# Report of

# ICANN 41

## Singapore, Republic of Singapore, June 23 - 28, 2011

Peter Van Roste
Wim Degezelle

# Executive summary

ICANN 41 Singapore was a well organized and well attended meeting with one highlight:
The Board instructed the CEO to start the implementation process for the new gTLDs.

### ccNSO
The ccNSO had a diverse agenda that dealt with both ICANN related issues and ccTLD operational issues. The ccNSO was chaired for the first time by Lesley Cowley who, even after only a few months, has made some significant changes to the way the ccNSO operates. The most notable change being the introduction of much more transparency in the decision making process and in the roles of the different counselors.
From the ccNSO working groups, the most notable issue is the discovery of an "accounting error" equaling 2 million USD in the Expense Area Group report. As a result the cost of the ccNSO (as calculated by ICANN) went down from approximately 13 million USD to 11 million USD.
While this is a quite forgiving community – see the disappointments following many promises from the ICANN finance teams in the past – this last error seems for many to have been the straw that broke the camel's back.  The community has urged ICANN to immediately make this into a priority.

### GAC
During the days before the decision was taken, the GAC expressed its concerns with the gTLD process, focusing in particular on the vertical integration issue, objection formalities and trademark issues.
While their concerns were not met by the Board, the GAC confirmed that they had received the necessary rationale for the Board's decision to reject the GAC's advice. In their Communiqué the GAC expressed their disappointment but are willing to further cooperate.
An important change in the GAC is the new approach by the European Commission. Not only was the Commission represented by a Director and an assistant director (this high level representation seems to indicate an increased attention for the ICANN process), the tone of their interventions were regarded by most participants and observers as aggressive and 'non-constructive'. The Commission has also sent a letter (explicitly outside the GAC process) to ICANN to underline its concern with the registry/registrar integration issue. This seems to indicate an intention to leverage the competition law aspects (which is a European competence). As a result the Commission can work on this matter outside the GAC process, or without even consulting with the Members States.

### ICANN Board
- Steve Crocker has been approved as new ICANN Board Chair
- Bruce Tonkin was elected vice-Chair.
- The ATRT Recommendations were approved.
- The FY12 Operating Plan & Budget was approved. (despite many comments…)
- The first meeting of 2012 will be held in San Jose, Costa Rica
- The second meeting of 2012 will be held in Prague, Czech Republic

# ccNSO Meeting Day 1

## Strategic & Operational Plan/Financial Contributions
## (Byron Holland, .ca; Roelof Meijer, .nl; Juan Ojeda, ICANN Controller; Akram Atallah, ICANN COO)

http://singapore41.icann.org/meetings/singapore2011/presentation-sop-update-holland-21jun11-en.pdf

SOP committee wanted to suggest reduction of activity/services. This will be possible in the months ahead.

Juan addressed all the comments made by the SOP WG in response to the SOP FY2012.
- Meetings: target: 2 million USD/ meeting – including supporting 250 people. Sponsorship is budgeted at 300K per meeting (which is very low compared to actual sponsorship per meeting as pointed out by Giovanni Seppia)
- Number of meetings is under consideration: public participation committee is currently summarizing community feedback.
- 28.5 million personnel cost – average salary is 150K USD – new benchmarking exercise is underway
- Cost for IDN program is going up with 30%, this is explained by the IDN variant program.
- There is still a lack of details of projects' goals and activities: this is **no**t going to be changed in the final version. But ICANN is currently changing the accounting program to have more details and measurement tools. (again… As Stephen Deersake pointed out: this is not the first time that ICANN promises the implementation of accounting software that will slice and dice and make toast…)
- Current headcount: 140-ish, budget 158
- Temp staff Is not included in staff costs but in professional services
- Global Partnerships has a 1.2 million increase. But currently significantly under budget. Actual to budget is about 25% increase. Attendants pointed out that actual to budget is the relevant measurement, not budgeted FY2011 to budget FY 2012)
- 12,3 million USD allocated to cc-community. **2 million Euro error discovered during the Singapore meeting**. How did this happen?
    o RPKI project (IANA) was attributed entirely to cc-community
    o Expense Area Groups is a way to look at the budget – the mistake was not an accounting issue
    o Akram Is not confident that EAG is a correct representation
- Kurt Pritz presented the SOP FY 2013-2015

## ICANN Board update

Change in format – whole board participated in exchange.

