Report of the

33rd Public ICANN Meeting

Cairo

2-7 November 2008

Prepared by the CENTR secretariat

Table of content

Executive Summary

These are the relevant highlights for ccTLDs from the 33rd ICANN meeting in Cairo.

DNSSEC – ICANN is reinforcing the campaign to get DNSSEC accepted and is urging for implementation in the ccTLD zones as soon as possible. At the same time more dissonant voices were raised. The GAC is also looking into the issue. ICANN and Verisign have both launched a proposal for signing the Root.

Fast Track for .IDNs – The fast track draft procedure was presented just prior to the ICANN meeting. The ccNSO organized an interesting session demonstrating step by step how this fast track would work. In the more general debates, the timing of the introduction of IDN ccTLDs was the key element. The gTLD industry seems concerned with the fact that IDN ccTLDs will likely be first to market. This is a result from an agreement between the GNSO and the ccNSO that while both the introduction of new gTLDs and IDN ccTLDs would run in parallel, delays in one introduction should not lead to postponing the other.

New gTLDs – The guidebook for gTLD applicants was discussed in detail at the GNSO and was also the focus of some debates in the ccNSO and the GAC. As pointed out repeatedly during the ICANN meeting by ccTLDs and the GAC, there is ground for confusion in the current proposal. This could lead to blurring lines between the definitions (and probably more importantly: policies) for ccTLDs and gTLDs.
In addition to this fundamental issue for ccTLDs, the most heard general comments deal with the pricing structure (not transparent and too high), timing of the introduction (too late) and the contractual imbalance (too relaxed for ICANN, too severe for applicants).
Probably the most fundamental (and un-answered) question raised was what ICANN expects from the introduction, what was the vision, how does ICANN expect the future TLD landscape to look like.

ICANN Strategic plan – The plan has a renewed focus on "globalization" and "policy development". During the meeting it was clarified that the strategic plan does not affect the deployment of eIANA.

ccNSO – The ccNSO focused on security (in particular DNSSEC) and the implementation of new gTLDs. One of the highlights of the meeting was a presentation and discussion on the different scenarios that could develop

and their impact on ccTLDs. The processes working group and the participation working group concluded there reports and tasks.

ITU Secretary-General's speech – Strong statements on lack of power of the GAC in ICANN, the role of the ITU and its limitations. Broadening the scope of the ITU on policy making.

Other points of interest – gNSO improvement report was finalized – IPv6 implementation – Accountability and institutional confidence – New ICANN dashboard - Next meetings are in Mexico (March 2009) and Sydney (June 2009) – both confirmed – and most likely Seoul (October 2009).

ccNSO Technical Workshop

Monday 3 November 2008

Eberhard Lisse (.na) put together a full day agenda for the ccNSO Technical workshop. The sessions, especially the morning session, was reasonably well attended.

During the morning session CNNIC gave an update on their IDN preparations and the Egyptian registry presented an overview of the .eg domain and registration procedures.

The participants listened to a presentation on the geographic visualisation of the distribution of the anycast DNS traffic and got an introduction on DNS Monitoring tools in which Duane Wessels presented the Domain Statistics Collector.

J. Hitchcock from DynDNS (http://www.dyndns.com/) gave under the title 'Registry best Practices' an overview of the different services DynDNS is providing for (cc)TLD registries.

Eberhardt Lisse (.na) presented the R-Project (http://www.r-project.org/), an open source project for statistical computing. R is a free software environment for statistical computing and graphics which compiles and runs on a wide variety of UNIX platforms, windows and MacOS.

Don Hollander (APTLD) summarised the outcome ADRP (Attack & Disaster Response Planning) session organised by the regional TLD organisations in Cairo. One of the key messages coming form the workshop was the importance of a good relation of the ccTLD registry with its peers. It was further underlined that a ccTLD's biggest asset is the trust its gets from the local internet community.
Plans for future similar workshops were announced.

