



Report of the

37th Public ICANN meeting

Nairobi, Kenya

7-12 March 2010

Prepared by the CENTR Secretariat



Contents

EXECUTIVE REPORT OF THE 37TH ICANN MEETING, NAIROBI, KENYA, 7-12 MARCH 2010	3
The DNS “can stop any time”	3
DNS-CERT	3
ccTLD Contributions	3
Geographic Names under New gTLD process	3
Expression of Interest	3
.XXX	4
Prayer	4
CENTR BoD meetings	4
Key Topics from the ccNSO meeting	4
Key topics from the GAC meeting	4
DNSSEC Workshop	4
FULL REPORT OF THE 37TH ICANN MEETING, NAIROBI, KENYA, 7-12 MARCH 2010 ..	5
Security	5
DNSSEC	5
CEO’s comments	6
DNS-CERT	7
Root-scaling	7
Wildcards	8
New gTLDs	8
Geonames	8
EOI	8
ccNSO Review	9
IDNs	9
Marketing	10
IANA	10
ccTLD Contributions	11
Strategic and Operational Planning	11
Review of the Role of the GAC	11
Delegation/Redelegation Working Group	11
Other News	11



EXECUTIVE REPORT OF THE 37TH ICANN MEETING, NAIROBI, KENYA, 7-12 MARCH 2010

The DNS “can stop any time”.

By far the most discussed event from this ICANN meeting was the speech from the CEO to the GAC. In that speech he said that the DNS “it is under more attack than ever, is fragile and vulnerable, and “can stop any time.” ... “The domain name system is under attack today as it has never been before. I have personally consulted with over 20 CEOs of the top registries and the top registrars globally, all of whom are seeing increasing attacks and complexity of attacks and who are extremely concerned”

ccNSO expressed very strong concerns about alarmist and incorrect statements like these from the CEO of ICANN. SSAC is trying to play it down.

Rod commented that he felt these statements were needed as some GAC representatives were about to oppose the DNS-CERT proposal.

As the statement was spoken out at the very end of the meeting, just before the closing by the Chair, there was no possibility for GAC members to comment or react.

To be continued for sure...

DNS-CERT

On the two sessions I attended I heard almost no support for the idea. Still ICANN refers to “significant parts of the community” that are asking for this initiative. Rod confirmed that this was a top-down initiative and that he felt it was appalling that this was not in place yet. CENTR is writing a comment, lining out some concerns related to the DNS-CERT idea and the business plan.

ccTLD Contributions

There is a renewed attention for the financial contributions from the ccTLDs. The ccNSO has reconfirmed its guidelines (voluntary contributions, level guided by contributions from comparable ccTLDs). The ccNSO will discuss the issue again in Brussels.

Geographic Names under New gTLD process

The Chair of the ICANN Board (Peter Dengate-Thrush) stated in the GAC meeting that the Board might not follow the advice from the GAC on this issue. While some issues related to the post delegation stage will be addressed in the next version of the Draft Applicant Guidelines, the Board does not agree that Country and Territory names should not be included in the new gTLD process.

Expression of Interest

What started as an idea to get a simple list of the number and the nature of gTLDs that could be expected to apply turned into a discussion on the need/necessity/usefulness of what is by many conceived as a pre-application procedure. The Board turned down the idea.



.XXX

The decision is postponed until Brussels. While most observers expected a favorable outcome for .XXX, the Board has decided to launch a public round of comments.

Prayer

Yes prayer. That's how the ICANN meeting in Nairobi started. Different religions and languages.

A great idea, to bring religion to the ICANN forum?

CENTR BoD meetings

The new CENTR Board met with Rod, Janis Karklins (GAC Chair) and Chris Disspain (ccNSO Chair).

Key Topics from the ccNSO meeting

Presentations and discussions focused on DNSSEC, Marketing and IDN Fast Track.

Key topics from the GAC meeting

The GAC finalized its comments on new gTLDs, DAG v3 and submitted 'Interim Principles on IDN ccTLDs' to the ccNSO's PDP. It questioned the proposed EoI, welcomed ICANN's security proposals but was critical about the role and added value of the DNS CERT versus existing initiatives at national, regional and global level (eg national CERTs).

DNSSEC Workshop

CENTR was invited to present the recent DNSSEC survey. The presentation was well received by Chair Steve Crocker. Registries found it useful to see the solutions chosen by European colleagues, Registrars were positively surprised by the advice to involve them in DNSSEC preparations.



