Report on

ICANN47

Durban

14-18 July 2013

Council of European National Top Level Domain Registries

Table of Contents

Highlights

Meeting - General Points

- 1800 delegates from 92 countries.
- Fadi announced new Engagement Centre to open in Geneva, Switzerland. Tarek Kamel to move there.
- Very first signers of Registry and Registrar agreements were on stage at the Opening Ceremony to sign their contracts.
- First new gTLD could be delegated as early as 5 September 2013.
- ICANN creates ICANN Labs in an effort to improve engagement with the community.
- Fadi Chehade gave an update on ICANN progress and achievements. Selected points:
  - Registry and Registrar agreements are ready
  - Next Generation Directory Service model. Expert Working Group has proposed a paradigm shift in WHOIS.
  - Closer to stakeholders – Istanbul Hub is now established (office, staff etc). African strategy (first discussed in ICANN Prague) is complete and being implemented.
  - First Executive Base camp: a period of time (till end of 2013) where ICANN not add more to their workload and rather strengthen and refuel.
  - The new Generic Domain Division (GDD) creates a better separation between new gTLD work and other areas of ICANN's work.
  - ICANN managed L-Root is the most distributed root DNS zone server on the planet
- New initiatives are popping up: first meeting ever between ICANN and the Regional Organisations, first discussion on the ICANN (engagement) strategy for Europe, the new Domain Name Association is looking for members. (Reports of those are included below.)

ccNSO – Executive Summary

Three years after its start, the Finance Working group is reaching the final stages of its work. The ccNSO members informally signaled that the direction taken (Voluntary contributions based on a recommended feeband model) has its support.

Byron Holland, CEO of CIRA (.ca) is the new ccNSO chair. Lesley Cowley received much deserved credit for her leadership of the ccNSO community over the last years.

Sticking to a strong tradition the ccNSO succeeded to have an excellent debate on the difficult topic of "capacity building".

GSNO – Executive Summary

There were two topics which seemed to permeate much of the GNSO discussions and sessions were the Policy Development Process (PDP) and the Policy and Implementation discussion. Although these two topics sparked debate within the GNSO, they were not obviously of huge importance to the community given the relatively low attendance at the Councils Public Session mid week.

The PDP was discussed at length both internally in the GNSO council as well as with other stakeholder groups. The discussions revolved around a theme that the 'PDP is not broken'. The angle was one of a defensive nature and an effort to reinforce the PDPs positive aspects.

There is an increased focus on distinctions between when policy is required versus implementation as well as how they should be acted on. There is a drafting team working on guiding principles in this area and a charter for a working group was voted in favour by the GNSO Council.

New gTLDs are progressing and seemingly on the home stretch to first delegations which could be as early as September. The trademark clearinghouse received perhaps the most attention during the week with the community concerned about the timeliness of the mechanism.

GAC

- Brazilian vice-minister can go home with a GAC consensus advice against .amazon.
- GACs miss real wine at the Gala due the disagreement on .vin/.wine .
- GAC leave Durban with homework: a solution for .vin/.wine needs to be found within 30 days after the meeting.
- New GAC members : Madagascar, Namibia, São Tomé and Príncipe, Swaziland and Zambia.

ccNSO Report

Finance WG

This WG was started in June 2010 following the claims by the previous CEO that the ccTLDs should be paying $ 10 to $ 12 Million as their share in the ICANN expenses.

The WG analyzed possible distribution models, continued to request hard data from ICANN and launched a ccNSO survey in 2011.

As a result the old (inaccurate) ICANN reporting mechanism was dropped, new model based on 'value exchange' introduced, choice made for banded model in 2012.

Numbers were verified and specific data produced.

This session discussed a framework, a set of principles that the Finance WG will recommend to the council.

Proposed guidelines:
- Voluntary: everybody recognizes that this is a voluntary model
- Recognition that ICANN spends money on the cc community
- Encourage ICANN to be cost efficient
- Recognition of differences within ccTLD community
- Voluntary model but every individual relationship between ICANN and the ccTLD would supersede these guidelines
- As this will not be a trivial change, amounts should be phased to the new contribution over the next 3 to 5 years
- Registries responsible for multiple ccTLDs could look at the total number of domains or at each ccTLD specifically

Numbers:

Gross costs of the ccTLD community after distracting the resources put in by the ccTLDs is $ 3.5 Million

		Estimated Revenue
> 5 Million	225k	900k
2.5 - 5 Million	150k	900k
1 - 2.5 Million	75k	825k
500k - 1 Million	25k	200k
250k - 500k	15k	75k
50k - 250k	10k	110k
<50k	0.5k	14k
		3.024 Million

This model still falls short some 400k Euro, but is beyond doubt the most realistic and fair model than can be proposed.