The afternoon session dealt with a presentation by Patrick Mevzek on the CPAN EPP Module. He extensively illustrated use the CoCCa tool and gave life examples of how to create a domain with it. The strength of the tool, he summarised is that it can manage multiple registries and multiple connections at the same time (eg. EPP, Whois, IRIS, …)

Presentations will be made available at
http://ccnso.icann.org/meetings/cairo/workshop.htm .

CENTR Report of the 33rd ICANN meeting in Cairo, November 2008

ccNSO meeting

Tuesday 4 and Wednesday 5 November

Transcripts of the first day are available at:
https://cai.icann.org/files/meetings/cairo2008/ccnso-members-04nov08.txt

Introduction of new gTLDs
Roelof Meijer and Markus Travaille gave an interactive presentation on the different scenarios that could develop with the introduction of new gTLDs. When discussing the different models (ranging from 'no impact' over 'succesful new business models' to 'chaos') most participants seemed to expect a scenario where the Root expands, new gTLDs create confusion (to the benefit of the search engines) and new TLDs create value for internet services.
There seems also a concern that there will be a confusing overlap on geographic names.
Attendants commented that this is a very complex issue, that there are rules on how to build a house but nobody considered cityplanning, and that some of the fundamentals should be looked at in more detail.
Norid suggested that the ccNSO members draft a paper to highlight the confusion that stems from the procedures for geographic names in the Guidebook.
https://cai.icann.org/files/meetings/cairo2008/ccnso-intro-new-gtlds-04nov08.pdf

Update from the ICANN Board
Paul Twomey explained that the Guidebook for new gTLD applicants should be seen as a discussion starter. He recognized the fact that it was published very shortly before the meeting, but expects questions and proposals for change.
Paul Twomey urged the ccNSO members to send in a reply to the Notice of Inquiry on DNSSEC. He explained that readiness for DNSSEC implementation was already foreseen in the strategic plan, but that now with the Kaminsky report it became clear that DNSSEC was the only way to establish the chain of trust. AS one of the key elements in the ICANN proposal he pointed out that ICANN believes that the key generation process should be run by others – not ICANN.
When asked about the possible confusing situation that will be created when a .IDN geographic name could both a ccTLD (under the Fast Track

or full PDP for IDN ccTLDs) or a gTLD (via the introduction of new gTLDs), he called for input and practical solutions to avoid this problem.

He highlighted the success of the ADRP workshop that was organized in Cairo before the ICANN meeting by the ROs and ICANN. (based on the positive feedback from the attending CENTR members we are considering organizing a similar workshop in May 2009).

The last topic that was addressed was the future of the JPA. PT expressed the expectation and hope that the Joint Project Agreement will come to a natural conclusion next year. ICANN is not looking for "independence". The community has made enormous progress over the last few years: more institutional confidence, more accountability. "We are a community that's been building an institution that's accountable to that community."

IANA Update

Barbara Roseman gave an overview of the work on DNSSEC, the interim trust anchor repository (stressing the support from RIPE) and eIANA.

The ITAR procedure is similar to the current regular change procedure. ITAR is a temporary solution. The test period for ITAR will be short. eIANA still works under the IANA DNSSEC proposal. eIANA is currently looking at an estimated 6 months testing period before deployment. Barbara also highlighted the new ICANN Dashboard that contains all the statistics that are currently available.

On the difference between the IANA and Verisign DNSSEC proposal:

"The IANA proposal starts from the perspective how we can best manage the data integrity from the point of receipt from the TLD manager through the signing of the zone. Verisign started from a slightly different perspective which is, how can we introduce DNSSEC signing to the current structure as it is right now."

https://cai.icann.org/files/meetings/cairo2008/iana-ccnso-update-04nov08.pdf

Update from the participation WG

Lesley Cowley reported on the progress the group has made since its start in June 2007.

Since the group started its activities, participation in the ccNSO and the ROs has increased. Membership has gone up, liaisons are more involved and the fellowship program is working better. The group also made some very concrete proposals:
- earlier agendas
- creating more value by adding an Admin WS before the ccNSO meeting
- improving the ccNSO information flow
- more translations

- social event
- link between the ROs and the liaisons

The next step is to finalise the report, and after approval by the ccNSO Council, dissolve the working group.