- Human rights issues. Triggered by a question from Nigel Roberts, Rod explained that ICANN has not particularly taken into account whether it falls under the convention of human rights or not. Mike Silber asked Nigel to ask the real question. Nigel unfortunately couldn't make it to the meeting so the question was dropped.
- NOI on the IANA contract. Board asking for community input.
    o National law issue is one of the most important ones
    o Mike Silber encouraged synchronization between submissions so that there is no contradiction between them
    o PDT suggested that deadline could be extended
- Budget

- o Lise Fuhr asked how ICANN could guarantee efficiency. Board Finance Committee Chair responded that there will be much more detailed information and metrics available to measure and prove efficiency.
- o Staffan Jonson asked for more transparency. Akram responded that confidentiality restricts what can be shared.
- o Byron Holland summarized: The budget doesn't give faith. A 2 million dollar mistake in the attribution does not give confidence. What is the Board going to do to solve this? The Board did not really answer that question. PDT picked it apart, focused on a detail and then stated there was no time left for the rest of the question.
- o Steve Crocker however clarified that the concern of an ever increasing budget is well understood. He stated that in his view the current increase is justified, but that it will not become an eternally growing budget. *Quite a relief to hear that at least someone in the Board understands that there is a real issue here.*

## IANA update – Kim Davies

Kim provided an (as ever excellent) overview of the workflow automation, business excellence and delegation/redelegation process. The presentation was similar to the one given at the CENTR GA in Trondheim.
Some highlights and additional comments below.

http://singapore41.icann.org/meetings/singapore2011/presentation-iana-update-davies-21jun11-en.pdf

Root zone management system
System is now ready for production.
Once in production, credentials will be sent to ccTLD managers.
Key dates: 21st June, system passed testing phase
Communication process started
Cutover day (Q3 2011) TLD confirmations and notifications will come from system, not manual staff email
Post cutover: start inducting TLDs to web interface
By Senegal: inductions completed, roll-out completed
Nothing changes if ccTLD manager doesn't want changes.
Induction in the system will lead to an additional choice.
Overall optimizations (time-wise) will be small due to improved performance over the recent years.
Thanks to CENTR community! ☺

Business Excellence
Will be based on European model: European Foundation for Quality Management. (comments from the room suggested that this is a somewhat controversial choice)
Research into performance metrics
Develop measurement models to improve quality of service.
Sample metrics
- time limits: end-to-end processing time
- accuracy: changes implemented as originally intended
- Quality: how many times is there a need to clarify a request/are customers happy
- Transparency: reporting performance
Suggestion to fully document process so that IANA can be held accountable against this process

Delegations/redelegations
Fast Track has emphasized some interpretation issues.
Board is considering some tweaks to the process.
This is NOT a change in policy, does not prejudice outcome of Framework of Interpretation Working Group

## IDN ccPDP WG II

- How to introduce IDN ccTLDs in the ccNSO
- What bylaw changes are needed to include IDN ccTLD managers as full members in the ccNSO (on equal footing)
- Interim report available here: http://ccnso.icann.org/workinggroups/idn-pdp-wg2-final-interim-report-22nov10-en.pdf
- "One vote per territory" – principle is being reviewed and turned into a" one vote per IANA code" principle  (open for further discussions)
- 'variant issues' will not be taken into account as this would stall the work of this WG for too long

http://svsf40.icann.org/meetings/siliconvalley2011/presentation-idn-pdp-wg2-update-15mar11-en.pdf


## Update on SSR-RT2 Ondrej Filip and Simon McCalla

This is one of the ATRT review teams.