Q&A following Byron's presentation:

Lesley: The value exchange model has been essential to solve this issue and come up with a reasonable and realistic proposal.

Oscar: How does the group think that this model could be promoted and ccTLDs encouraged to stick to it?

Byron: Not much we can do as this is a voluntary model but we will try to convince members that this is fair and equitable. The list of contributors will be published though.

Jörg: We will experience an increase with more than 100%. The risk is significant that the community falls short of the expectations. One can "name and shame" or one can reduce the costs.

Byron: ICANN recognizes that we could fall short and then it will be up to ICANN to convince the individual cc that there is value.

Increase in expenses are not happening in ccTLD space. Proportionality of cc community will decrease, some others will have natural increases (indexation), so the end result for ccTLDs will remain stable at the same level.

PVR: This has been confirmed in a preparatory meeting by the ICANN CFO)

Patricio: Board members (2 out of 16) should not be seen as a cost but as a contribution. It is what comes out of the board (what is relevant to ccTLDs) should be regarded as a guidance. If everyone would pay the contributions could decrease…

Lesley: Some ccTLDs simply can't pay so we should be careful with peer pressure.

Sabine: IANA is a service and for a cost there should be a service level. Value exchange is nice, but it requires a value proposition first. How is it that we are asked to pay for something that we didn't ask for?

Byron: Fair comment. As we transition to a new regime there is a good opportunity to raise these issues.

This is however not a service model.

Ondrej: Will be difficult to explain to the board that .CZ's contribution will be increased by factor 5. Costs for hosting a meeting should be calculated.

Byron: This is already included as ccTLD meeting hosting costs (720k).

(after break)

CNNIC: Work that individual cc's do in their local environment should be included.

Byron: That is what the WG tried to capture in the 'value exchange' concept.

Sabine: Support banded model but sees a big issue with putting ccTLDs in bands according to the number of domains they have. Amount of domains is not relevant. Every ccTLD gets service from ICANN for one TLD. .DE does want to pay in a high band but will never pay according to the number of domains.

Byron: The banded model was the most universally applicable. There is a strong correlation between the size of the zone file and revenue.

Nigel: If calculated per domain name it suspiciously sounds like a tax.

Byron: Taxes aren't voluntary, taxes aren't guidance

Getting the opinion from the room:

Is USD 3.5 Million a fair allocation? Material **majority says yes**, few neutral, one opposed

Question will be up for vote by the ccNSO Council in Buenos Aires.

Sabine: Is the ccNSO council responsible for this? Isn't this up to the individual ccTLDs?

Lesley, Roelof, Byron: Too late to raise this at this stage of the process

Bart: Will be up to the council, not to the membership to vote on this. However, the members can ask to vote on this. This can never be a PDP as this would be binding.

Do we feel that this is a reasonable model given the facts that we can live with?

Majority green, couple of reds, few oranges

Roelof: Happy to increase but only on the condition that enough members start to pay or increase their fees according to the model

There seems confusion on the terminology: how does voluntary match with recommended contributions? Dmitry raised a concern that members who would not be able to pay might drop their contribution all together instead of paying maybe up to tenfold from what they are paying know.

http://durban47.icann.org/meetings/durban2013/presentation-finance-holland-16jul13-en.pdf

ICANN Board meeting

What are the post WCIT developments and plans by ICANN?

WCIT did not have a satisfactory outcome. The state of affairs is unstable. ICANN's strategy is to create 5 presidential strategy committees. In addition an office in Geneva will be opened and Tarek Kamel will move there.

Olga Cavalli: One of the decisions was to develop talking points on the main issues and share these with the ICANN community before the next meeting (Regional prep in Montevideo)

Lesley: For the last 3 meetings we have heard from Fadi what the plans are for creating the strategy, but we haven't heard if there is one.

Chris: Things are getting done. Getting engaged, opening an office in Geneva, participation in CSTD etc…

Lesley: We see things happening but what is the longer term direction…

Steve:	ccTLDs are already involved and ICANN would be foolish not to see them as an asset
Cherine:	ICANN will have a n all encompassing inclusive strategy for the plenipotentiary next year
Young-eum:	Lack of (voting) representation of governments in ICANN is the main weakness. Is ICANN going to address that?