ICANN Strategic priorities.

Doug Brent gave an overview of the Strategic priorities for the next three years, explained the planning circle, encouraged everyone to read the document and solicited input and questions.

When asked about the impact of the strategic priorities, more specifically priority #5 'improving operational excellence' on the deployment of eIANA, Doug responded that eIANA is not affected by this. The eServcies for TLD registries refer to other processes such as the full automation of the Root Zone Whois.

Lesley Cowley pointed out that while the strategic priorities are excellent, the strategic plan misses a long-term vision.

Usability study

Josh Rowe presented the conclusions from his research paper on structure of TLDs and the effects on usability. In that study he focused on the second level domains and the inconsistencies that can be observed when comparing the different domains.

There was some controversy in the room as to the purpose of the study.

https://cai.icann.org/files/meetings/cairo2008/ccnso-domain-usability-04nov08.pdf

Joint ccTLD – GAC session

Chris Disspain (ccNSO Chair) gave an overview of the .IDN ccTLD process and focused on the issue of the relationship between ICANN and the applicant for an .IDN ccTLD. He expressed the general feeling that there should be a light-weight framework and not a contract. Something similar to what ASCII ccTLD managers have accepted.
He will propose a draft document including elements of what such an accountability framework would need to include. Fees is a separate issue and will not be covered by that document.
The EU Commission pointed out that the majority of ccTLDs have no accountability framework or exchange of letters with ICANN. The Commission insists that ICANN shouldn't exclude those who will not sign. Bill Dee, speaking for the Commission also pointed out that if there is a general understanding on this topic (as the ccNSO Chair stated) that this general understanding is probably between the members of the ccNSO. Other GAC members also raised the issue that some ccTLDs could not legally enter into an agreement with a US corporation.

Responding to questions from Stefano Trumpy, Chris replied that in his view the vast majority of .IDN ccTLDs will be managed by the existing ccTLD registry and that with the exception of geographical names there does not seem to be any competition between ccTLDs and gTLDs.

The Norwegian delegate raised the issue of overlap for geographical names between .IDN ccTLDs and gTLDs and urged for an in depth discussion during the drafting of the IDN PDP.

Hilde Thunem (Norid) supported that point and specified that this could seriously affect the possibility to create community specific policies. Hilde suggested that no geographical names should be accepted as gTLDs as long as the IDN PDP is not finalized.
Another example is the application of the ICANN UDRP rules to contention issues in local internet communities.

The Chair of the GAC (Janis Karklins) suggests to look into the possibility to create a new reference table to be used as guidance during this process. The GAC representative for New Zealand suggested that this list should be wider than the names on the ISO list that is currently being used.

The EU Commission reminded the attendants of the GAC principles and the sovereignity principle.

UPDATES
The afternoon of the ccNSO meeting consisted of updates from ccTLDs and Regional Organisations. The presentations can be found here:

http://cai.icann.org/en/node/1662

The second day started with a brief session on Contingency planning, the rest of the morning session was dedicated to DNSSEC and security.

Only a few new elements were raised on DNSSEC:
- ICANN is now urging ccTLDs to start implementing DNSSEC as there is no valid alternative
- Kim Davies gave an excellent presentation on the Kaminsky bug http://www.iana.org/about/presentations/davies-cairo-vulnerability-081103.pdf
- Kim also pointed out the FAQs that you might find helpful to brief ISPs and other industry players: http://www.iana.org/reports/2008/cross-pollination-faq.html
- It seems generally accepted that zone files increase with a factor 5-6 when DNSSEC is implemented. (as were previously the factors 8 – 9 were used)
- There seems to be more doubt about readiness of end-user applications than expected. There is a risk that the webpage is unavailable to the end-user due to the inability of the application to handle DNSSEC info that is being sent along.

An interesting initiative from the Anti Phising Working Group replaces a spoofed page with an educational page to help users understand what they should be paying attention to and how to better protect their personal information.
The APWG is now specifically focussing its attention to ccTLDs. The rather strange claim was made that "ISPs might not further want to resolve ccTLDs that are on the Risk List."