Security Stability and resilience is clear ICANN priority
100% uptime is one of the measurements. It is however unclear how ICANN is going to achieve that.
So far it has been difficult to find clear goals and well defined measurements for success.
Headcount for 10 SSR and 1 VP Cryptography
ICANN's relationship with SO's and third parties is not ideal.
SSAC/RSSAC confusion over responsibilities
Next steps: interim report to be out soon… working towards full report by ICABNN Senegal, final report planned for spring 2012
http://singapore41.icann.org/meetings/singapore2011/presentation-ssr-rt-update-mccalla-21jun11-en.pdf


## ATRT update – Denise Michel

http://singapore41.icann.org/meetings/singapore2011/presentation-atrt-update-michel-21jun11-en.pdf


## FNOI – ccNSO contribution – update by Keith Davidson and Becky Burr

Becky clarified the IANA contracts evolution in the light of the US public procurement laws
ccNSO comments (march 29)
support for bundled functions
support for metrics
support for automation
support for review of contractual relation between ICANN and IANA

ccNSO will respond to FNOI
This will be a consensus comment
Drafting team: Katryn Reynolds, Paul Syndler, Keith Davidson, Martin Boyle, Becky Burr

- Request modifications to ensure that the specific tasks do not pre-empt current work of the Framework of Interpretation WG
- Request clarification regarding NTIA approval
- Significant concern regarding role of local law
    - resolve disputes between cc operator and government in country? YES!
    - Expect ICANN To interpret and apply local law? NO!
      The real concern is that ICANN would not be able to make absolutely sure that the rights of the registry operator are safeguarded.

**Use of Adobe connect (training bij Kristina Nordström)**


**Security session**


**DSSA working group update – Jörg Schweiger**
Formed to understand the stability and security of the global domain name system
Activity since San Francisco:
WG Launch and work planning
Determine the security stability and resiliency level of the global DNS from a TLD perspective.
http://singapore41.icann.org/meetings/singapore2011/presentation-dssa-update-schweiger-21jun11-en.pdf


**IRI WG update – Jörg Schweiger and Bart Boswinkel**
Builds on Incident Response Planning Working group
Background:
Purpose of IRPWG WG: implement mechanisms for interaction during incidents that impact DNS
Build repository for ccTLD contacts
Contact repository data attributes are already refined
Make or buy decision will depend on financing models:

  ⇨ Community is asked to give input on financing
  ⇨ Set up Incident repository implementation working group
http://singapore41.icann.org/meetings/singapore2011/presentation-irwg-update-schweiger-21jun11-en.pdf


**Dissection of the .CR hacking incident - Luis Diego Epinoza**
Luis provided an overview of the incident, the vulnerabilities that allowed it, how it was detected and how changes were reverted back to the original data.
Preesentation is available at:
http://singapore41.icann.org/meetings/singapore2011/presentation-security-lesson-espinoza-21jun11-en.pdf


**JP experience of earthquake and its aftermath – Hiro Hotta**
Lesson learned: communication was almost impossible: all lines congested
JP service not disrupted
Staff could not return home
Domain Names that were registered to affected areas were automatically renewed free of charge.
Hiro also provide a practical checklist for short term preparation. It is included in his presentation:
http://singapore41.icann.org/meetings/singapore2011/presentation-jp-experience-hotta-21jun11-en.pdf


**.CZ DNSSEC awareness campaign – Pavel Tuma**
Pavel presented on the marketing campaign to increase the DNSSEC awareness targeting the regular internet users instead of targeting service providers – concept, execution, lessons learned after first round of the campaign, follow-up plans.
Hi presentation can be found at: http://singapore41.icann.org/meetings/singapore2011/presentation-dnssec-campaign-tuma-21jun11-en.pdf

