison to the Board was discussed.

The presented draft document contained the sentence *'The GAC does not clearly indicate when they are providing advice, in the various forms of communications that are delivered.'* This started a long discussion during which several GAC members wondered why never before during for example the numerous GAC/Board meetings the Board members, or on other occasions the ICANN staff had indicated that they had difficulties with identifying GAC advice. Some members went even further and said that since the Bylaws require the Board to consider the advice from the GAC on policy issues, the Board has the obligation to ask for clarification if it was unclear what was the advice on a certain issue.

Several GAC members suggested that all written text produced by the GAC had to be considered as an advice from the GAC as foreseen und the ICANN bylaws.

Therefore the communiqué clearly describes that *"Any explicit advice, in any written form, constitutes the advice foreseen in the Bylaws. The GAC also advises on the effectiveness of procedures for facilitating interactions between ICANN constituencies for the development of policy. In addition, the GAC first seeks consensus in its work and this can take time to achieve. If consensus is not possible, a range of views can be provided as advice. The bylaws provide only for GAC advice to be given to the Board and do not include provisions for the other SOs/ACs to formally consider GAC advice"*.

The GAC also suggested setting up a register to record clearly the GAC's advice on a policy issue and the Board's reaction.

The GAC also discussed the role of the GAC liaison to the Board and said that a Board liaison to the GAC would be useless since this person would never be able to attend all the GAC meetings and therefore unable to follow the discussions and fully understand the sensitivities.

### New gTLDs

*The GAC discussed the introduction of new gTLDs on different occasions, with the ICANN staff (Kurt Pritz), with the GNSO, ICANN Board, ...*

*The main discussion point remains the notion of 'morality and public order' or since this meeting called 'MOPO'.*

Kurt Pritz (ICANN) presented an overview of the changes made to the DAG, including the exclusion of country territory names in the first round. He focussed on new provisions for mitigation. Amongst other things DNSSEC is now required instead of being optional. There are also additional protections for trademark holders. With regard to the economic studies Kurt informed that a second phase of the studies which should answer most of the still open questions eg on costs for different business models should be ready in the coming months.

GAC members were interested to know whether this was the last version of the DAG. Kurt Pritz told that 'if' DAG4 was the last version the Board could at the earliest decide in December. Although much was depending on the additional changes that might had to be made after the comment period, which was open until the end of July 2010. He also noted that the completion of the root scale studies and the communication plan (which, he said, was lagging behind) had an influence on the date for the final decision. In the end, he concluded, it is up to the Board to decide whether the current DAG4 was the final one or not.

Kurt's update can be found at <http://brussels38.icann.org/meetings/brussels2010/presentation-gac-new-gtlds-19jun10-en.pdf> .

There were some questions on what grounds the application would be divided into batches. Kurt Pritz assured the Japanese representative that all the names on the official list of capital cities and all their translations (in Japan there are 3 official scripts) are protected. The Japanese GAC however suggested that sub national names and their translations also had to be protected.

The Swedish GAC had a whole list of comments and concerns regarding the trademark protection; she wondered how trademark holders would know that they have to be in a clearing house database and how they could be aware of applications that possibly infringe their trademark. She also asked what would happen if a party in one country would sue ICANN for registering a trademark name. Kurt Pritz answered that the registries will have to set up their own clearinghouse and underlined the importance of a robust communication plan to inform trademark holders.

In its communiqué, the GAC also urges ICANN to take measures '*in order not to exclude developing country stakeholders from participating in the new gTLD process*' .

## GAC/GNSO

The GAC and GNSO discussed the need of a GAC/GNSO liaison or other new channels of communication. They discussed the new gTLD policy and the US representative noted that there was no universal definition of MOPO which a panel of 3 specialists could use to make its decisions. The French GAC touched the issue of further categorisation of the gTLD space as suggested by the GAC in Nairobi. He stressed that the GAC did not intend to delay the process. A working group was set up in Nairobi, but not much work was done in the mean time. He suggested that short meaningful words could be a category to discuss, eg. who can manage a very short generic name. He further suggested that it could be interesting to put applications of similar themes together in the same batch and evaluate them at the same moment.

## GAC meeting with ccNSO

The ccNSO informed the GAC on the work of its delegation and redelegation working group and gave an update on the IDN Fast Track and .IDN PDP working group. Chris Disspain informed that the working group had now agreed on the definition of an IDN ccTLD – one character is enough – and that it was clear now that country and territory names should not be available for registration.

Chris Disspain also informed GAC members about the plan to set up a cross constituency working group with the GNSO, SSAC and ALAC and if useful external parties to discuss the DNS CERT and other proposals by ICANN regarding the stability and security of the DNS.

The GAC, in its communiqué, fully supports this cooperation.

## Law enforcement Due Diligence Recommendations

The GAC discussed with representatives from law enforcement agencies around the world the proposals to amend the Registrar Accreditation Agreement. The proposals should, amongst other things, make domain owners more traceable. Still more than 27% of domain owners were said to be not traceable.

The GAC, in general supported the proposals. However, some members asked the proposals to be further clarified.

<http://brussels38.icann.org/meetings/brussels2010/presentation-gac-raa-19jun10-en.pdf>

## GAC meeting with the Board

The GAC raised the apparently unclear situation regarding the GAC advice (see higher) during its meeting. The US GAC noted that it might be helpful to have a better understanding of the Board's interpretation of the 'advice' subscribed by the Bylaws.