The afternoon session of day two focussed on the .IDNs. Bart Boswinkel explained in detail how the PDP process will evolve and where and when input and comments can be provided.

The day concluded with the ccNSO Council meeting. Minutes of the meeting will be made available shortly here:
http://ccnso.icann.org/meetings/cairo/

GAC Plenary meetings

Tuesday 4 and Wednesday 5 November

In contrast with the past ICANN meetings, the Cairo GAC sessions were in general open to the public. (in the past the general rules was closed, except for eg some joint sessions.

The major points on the GAC's agenda were:
- GAC reform (dealt with in close sessions)
- GAC's input to the President's Strategy Committee
- New gTLD implementation plan
- IDN ccTLD fast track

As usual at the end of its meeting the GAC agreed on a clear communiqué which covers all items discussed.
The communiqué is available at
https://cai.icann.org/files/meetings/cairo2008/gac-communique-06nov08.pdf .

IDN ccTLD Fast Track
With regard to IDN ccTLDs the communiqué asks for additional information on the different issues o Module 7 of the Draft Implementation plan, a draft text for the agreement between ICANN and the IDN ccTLD registry, further examination of question of charging fees for the fast track and mentioned the issue with IDN ccTLD fast track and country and territory names in the new gTLD process.
        [During its meeting with the ICANN Board, the GAC indicated in less diplomatic   terms that it was not supporting the idea of fees for IDN ccTLDs]

New gTLDs
The GAC withhold withholds itself from giving substantive comments on the Draft Applicant Guidebook for new gTLDs due the late posting of the document.
        [During the GAC's meeting with the ICANN Board, the issue of the late posting of   the documents for the Cairo meeting had lead to a long and by moments   unfriendly discussion between some Board and GAC members.]
The communiqué says that GAC listened to the ccNSO's warnings about the potential blurring distinction between ccTLDs and gTLDs and will

consider whether it can support the request temporarily not to allow country and territory names as new gTLDs.

GAC input to the PSC

[At the beginning of the week – eg GAC session on Tuesday – there was the   hope to finalise the document during the Cairo meeting. However the GAC   didn't finalise it statement. GAC Chairman Karklins expressed the hope to have the document finalised within some weeks after the Cairo meeting.

Main discussion points were the internationalisation of ICANN (with ICANN   working in different jurisdictions outside the US) and the accountability of the   different elements in the ICANN structure including the accountability of the   organisation itself. There was also some discussion on whether the   drafting of the document should happen in plenary or prepared by a smaller   group of GAC members.]

gTLD Whois

[The GAC discussed with the Board the slow progress with regard to the studies   requested by the GAC on the use and misuse of Whois data. The Board informed   that the staff was reviewing the proposals for 25 different studies, but that it was   not yet clear how the different studies would be prioritised.]

GAC Elections

Janis Karklins (Latvia) and Bertrand de La Chapelle (France) were re-elected as Chair and Vice Chair. Two new Vice Chairs were appointed: Manal Ismail (Egypt) and Jayantha Fernando (Sri Lanka)

Workshop. The First Mile: Additional Solutions for a successful gTLD Launch

Wednesday 5 November 2008

The different presentations at the workshop discussed different aspects which could be important for the success of a new gTLD. The workshop focussed mainly on the preparation of the procedures and policies. The workshop was very much city and community TLD inspired.

Nacho Amadoz (.cat) gave an overview of how the .cat sunrise was prepared, discussed the sunrise and summarised the 2,5 years of .cat's existence. He advised that it was important for a (starting) registry to consult with the local registrars and stressed the importance of good policies to avoid (later) problems.

Dirk Krischenowski (.berlin) announced the formation, at the Cairo meeting, of a new stakeholder group of applicants for city TLDs (Barcelone, Hamburg, New York, Berlin) which will take part in the ICANN framework and structures. The group will also discuss best practices in city TLDs. As an example of best-practice sharing Dirk presented the 'cityTLD Namespace Mandate', a voluntary obligation of a city-TLD manager to build a reasonable framework for the allocation of domain names.