**ICANN ccTLD DNSSEC Deployment Update – Richard Lamb, ICANN**
Currently 70 out of 310 TLDs signed (= 21% of TLDs with 81% potential of second level domains)
PCH DNSSEC signer platform is ready (for free) for any ccTLD
5 key ceremonies so far
Automation is the key in increasing roll-out speed. (e.g. Reminders about key-updates)

SysTrust certification by Price Waterhouse Coopers.

http://singapore41.icann.org/meetings/singapore2011/presentation-dnssec-deployment-update-lamb-21jun11-en.pdf

**Anti-phishing Working Group Survey Update - Rod Rasmussen, APWG**
Stats and top lists of TLDs by APWGs Domain Score included in the ppt:
http://singapore41.icann.org/meetings/singapore2011/presentation-global-phising-survey-rasmussen-21jun11-en.pdf

**Framework of Interpretation Working Group update – Keith Davidson, InternetNZ**
http://singapore41.icann.org/meetings/singapore2011/presentation-foi-update-davidson-21jun11-en.pdf
This presentation is similar to the one presented in Trondheim.


# IDN session – Chaired by Young-Um Lee


**.EU Survey on IDN State of Play Today – Giovanni Seppia, EURid**
http://singapore41.icann.org/meetings/singapore2011/presentation-idns-state-play-seppia-21jun11-en.pdf
Giovanni presented on this topic at the GA in Trondheim

**Universal Acceptability: The Public Suffix List and IDN Whitelist – Jothan Frakes, Mozilla Foundation**
http://singapore41.icann.org/meetings/singapore2011/presentation-universal-acceptability-frakes-21jun11-en.pdf
Public suffix list is maintained by the Mozilla Foundation.
This list includes all subdomains (e.g. .CO.UK)
This list needs to be properly maintained as many libraries and tools rely on it.
http://publicsuffix.org/list
Jothan asks the ccTLD registries to review and add or update their entries!
Mozilla IDN whitelist. This whitelist will expose the Punicode of a domain name as default behavior so that a fraudulent "homograph" gets exposed.
Until approved, domains display in Punicode.

**Fast Track Experiences and Update on Preparations for the Launch of .срб – Serbia – Slobodan Markovic, .rs**
IDN was selected after public vote (80% support).
Entered into the root June 2011
http://singapore41.icann.org/meetings/singapore2011/presentation-idn-cctld-serbia-markovic-21jun11-en.pdf

**Fast Track experiences: Russia – Andrei Kolesnikov, .РФ**
840.000 as of June 2011
41% are not delegated
http://singapore41.icann.org/meetings/singapore2011/presentation-idn-cctld-russia-update-kolesnikov-21jun11-en.pdf

**Fast Track Experiences: Qatar – Mohamed El Bashir, .qa**
http://singapore41.icann.org/meetings/singapore2011/presentation-qatar-domains-registry-el-bashir-21jun11-en.pdf

**Fast Track Experiences: Thailand – Parkpoom Tripatana, .th**
http://singapore41.icann.org/meetings/singapore2011/presentation-idn-cctld-thai-21jun11-en.pdf
Variant Issue Project (VIP) Update – Dennis Jennings, ICANN
There has been a long-standing request from IDN users that IDN variants are delegated.
First step: glossary of terms. Second step: defining the problem:
Linguistic accuracy
Technical feasibility & accuracy
Usability
Accessibility
Security and stability
Up-to-date status of the work can be found on: https://community.icann.org/display/VIP/Home
Final report expected to be published by December 15 2011.
http://singapore41.icann.org/meetings/singapore2011/presentation-idn-variant-tlds-update-jennings-21jun11-en.pdf

**Joint ccNSO/gNSO IDN WG update – Edmon Chung**
http://singapore41.icann.org/meetings/singapore2011/presentation-jig-update-chung-zhang-21jun11-en.pdf