FULL REPORT OF THE 37TH ICANN MEETING, NAIROBI, KENYA, 7-12 MARCH 2010

Security

DNSSEC

The ccNSO Tech Day covered several security and in particular DNSSEC related topics.

- Kim Davies (IANA) gave a presentation on the signing of the root and the roles of the different partners – ICANN/IANA, DoC, VeriSign. He assured that there will be multiple layers of redundancy to avoid problems with community representatives involved in KSK rollover. <http://nbo.icann.org/meetings/nairobi2010/presentation-ccnso-tech-day-davies-08mar10-en.pdf>
- Luis Espinoza (.cr) gave a presentation on the total cost of DNSSEC and concluded that the main costs are the same irrespective of the size of the TLD and as a result relatively high for a small ccTLD. The presentation was criticized for focusing too much on the ENISA study and not taking into account open source solutions like OpenDNSSEC which could decimate the cost. <http://nbo.icann.org/meetings/nairobi2010/presentation-ccnso-tech-day-espinoza-08mar10-en.pdf>
- Roy Arends (.uk) reported on a software bug and related problems which lead to a DNSKEY amplification attack when rolling over the KSK. <https://nbo.icann.org/meetings/nairobi2010/presentation-rollover-and-die-08mar10-en.pdf>
- Ondrej Filip (.cz) presented a study on cache poisoning which concluded that the DNS remains vulnerable even after the patches to solve the Kaminsky bug. Cache poisoning as such is not to avoid, the only available protection at the moment is DNSSEC. The study will soon be available at <http://labs.nic.cz/> - <https://nbo.icann.org/meetings/nairobi2010/presentation-dnssec-dns-attacks-in-cz-08mar10-en.pdf>

The ccNSO dedicated a session to DNSSEC and it turned into an excellent best-practice sharing session.

- Introduction of DNSSEC under .PT – Pedro Veiga: <http://nbo.icann.org/meetings/nairobi2010/presentation-pt-veiga-10mar10-en.pdf>
- Education of Registrars in .CZ – Pavel Tuma: <http://nbo.icann.org/meetings/nairobi2010/presentation-cz-tuma-10mar10-en.pdf>
- Do Registrars care about DNSSEC? Anne-Marie Eklund-Löwinder: <http://nbo.icann.org/meetings/nairobi2010/presentation-dnssec-eklund-lowinder-10mar10-en.pdf>

The DNSSEC workshop on Wednesday morning focussed mainly on technical/operational issues with DNSSEC (Transfers and Key Rollovers) and DNSSEC Tools (open source tools and in particular Open-DNSSEC).

CENTR presented an update on DNSSEC deployment in Europe based on the recent survey. (cfr presentation @ Warsaw GA). The Chair of the working group Steve Crocker was pleased with a presentation that focussed on practical answers. Registries in the room found



it useful to see what solutions were chosen by their European colleagues and some registrars were positively surprised to see that registries give each other the advice to work closely together with their registrars when preparing DNSSEC (they weren't expecting such a suggestion coming from the registries themselves).

Agenda, presentations and transcripts of the workshop can be found at <http://nbo.icann.org/node/8924> .

CEO's comments

The most discussed topic of this ICANN meeting was without any doubt the comments made by ICANN's CEO Rod Beckstrom in an open meeting with the GAC. In that meeting, Rod stated that:

"I've personally consulted with over 20 CEOs of the top registries and the top registrars globally, all of whom are seeing increasing attacks and complexity of attacks and who are extremely concerned.

The DNS is more fragile and vulnerable today than it has ever been and it could stop at any given point in time, literally. It's never stopped: it has been slowed down through attacks, and the Kaminsky exploit that was disclosed only 18 months ago or so could have been used to fundamentally cripple the DNS. That system is used 1 trillion times per day and your economies depend upon it.

It can stop or it can be materially damaged and harmed. It is under attack. Parts of that system are in your countries and I will be writing you a letter and asking you for what is happening in the DNS in your countries because we are seeing new levels of wildcarding that is occurring at the telecom / service provider level, synthesis of DNS providers interrupting DNS requests, and providing false data and information for commercial and other purposes. But the system is under full-scale attack and I am extremely concerned - as the CEO of ICANN I wanted to let you know that, and we're all in this together.