Peter Dengate Trush invited GAC and Board members to fix this issue however, he didn't see any practical influence as he was not aware of any example of GAC advice that was not recognized as such by the Board. The US GAC pointed at March 2007 GAC principles on the introduction of new gTLDs and the discrepancies between this GAC document and the later versions of the DAG.

The Canadian GAC referred to 2 documents the GAC had produced on ccTLDs and told that the Board and Staff kept referring to the first document without noticing that there was a second, newer version.

The GAC also discussed its objections against the use of the concept of Morality and Public order and informed the Board that it had come to the conclusion that the public order and morality concept was unworkable. However the GAC had to acknowledge that it had no workable solution, but promised it would continue its work on the issue.

## GAC Secretariat

The GAC accepted a proposal from Brazil, the Netherlands and Norway to organize and co-finance an independent GAC secretariat for a period of 5 years. The secretariat will be accountable to the GAC and co-financed by ICANN. The new secretariat will be operational at the 41<sup>st</sup> ICANN meeting. Currently the government of India is providing a secretariat to the GAC.

The secretariat should work pro-active but cannot take over any policy tasks (eg drafting of policy documents from the GAC and GAC members).

More details at <http://brussels38.icann.org/meetings/brussels2010/presentation-gac-hybrid-models-19jun10-en.pdf>

## Appointment interim Chair

The GAC, on Janis Karklins' proposal, appointed the Canadian representative Heather Dryden as interim Chair. Janis Karklins had to resign from the GAC following his departure from the Latvian Government. Janis Karklin joins UNESCO in the function of Assistant Director-General for UNESCO's Communication and Information Sector.

The GAC communiqué can be downloaded at

<http://gac.icann.org/press-release/gac-2010-communique-37>

## ICANN Board meeting

The full agenda for the Board meeting and the transcript can be found on:

<http://brussels38.icann.org/node/12525>

These are the most interesting points from the ICANN Board meeting in Brussels

- Chinese IDN domains (simplified and traditional Chinese) approved and delegated CNNIC
- Hong Kong and Taiwan IDNs approved and delegated to the respective ccTLD managers.
- .XXX: Board to stick to the process and follow the recommendations (while keep dragging their feet). The Board instructs the staff to redo the whole process (including checking ICM's claims and status) as the application dates back more than 5 years and prepare a contract. Then the draft contract will be presented to the GAC. Some board members put on record that they are still very uncomfortable with the decision but that they feel there is no other choice: Rita Rodin still does not see a real community behind this sponsorship. Conclusion: if certain conditions are met, .XXX will move forward.
- Board member Raimundo Beca leaves the Board and received a warm "thank you" from the community
- The ICANN Chair will as of now receive a reasonable compensation for his services to ICANN (75k USD/year)
- Adoption of FY 2011 budget. Mike Silber commented that comments could be sent in until today. Some questions for clarification have not been answered.
- Thanks to Doug Brent for the exceptional work he accomplished over the last two years. He will be dearly missed.
- Standing ovation for EURid team for the excellent organization. Special mention for the food!

## Other meetings

### DNSSEC Workshop

As DNSSEC becomes more and more relevant at top level domains including the root, this workshop provided information, shared experiences and questions and answers from active participants involved in the deployment of DNSSEC.

The panel devoted a good amount of time on the operational issues involved in deployment including transfers of DNSSEC domains and key rollovers as well as the issue of a 'business case' for deployment. The question of a 'business case' for DNSSEC (from point of view of registry, registrar and registrants) was raised several times with a lot of interest from the room and panellists.

- The real cost of deploying DNSSEC (hidden and broader costs - eg: increased risk, support system/staff costs, interface systems etc)
- DNSSEC as an insurance measure and as an investment
- Major market forces are being created with the deployment of DNSSEC at root and large registries like .org and .com as well as market leaders .se
- How can you convince/help registrars/customers deploy DNSSEC? Incentives, subsidies?
- Registries should consider social benefits when considering the cost of deployment.
- A signed zone be less cost than an unsigned zone
- General update on activities in differing regions and adoption rates of DNSSEC

<http://brussels38.icann.org/node/12491>

### Whois Data Accuracy Study

Results of a study on the study by ICANN which had the purpose to provide the internet community data on a percentage of domains with accurate Whois data as well as useful information for policy development and generally to promote community contribution. The study was open to public comment from 15 Feb to 1 May 2010 and received 133 comments from 21 sources.

- Only 23% of records were fully accurate
- Comments : concerns on intellectual property rights, criminal activity, privacy and accuracy leading to increased costs.
- Suggestions : match registrant information with credit card info, implement centralised global clearinghouse or thick registries, deploy system of email verification, etc.
- Both GAO and NORC (two previous similar studies) both found there were unacceptable levels of inaccuracies in Whois.
- Next steps: additional studies on Whois, increase Whois information available to registrants on the ICANN website, implement registrar-developed and led Whois education program for registrants, further studies on privacy, better use of WDPRS tool for more effective complaints management.

<http://brussels38.icann.org/node/12495>

### Internet Governance Forum

General discussion on the continuation of the IFG as a forum for multi-stakeholder dialogue during lead up to 5<sup>th</sup> IGF in Vilnius, Lithuania from 14 to 17 September 2010. General comments:

- IGF important as the traditional alternative of top down regulatory framework perhaps not appealing
- Push for increased representation from developing world
- Greater transparency within multi stakeholder advisory group
- Funding of the IGF continues to be an important issue
- Discussion on regional IGF which are becoming more popular and regular.

<http://brussels38.icann.org/node/12515>