Amadeu Abril I Abril talked about the importance of responsibility and a good reputation for a (new) TLD. All TLDs, but especially community TLDs need a credible enforcement. Community TLDs, he stated, must have a strong band with their community, they are not the TLDs to gain a lot of money with.

Nick Wood (Cum Laude – a registrar specialised in big brand names) advised the future TLD registries that choosing the 'right registrars' is an important and serious task. The registrants should be selected based on their past and current activities, not because of the promises they make. Nick further urged the new registries make their rules somewhat flexible to avoid that the young registry get stuck due to small administrative problems. He also stressed the importance of correct and up-to-date whois information.

Bart Lieben (Laga) who was involved in amongst other the sunrise of .eu, .asia, .mobi, …. noted that intellectual property owners are concerned about the introduction of new gTLDs. he informed about a

database containing information on IP-rights that have been matched with domain names during previous sunrise processes. The database could be of great use for those applying for a new gTLD.

gTLD Registry Constituency Workshop: Impact of consensus Policies on Domain Registration Operations

Wednesday 5 November 2008

The presentation is available at
https://cai.icann.org/files/meetings/cairo2008/cairo-registry-workshop-05nov08-en.pdf

Working Session on Single-Letter Domains at the Second Level

Wednesday 5 November 2008

The panel of the workshop existed of three gTLD registries (.coop, .mobi, .biz) that recently had submitted a proposal to amend their contract with ICANN in order to register single-character domains. The gTLD contract reserves single-character domain names.

The three parties presented their request to ICANN and argued that there were no technical or stability reasons for not allow single-character names. Moreover, refeering to the new gTLD process, the single character domains do not appear in the list of names not to allocate under the new gTLDs.

Single character domains are being reserved under the gTLD contracts while on the other hand, the single character domains are not in the list of names not to allocate under the new gTLDs.

Note: On Friday 7 November the ICANN Board approved the proposed amendments to the gTLD contract submitted by dotCoop and dotMobi.

Open Joint Session – gNSO, ccNSO, GAC, ALAC: Reporting Back

Thursday 6 November 2008

At the Open Joint Session gNSO, ccNSO, GAC and ALAC briefly summarised the discussion and the outcome of their work on three main topics: the Presidents Strategy Committee Report, the new gTLD process and the IDNs ccTLDs Fast Track.

Presidents Strategy Committee Report

GNSO:
- ongoing discussions on GNSO reforms also focussing on accountability and transparency
- GNSO discussion on Thursday afternoon (after the joint session)

ccNSO:
- PSC was not on the ccNSO agenda for Cairo

GAC:
- discussion still ongoing, draft document to be expected within some weeks after the Cairo meeting
- internationalisation of ICANN: GAC needs better understanding how ICANN would work with units outside the US
- accountability of ICANN but also of different constituencies widely discussed

ALAC:
- formation of an ad hoc working group

new gTLDs & ccTLD IDNs

ccNSO:
- session on impact introduction of new gTLDs
- asks moratorium on country and territory names as new gTLDs

GAC:
- protection and use of geographic names needs further reflection
- separation of the ccTLD name space and gTLD space needs to be looked at

GNSO:
- is having a thorough discussion of the draft implementation plan
- recognises that geographic names is one of the big issues still to be dealt with

ALAC:
- new gTLDs, ccTLD IDNs positive developments for the comminuty
- ad hoc working group set up, outcome expected by December

gd

ICANN Public Forum: Reports from SO's/AC's

Thursday 6 November 2008

The different reports are available at http://cai.icann.org/en/node/1633 .