# ccNSO Meeting Day 2

## Joint ccNSO/GAC session

The ccNSO gave an update on the progress of the work of the different working groups
- SOP
- Finance
- FOI
- Names of Countries and Territories Study Group
- SSR
-
Update from Annebeth Lange and Norwegian GAC rep:
- Impact of GEO gTLDs on ccTLDs (from Norway)
This triggered the attention of many GAC members who are interested in the report from the Norwegian discussion or who plan to conduct a similar study. Annebeth cautioned that in order to be successful she strongly recommends to take on board the whole community (academic, IP community, civil society, government and ICT sector)
The session was too much unidirectional. The GAC probably learned a lot from the ccNSO activities, but the ccNSO didn't learn too much of what is happening in the GAC…
http://singapore41.icann.org/meetings/singapore2011/presentation-gac-ccnso-davidson-22jun11-en.pdf

## IDN PDP WG 2 Update – Hiro Hotta

This WG is looking into the impact on ccNSO membership and structure of the introduction of the IDN ccTLDs.
Key issues that are being discussed:
- What is a ccTLD?
- How will entities with more than one (IDN) ccTLD fit into the ccNSO structure?

We will follow this discussion closely as it tries to solve similar questions like those we will need to address eventually at CENTR.


## ccTLD updates session moderated by Patricio Poblete


## .sg ccTLD update – Michele Sng, .SG

130k names
Registry-registrar model
Third level registrations most popular, second level possible
.com.sg Is the largest with 60%+
Since the opening up of second level, .com.sg and .sg are growing at similar rates
IDNs currently being introduced
DNSSEC testbed for registrars – end of the year it will go public
http://singapore41.icann.org/meetings/singapore2011/presentation-sg-update-sng-22jun11-en.pdf


## IDNs on the Second Level in .my – Norsuzana Harun, .my

IDNs needed for social and cultural preservation, not needed from commercial point of view.
http://singapore41.icann.org/meetings/singapore2011/presentation-idns-second-level-my-harun-22jun11-en.pdf


## Setup and Status of .fo Today – Isak Jacobsen, .fo

50k inhabitants
Capital Thorshaven
University of Thorshaven, Faroese IT association, ministry of industry started the registry
Started in 1995
FRED implemented in 2010
2 public and 2 private sector reps
Appointed by IT-association
Non-profit organisation
Not regulated by national law
**Rents** domain names
3080 domain names
60 EUR or 120 EUR depending on whether or not you can proof your right to a name (own name, trademark or similar)
No registrars – only direct registration
http://singapore41.icann.org/meetings/singapore2011/presentation-fo-22jun11-en.pdf


## .uk New Policy Process – Alex Blowers, .uk

Nominet is considering how the policy can be most effective and reflect the public interest in the decision making.
Important to maintain high standard of self-regulation and independence.
New policy process launched in Feb 2011
Key element: discussion with and input from all stakeholders

Two issues in the process so far:
- Domain names associated with criminal activities (how to cooperate with law enforcement agencies)
- Expired domain names

Reactions to new policy process almost unanimously positive

## .cd Prospective – Bringing Back its Value Where it Belongs – Chris Tshimanga, .cd

From 15k domain names down to about 3k.
Democratic republic of congo
60 million inhabitants
Delegation in Feb 2011
Aiming at (music)CD market and Diplomatic (Corps Diplomatic) environment
Low price
Time to market: before new gTLDs launch

## Recent Developments in .au – Jack Simpson, .au

2 million domain names, 25<sup>th</sup> anniversary of delegation
ccTLD strategy: Patriotism + ownership = value
Broad public relations campaign; print and broadcast media
Message: AUSSIES are driving success of .AU
(as opposed to  AUda or AUSregistry)

http://singapore41.icann.org/meetings/singapore2011/presentation-au-22jun11-en.pdf