I have met with heads of cyber-security or technical infrastructure of 3 of the largest countries on Earth who are concerned as well. I am sharing this because I am gravely concerned and we need your help. So we're going to be asking you for your advice on domain name security and on the DNSCert and what can be done a particularly learn from your CERTs as well - what has been accomplished in your countries. I have experience with CERTs in several countries but we need to learn more. So that will be coming and I just want to express my concern to this group because I don't want to wait until Brussels."

The statement was spoken out by the CEO at the very end of the meeting day, just before the closing by the Chair. As a result, there was no possibility for GAC members to comment, react or discuss with the CEO.

In response, the ccNSO drafted a letter, expressing strong concerns over these statements and the way in which they have been communicated. In particular the fact that ICANN feels it should warn the Governments to take up this issue does not fit well in the traditional ICANN process. The letter can be found on the CENTR website

<https://www.centri.org/main/lib/g8/5542-CTR.html> .



DNS-CERT

There was a dedicated session “Consultation on Strategic Security Initiatives” of which most was spent on DNS-CERT.

All documentation can be found at <http://nbo.icann.org/node/8873>

There were no new updates since the CENTR GA. It was stressed by Greg Rattray that the format of the DNS-CERT and whether it would be within or outside ICANN was still open for discussion.

The issue was also raised by Rod in the *meeting with the ccNSO and the CENTR Board*. It is obvious that it sits high on his agenda and based on the ccTLD feedback into the strategic plan (security and stability ended up as our number one priority for ICANN) he feels everyone should support this proposal. Fear that some GAC representatives would reject this initiative apparently led to the comments made in the GAC.

The GAC The two ‘strategic initiatives for security, stability and resiliency’ (DNS risk analysis and DNS-CERT) were presented to the GAC. In general GAC members welcomed the initiatives although some warned ICANN not to be too ambitious. Several GAC members pointed at the existing initiatives (eg national CERTs) and asked what added value a global DNS CERTs would bring.

Greg Rattray (ICANN Chief Internet Security Advisor) answered that the stress was laying on fostering existing initiatives and supporting the easy and rapid information sharing amongst them. He advised that the DNS CERT was not to recreate existing capabilities. He also said that there were plans to train national CERTs where there is a gap of knowledge regarding DNS security.

Root-scaling

The GAC noted that SSAC’s update on Root scaling issues sounded more secure and comfortable than in Seoul. Steve Crocker said that DNSSEC deployment was the crucial issue from a root perspective. The European Commission asked some questions about the research done regarding variants.

The update can be found at <http://nbo.icann.org/meetings/nairobi2010/presentation-root-scaling-09mar10-en.pdf> .

Further security related presentations @ ccNSO Tech day

Apart from the DNNSEC related presentations (see higher) the following security related topics were discussed at the ccNSO Tech day:

- Security Features in the Draft Application Guidebook (Jay Daley, .nz):
<http://nbo.icann.org/meetings/nairobi2010/presentation-dag-v3-security-08mar10-en.pdf>
- Takedown of the Mariposa Botnet (Chris Davis and David Dagon):
<http://nbo.icann.org/meetings/nairobi2010/presentation-mariposa-botnet-takedown-1-08mar10-en.pdf>
<http://nbo.icann.org/meetings/nairobi2010/presentation-mariposa-botnet-takedown-2-08mar10-en.pdf>
- .cl registry surviving the Chilean earthquake on 17 February 2010 (Patricio Poblete, .cl)
<http://nbo.icann.org/meetings/nairobi2010/presentation-chilean-earthquake-08mar10-en.pdf>



A transcript of the meeting can be found at <http://nbo.icann.org/meetings/nairobi2010/transcript-chat-ccnso-tech-day-08mar10-en.pdf> .

Wildcards

Bill >Semich from .NU gave an interesting presentation on the use of wildcards under .NU to support IDNs.

<http://nbo.icann.org/meetings/nairobi2010/presentation-wildcards-09mar10-en.pdf>

New gTLDs

Geonames

In a meeting with the ccNSO, Peter Dengate Thrush explained that in the new version of the Draft Applicant Guidebook, the post delegation issues that could arise when a gTLD does not longer hold the support of the Government will be addressed. The DAG4 will be available at least 4 weeks before the Brussels meeting in June.

During a joint meeting with the ccNSO Council , the gNSO indicated that they felt the level of protection for country and territory names in the current version of the DAG (top level only) was quite sufficient. It does not seem likely that they are going to move on this one.