Speeches at the ICANN Cairo meeting

Thursday 6 November 2008

Speech of Dr. Hamadoun Touré, Secretary-General, ITU

The ITU Secretary-General delivered an amazing speech: while not shying away from controversy (and sometimes unhindered by diplomacy) he called for cooperation while at the same time stressing the role for the ITU on e.g. cybersecurity policy or IP trace-back harmonisation.
The speech is well-worth reading, here are a few quotes:

"And the main reason why I'm here is that my motto is, the best way to win a war is to avoid it in the first place."
"Coming back to what we do with ICANN, we also participate actively in the work of Internet Governance Forum, which was established as the result of the multistakeholder deliberations at the World Summit on the Information Society. We go around, the IGF -- I personally believe that the IGF is just going around and around, avoiding the topics, and becomes sometimes a waste of time."
"Next year, ITU will organize the World Policy Forum, which addresses a number of Internet-related public-policy issues, ranging from cybersecurity and data protection to multilingualism and the ongoing development of Internet. I hope you will not tell me here, "Don't talk about Internet." It's an issue for everyone.
Of course, ITU is not doing any operational issues. I don't have the capability of operational issues. But the public-policy issues are within the ITU, because we do have member states and private sector companies that are involved in it whose life, whose work is related to Internet. They are related, so we need to talk about it. And you shouldn't see us as an enemy as a result."
"It has been alleged in some corners of the ITU that ITU wishes to govern the Internet.
And I have specifically said that I categorically deny that, and I say today again to you, it is not the case. My intention as Secretary-General of ITU is not to govern the Internet, but we need to work together, because there are developing countries that are in need of access."
"I was just telling someone a joke when I was coming here, when I mentioned ICANN, someone who didn't know ICANN -- and believe me, there are many people who do not know ICANN. I was amazed by that, amazed by the fact that many people don't know the ITU, either, even though we are 143 years. We are working on that.
They were telling me, "That an Obama thing?" I said, why?
Oh, because Obama's motto is "we can." And I said, yes, we're going to transform ICANN into "we can.""
"I think the greatest weakness of ICANN is the GAC. The GAC structure.
I think the Governmental Advisory Committee is very weak and doesn't have a significant role, whether you recognize it or not. You can play the ostrich game and hide your head in the sand, but it's weak. And that's the perception."
"On the question of the IPv6 and other things that I mentioned where we are asking what is the limitation. There is one clear limitation for ITU. We don't do operational matters. No. Not to keep to do operational issues within the ITU. We are trying to ensure that developing countries are understanding the issues, their standards are developed, they are interoperable to each other, and that's the way science and technology evolves.
But having the operational part is not part of ITU at all."

transcript:

https://cai.icann.org/files/meetings/cairo2008/toure-speech-06nov08.txt

Speech of Mrs Meredith Atwell Baker, Assistant Secretary for Commerce, NTIA

transcript:
https://cai.icann.org/files/meetings/cairo2008/baker-speech-06nov08.txt

Meeting of the ICANN Board

Friday 7 November

Overview of the main discussions and resolution adopted at the ICANN Board of Friday 7 November 2008

- Approval of BGC Recommendation regarding Board Committee Minutes

- Update on GNSO Improvements Implementation (discussion only)

- Single Letter Domains at the Second Level, including Proposed Contract Amendments for DotCoop and dotMobi
  -> the Board approved the amendments to the .coop and .mobi contract allowing them to register single-character domain names

- Approval of GNSO's Recommendations on Inter-Registrar Transfer Policy Clarifications

- Approval of Site of June 2009 Asia/Pacific Meeting
  -> Sidney Australia as location of the June 2009 meeting
  -> Seoul, Korea as location of the October 2009 meeting
  -> US$ 1.973million budget for the Sidney meeting (and similar for Seoul)

- Planning Status Report on At-Large Community Summit (discussion only)

- Community-Wide Working Group to Review ICANN's Geographic Regions
  -> formation of a community-wide working group to study and review the issues   related to the definition of the ICANN Geographic Regions
  -> charter, on the criteria for assigning countries, dependencies and geopolitical   entities to a region to be submitted at the Mexico meeting

The complete agenda of the Board meeting, including the full text of the resolutions can be found at http://www.icann.org/en/minutes/resolutions-07nov08.htm#_Toc87682552 .

All available transcripts for the ICANN Cairo meeting can be found at http://cai.icann.org/en/transcripts .