## APTLD Update – Jian Zhang, APTLD
## CENTR Update - Peter Van Roste, CENTR

http://singapore41.icann.org/meetings/singapore2011/presentation-centr-update-van-roste-22jun11-en.pdf

## Panel discussion on the impact of new Geonames on existing ccTLDs

Intro: Norwegian case:
http://singapore41.icann.org/meetings/singapore2011/presentation-geographic-tlds-impact-storm-22jun11-en.pdf

Main conclusion in Norway
- Norid is serving Norwegian market very well
- No need for new gTLD
- Framework conditions for new Geo gTLDs sets out rules and requirements
- Even if these framework conditions will not solve all questions, it will help

Norway is really taking the lead and demonstrates thought leadership.
All governments and ccTLDs who are considering these questions should make their report their first stop.

Annebeth Lange .no
Dennis Jennings .irish
Sabine Dolderer .de
Dirk Kirenowski .berlin
Fabien Betremieux .fr and .paris
Edmun Chung .asia
Jonathan Shea .hk
David Curtin .ie
Olivier Crepin-Leblond

Regulatory and Policy area

In case where there is national legislation that governs the ccTLD, should the new gTLD be governed under the same law?

Sabine: Difficult to establish which local law? There are 12 potential .berlin registries all over the world

Olivier: Agrees with Sabine, some countries have very restrictive rules and these rules should not be applied

Annebeth:for the consumers .com stands for global and American, a national name should governed by national law, sometimes of course that will not be possible in full

Dennis: a gTLD might benefit from applying some regulatory framework in order to send out the message that it can be trusted

Edmun: most laws governing ccTLDs are very specific: they name the ccTLD to which they apply

Sabine: every organization is subject to local law – having a contract with ICANN doesn't change that

What if this local law clashes with ICANN obligations?

New gTLDs are in discussion with ICANN because there whois model will not be allowed under local law

Dirk: gTLD has to give zonefile to ICANN escrow service: this is not allowed in Germany

Olivier: trust has many aspects: identity of registrants, reliable registrar, stable registry

Fabien: new framework law in France only covers ccTLDs

Edmun: as a regional gTLD one has to follow local developments e.g. rules for ISPs could also be applied to gTLDs and hence affect their operations


Competition and Marketing area

Should a registry compete or is that for the registrars?

Sabine: you can't choose that. Currently there is already a lot of competition (e.g. .com or .eu), this is basically consumer choice. The registry can try to convince the consumer to swing its way.

You have to find a balance: if both ccTLD and new gTLD do well, this will be better for the consumer

Dennis: of course there should be competition

      Anti-competitive measures are illegal

      .irish and .ie are not necessarily natural competitors

Fabien: .FR and geoTLDs: there is natural competition as those TLDs will address the same market.  But also largely complimentary. See the .CAT example

Ornulf: competition can be a great incentive for all registries to keep striving to improve themselves

David: Competition on registrar level will become very important


Conclusion: consumer choice and competition will go hand in hand. The market has changed from 1 name per business to a domain name portfolio.

# GAC Report

### New gTLDs

Following the time schedule set at the ICANN meeting in San Francisco the ICANN Board met on Monday 20 June to approve the final version of the Applicant guidebook for new gTLDs and to launch here with the new application gTLD process.

The ICANN board approved the Applicant guidebook with 13 votes in favor, one against (George Sadowsky) and two abstentions (Mike Silber, Bruce Tonkin).

New gTLD applicants will be able to submit their applications between 12 January 2012 and 12 April 2012. The initial evaluation results are expected to be published from November 2012 on.

The Applicant guidebook can be found at http://www.icann.org/en/topics/new-gtlds/dag-en.htm .
The Board resolution can be found at http://www.icann.org/en/minutes/resolutions-20jun11-en.htm.