The GAC stated during its meeting with the ICANN Board that the government should play a role in the delegation process when geo and city names are involved.

Eol

The GAC finalised its comments on the new gTLDs and DAG v3 (Annex B to the communiqué).

The GAC had asked the ICANN Board to postpone its decision on the Eol to be able to discuss it at its plenary in Nairobi. The discussion focussed on the question whether the Eol had to be considered as a commercial analysis of the potential new gTLD space or rather as the launch of the new gTLD round.

The GAC concluded that the mandatory nature of the Eol turned it into a slot reservation step would be a de facto launch of the application process.

The ICANN Board found no community consensus and decided to withdraw the Expression of Interest proposal.

With regard to the new gTLD process the ICANN Board also:

- decided that 'within the context of the new gTLD process, there will be strict separation of entities offering registry services and those acting as registrars. No co-ownership will be allowed.' (Vertical integration)
- instructed ICANN staff to analyse public comments on the Clearinghouse and URS proposals and develop final version to included in the DAG v4.
- decided that 'ICANN should take the remaining public comment from the community and synthesize those comments, as appropriate, into a final draft PDDRP (Post Delegation Dispute Resolution Procedure) , ensuring that the varying interests of the community are considered, and include the final draft in the DAG v4.



- decided that 'ICANN shall publish a final draft version of the RRDRP (Registry Restrictions Dispute Delegation Procedure) in the DAG v4 and consider whether this or a similar post-delegation dispute resolution procedure could be implemented for use by government-supported TLD operators where the government withdraws its support of the TLD.
- decided that ICANN shall develop an final proposal with regard to the IDN 3-Character Requirement in the DAG v4.
- instructed ICANN to include a proposal on IDN variants in the DAG v4 and tasked the ICANN CEO to undertake a study on the usability of the DNAME resource record as a part of a supported mechanism for managing TLD strings containing variants.
- agreed on the launch of a communications plan supporting the new gTLD program.

ccNSO Review

Tom Mackenzie from Items International gave a summary of the findings of the ccNSO review survey. This is only the first phase in a three step process:

- Factual assessment (the survey is still open but hurry if you want to get your voice heard)
- Strategic and Operational Diagnostic (Until May 2010)
- Recommendations (Before the Brussels Meeting)

The goal of this review is to evaluate the effectiveness of the ccNSO and recommend changes in its structure or operations where needed.

The majority of the 85 respondents to the survey so far indicated that they are relatively happy with the ccNSO as it is and had only minor suggestions for improvement.

IDNs

An update from Tina Dam on the IDN ccTLD Fast Track can be found here:

<http://nbo.icann.org/meetings/nairobi2010/presentation-idn-cctld-fast-track-update-10mar10-en.pdf>

Currently there are four ccTLDs moving along the Fast Track. Russia, Egypt, Saudi Arabia and the United Arab Emirates. The Chinese application did not pass the application criteria, but no information was made public as to the nature of the issues.

An overview of the PDP process and the presentation by Chris Disspain can be found here:

<http://nbo.icann.org/meetings/nairobi2010/presentation-idn-interim-paper-disspain-10mar10-en.pdf>

The GAC finalised it's "*GAC Interim Principles on IDN ccTLDs*" which are added as annexe to the communiqué. The members agreed on the 'interim' or as called at the meeting 'draft' status of the principles so that they could serve as input for the ccNSO's PDP. Once the PDP finished they could than be turned into 'GAC principles'.

The Communiqué can be downloaded at <http://gac.icann.org/press-release/gac-2010-communique-37>

Experiences with the Fast Track from .KR, .RU, .EG were presented at the ccNSO meeting:



http://nbo.icann.org/meetings/nairobi2010/presentation-experiences-fast-track-lee-10mar10-en_0.pdf

<http://nbo.icann.org/meetings/nairobi2010/presentation-experiences-fast-track-nikerova-10mar10-en.pdf>

<http://nbo.icann.org/meetings/nairobi2010/presentation-experiences-fast-track-ismail-10mar10-en.pdf>

The ICANN Board decided on:

- the formation of an Equivalent Strings Support Board Working Group to advise staff on ‘the issue relating to instances in the Fast Track Process where more than one official language or script exists within a country/territory, and where requests are for multiple corresponding strings that are considered equivalent, so that users of the community accessing domains under all versions of the string expect that each of them will resolve to the same address;
- approved the Principles for Handling Synchronized IDN ccTLDs for the Fast Track Process