### Saturday 18 June, GAC letter highlights outstanding issues

After a closed meeting on Saturday 18 June, the GAC sent a letter to the ICANN board. The letter recognised that changes made by the most recent version of the DAG addressed some of the GAC's outstanding concerns. But more importantly the letter reiterated that there remained several substantial issues that needed to be solved before the launch of the new gTLD process.

The GAC letter in particular pointed at five issues:

  - competition concerns, in particular those resulting from changes to registry-registrar cross-ownership rules;
- the requirement that trademark holders demonstrate the use of their trademark if they  wish to make use of the proposed trademark protection mechanisms;
- removal of references in the gTLD Guidebook that attempt to specify the form of future
GAC early warnings or require that advice must contains particular information;
- appropriate and timely support for developing countries in implementing the new gTLD process;
- protections for names Olympic, Olympiad and Red Crescent/Red Cross names.

GAC letter to the Board:
http://gac.icann.org/system/files/GAC%20communication%20on%20new%20gTLDs%20and%20Applicant%20Guidebook-%2020110618_0.pdf

### Letter from the EU and US

To get the full picture it is necessary mention that both the European Union and the US government recently sent a unilateral letter to ICANN which said that ICANN should change the registry-registrar cross ownership rules without further consideration of the completion concerns.
European Commission letter (17 June 2011):
http://www.icann.org/en/correspondence/eu-to-icann-17jun11-en.pdf
US government letter (16 June 2011):
http://www.icann.org/en/correspondence/strickling-to-dengate-thrush-16jun11-en.pdf

## Sunday 19 June, joint GAC – ICANN Board meeting on new gTLDs

On the evening before the special ICANN Board meeting to approve the Final Applicant guidebook the Board and the GAC met. The meeting started with a 45 minute delay due to the extended preparatory meeting of the GAC. Apparently it took the GAC more time than foreseen to prepare its strategy for the meeting.

The trademark issue and the vertical integration issue were the two most important issues at stake and it was clear that neither the GAC nor the Board were planning to change their fundamentally different positions.

Regarding the support for developing countries the ICANN Board announced that a 2 million US dollar program was to be launched in support of new gTLDs. Several GAC representatives passed the message that it would be very bad if only a few applications would come from developing countries.

Change in the EU approach
The European Commission sent a high level delegation to Singapore. Topic leader for the Commission in GAC discussions on new gTLDs was Gerard De Graaf, the new Director for Audiovisual, Media, Internet and Electronic Communications Policy (DG INFSO).

But the European Commission and in particular Gerard De Graaf put himself in the picture with hard and threatening interventions, unusual for GAC meetings. Quotes like' this is a discussion between the deaf and the stupid' or 'why should we further try to explain if you don't want to understand' shocked not only the people in the room but were also immediately tweeted and re-tweeted.
It was said that behind closed door the tone was even harder.

When informally talking to GAC members some expressed the fear that this kind of interventions would not do good to the view the community has from the GAC.


## Tuesday 21 June, GAC meeting with the ICANN Board

On Tuesday the GAC had its regular meeting with the ICANN Board. In her opening words GAC chair Heather Dryden said that the GAC took note of the decision on new gTLDs. The GAC acknowledged that there had been progress but was disappointed that not all GAC advice was taken into account and that several issues needed further consideration.

GAC asked for some minor clarifications from the Board to be sure of the exact text that was voted on Monday and for clear confirmation of the timeline for some of the remaining work mentioned amongst others in the Board's rationale.
During these discussions EU representative De Graaf made clear to the Board, but definitely also towards his GAC colleagues that the competition issue regarding the registry/registrar cross ownership was an issue 'outside the GAC context' since the Commission had sent the letter directly to ICANN and not to or through the GAC.

ICANN Chair Peter Dengate-Thrush reached out to the GAC members and said that the Board and staff were ready to help individual representatives to explain the new gTLD process to their governments. He stresses that in this new gTLD process the GAC was an important ally of ICANN and Board.  This triggered the comment on twitter 'this partnership would have been useful 6 months ago' (Kieren McCarthy).

Partially related to the new gTLDs but also to .xxx, the Dutch GAC representative informed about a session of the GAC with SSAC (unfortunately behind closed doors) on the issue of blocking of controversial strings in some countries. Although not being in favor of blocking himself, he suggested that, in cases where blocking cannot be avoided, there should be some guidance or help from ICANN for countries that decide to block a string. This is to limit or avoid potential unwanted effects of blocking.

## Other meetings of the GAC

There was a meeting of the *'Joint Board-GAC working group on the role of the GAC'* which continued its work on the draft recommendations and further refined and discussed amongst other the text on the role of GAC advice, GAC liaisons, involving the GAC earlier in the process, additional funding (currently there is funding for 6 GAC members per meeting). He GAC is still considering the organisation of a high level meeting for governments to raise awareness on the role of the GAC within the ICANN community.

*The Registrar Stakeholder group* (http://www.icannregistrars.org) had on their request, a meeting with the GAC and expressed the wish to establish a regular dialogue with the GAC. According to Mason Cole (Chair) the Registrar Stakeholder group represents 70-80% of domain registrations and he regretted that too often "registrars wrongly seen as the group that always says no in the ICANN community". The meeting further focused on the law enforcement recommendations and the draft code of conduct that was presented after the meeting between registrars and Law Enforcement Agencies in Brussels earlier this year. (CENTR report on this meeting at https://www.centr.org/main/lib/g7/6312-CTR.html)

Several GAC representatives (amongst who the EU and US) put some pressure on the registrar community by asking for concrete progress and deliverables GAC members could report on in their home countries, and in particular on the EU/US meeting on Cybercrime in November 2011.
Bobby Flaim (FBI) gave more information on the current state of the process: from the 12 recommendations 9 were included in the draft code of conduct after a workable agreement was reached in Brussels, 3 recommendations need further discussion.

!! There was a discussion on Whois accuracy during which Rob Hall (Namescout.com) suggested that GAC members should go to their local country code manager and find out how they deal with it on a national level and bring this experience to the debate. Nationally, he said, there are more tools available to check who is behind a domain name.

Elliot Noss (Tucows) suggested some concrete ways GAC members could help, amongst other by raising the national debate on cross-border law enforcement and unbundling criminal and IP issues.

The GAC received an update from the *Whois review team*. Amongst other the question on balancing the registrant's desire for privacy (including the use of proxy and privacy services) and the need and commitment to have an accurate and complete Whois triggered the attention of GAC members.

Also here, and for a second time, GAC member were told to go and see how their national ccTLD manager is dealing with the issue and learn from their practices.

The **DNS Security, Stability and Resiliency review team** came to give an update on its work. It was said that one of the outstanding questions was how far the team had to look into the way individual domain registries deal with security and stability since this is on the boarder or just outside the scope of its work. The Kenyan GAC, who is the liaison for the review team, demanded that government input would be taken into account.

# GAC meeting with the ccNSO (see higher)

## GAC Communiqué

The Singapore Communiqué is available at
http://gac.icann.org/press-release/singapore-communiqu%C3%A9-23-june-2011

## Regular Board meeting and Board elections

On Friday the ICANN Board had its regular meeting.
The approved resolution will soon be posted at http://www.icann.org/en/minutes .

One of the most important points on the agenda was the approval of the FY12 Operating Plan & Budget. Reference was made to the substantial comments from some constituencies and supporting organisations (amongst others the ccNSO).

The end of the Singapore meeting also meant the end of the Board term of Peter Dengate Trush (ccNSO) and Rita Rodin Johnston (GNSO). Chris Disspain entered the Board for the ccNSO.

The new ICANN board elected a new Chair and Vice-Chair. As expected, Steve Crocker was appointed as new Chairman of ICANN. Bruce Tonkin is the new Vice-Chairman.