Marketing

The ccNSO held a marketing session during which three CENTR members presented on their latest marketing campaigns: .EU, .FI and .JP

<http://nbo.icann.org/meetings/nairobi2010/presentation-marketing-session-seppia-1-09mar10-en.pdf>

<http://nbo.icann.org/meetings/nairobi2010/presentation-marketing-session-seppia-2-09mar10-en.pdf>

<http://nbo.icann.org/meetings/nairobi2010/presentation-marketing-session-juselius-09mar10-en.pdf>

<http://nbo.icann.org/meetings/nairobi2010/presentation-marketing-session-hotta-09mar10-en.pdf>

IANA

As discussed in the previous meeting, IANA started with additional technical checks to encourage TLDs to stick to certain standards that are not necessarily formal requirements. These checks (such as for open nameservers) have led to almost no change. There is even a 1% increase in the number of TLDs with open servers...

On IPv6 compatibility there is also a decrease as one European ccTLD went from 1 IPv6 enabled nameserver to none.

Increase in tlds with referrals that can fragment. (For more info on this: ask Kim)

Under the Fast Track IANA received 19 applications for string selection.

One project to check the physical addresses that are listed in the Whois turns out to be more difficult than expected as the US postal services do not seem to recognise some countries. See Kim’s slides for some great “address unknown” examples.

<http://nbo.icann.org/meetings/nairobi2010/presentation-iana-update-09mar10-en.pdf>



ccTLD Contributions

ICANN's CEO Rod Beckstrom raised the issue on a few occasions (opening speech, meeting with ccNSO, ccNSO Council Breakfast, meeting with CENTR Board) and it seems to have climbed on the Staff's priority list as well.

The ccNSO Council renewed its position on this topic but deferred to the Brussels meeting for further discussion. In the meantime the guidelines as agreed upon by the ccNSO still stand. These guidelines can be found here: <http://ccnso.icann.org/about/guidelines-cctld-managers-06-07.pdf>

During the joint meeting with the ccNSO, the Australian GAC representative pointed out that the Australian government feels it is time to review these guidelines as he feels some ccTLDs are currently cross-subsidizing others. (Which doesn't make any sense if one realises that ICANN claims that the ccTLD community is only paying 15% of their share in the ICANN budget.)

Strategic and Operational Planning

Byron Holland presented the work from the Strategic and Operational Plan Working Group. Byron summarized the group's output so far and reflected on the next steps. It is very important that the ccTLD community keeps on providing input into the planning cycles as it allows us to have a very tangible impact on ICANN's strategy.

<http://nbo.icann.org/meetings/nairobi2010/presentation-sop-wg-holland-09mar10-en.pdf>

Review of the Role of the GAC

The Board/GAC joint working group on the review of the role of the GAC met in Nairobi and will present its report at the ICANN meeting in Brussels. The nature and treatment of a GAC advise to and by the Board needs further consideration. The working group is also discussing the establishment of an independent GAC secretariat co-funded by governments and ICANN.

Delegation/Redelegation Working Group

The WG does not look into any individual cases but looks into the underlying principles and will report back to the ccNSO on any aspects that may require a PDP.

It has reviewed RFC 1591, ICP and the GAC principles and concluded that between these 3 policies there are no significant differences. Becky Burr gave an excellent review of RFC 1591 (ask Gabi for ppt!)

Other News

The CEO's opening show was met with quite a few raised eyebrows: not only did he manage to offend quite a few African Governments "for keeping up a telecom monopoly and therefore making Internet unavailable to their citizens", "for not being in the GAC", "for making up



stories and lies about IPv6” he also started the meeting with prayers led by three different religions.

In general the attendance was pretty low. (Estimated at 750 vs. the regular 1100 attendants) But in particular the absence of the gTLDs and the US based registrars made a significant impact. This was an ICANN meeting unlike any other we’ve experienced so far.

ccNSO, gNSO and ALAC expressed their concern on the Affirmation of Commitment Review process. They find it too rushed. It seems that the current ‘ad hoc’ process will not leave us with necessarily the right candidates for the review committee. At the moment the gNSO has 10 candidates. The ccNSO has 1 (Becky Burr).

The next ICANN meeting will be held in Brussels, Belgium from 20-25 June 2010 (<http://brussels38.icann.org>). There was no decision taken with regard to the venue of ICANN39 in Latin America.