Update from Byron on Financial model.

Lesley:	What is ICANN's long term financial strategy plan and what will it do with potential surplus?
Cherine:	Operations 28% increase on new gTLD: down 38% and a total decrease of 6%
	On the long-term surplus: 117 million by 2015
Lesley:	At the moment there isn't any income post-application process
Cherine:	**There are no projections at the moment of the income after the gTLDs are implemented.**

IANA Update

Kim highlighted the upcoming consultations on IANA functioning documentation and asked for comments and suggestions on how IANA can improve services.

New gTLD readiness.

- IANA delegation process is the last step in the new gTLD process
    1. Successful applicants will get a delegation token
- IANA has focused on streamlining the process
    1. Improvements to automation system
    2. Move to checklist approach
- 1 additional staff for IANA

Substantive review of new gTLD delegation is not happening in IANA but elsewhere in ICANN so delegation timeframe is "days" as opposed to "weeks".

DNSSEC: 33% of all TLDs are signed. This number will increase significantly after the introduction of new gTLDs.

8% of DNS lookups validate DNSSEC (up from 3% due to implementation by Google for all their services).

ICANN provides 24 hour response for root zone emergencies.

Imminent threat that the service will be off-line is definitely an emergency.

Works via call center. They contact staff on duty.

All TLD managers get the phone number on an annual basis. If you don't have it, ask Kim.

Make sure your IANA contact information is up to date.

http://durban47.icann.org/meetings/durban2013/presentation-iana-davies-16jul13-en.pdf

Update from SOP WG

Comments from ccNSO will be answered in the second round as they were filed a bit late.

Main comments:

- Improvement from last plan
- Difficult to judge if certain activities were needed
- Strong increase in operating expenses (24%)
- Still lack of measurable goals
- Large staff increase (+65) is hard to manage

Other activities:

5-year strategic plan

Pierre Bonis: What is the purpose of those 5 new groups?

Lesley: The new 5 groups replace the president strategy committee.

http://durban47.icann.org/meetings/durban2013/presentation-sop-meijer-16jul13-en.pdf

Meeting with the GAC

Please see GAC report.

Framework of Interpretation WG update

Work of the group is almost finished. Most recent topic addressed: revocation.
http://durban47.icann.org/meetings/durban2013/presentation-foi-davidson-turcotte-16jul13-en.pdf

Multistakeholder Models of ccTLD Governance: Dynamics, Opportunities and Challenges

Internet Governance in Korea - Kye-Nam Lee, .kr
http://durban47.icann.org/meetings/durban2013/presentation-internet-governance-korea-lee-16jul13-en.pdf

New Zealand - Debbie Monahan, .nz
http://durban47.icann.org/meetings/durban2013/presentation-multi-stakeholder-model-monahan-16jul13-en.pdf

Brazil - Demi Getschko, .br
http://durban47.icann.org/meetings/durban2013/presentation-internet-governance-model-getschko-16jul13-en.pdf

Tanzania - Abibu Ntahigiye, .tz
http://durban47.icann.org/meetings/durban2013/presentation-multi-stakeholder-model-ntahigiye-16jul13-en.pdf

The Netherlands - Roelof Meijer, .nl
Excellent presentation on the challenges and benefits of the implementation of the multi-stakeholder model in NL
http://durban47.icann.org/meetings/durban2013/presentation-multi-stakeholder-model-meijer-16jul13-en.pdf

European Union - Giovanni Seppia, .eu
Giovanni underlined the need for education. Especially when most stakeholders are replaced regularly (EP and Commission in the EURid case) this is crucial.
Broad consultation is the first step in any policy change (e.g. IDN introduction)
http://durban47.icann.org/meetings/durban2013/presentation-multi-stakeholder-model-seppia-16jul13-en.pdf

South Africa - Vika Mpisane, .za
Difficult to attract new people to participate in the multistakeholder model. Slowly and with much effort this is changing.
Here too, education on internet governance issues is a problem.
Limited synergies between stakeholders leads to inefficiency.
Main benefits: inclusivity, stakeholder voices and meaningful participation in international fora
http://durban47.icann.org/meetings/durban2013/presentation-za-case-mpisane-16jul13-en.pdf

France - Pierre Bonis, .fr
Strong gov representation might reduce participation from other stakeholders.
Lack of organized representation by individual users can be a concern (but isn't at the moment).
Main benefits: Gvt involvement makes it easy to focus on public interest. Model create a platform for cooperation between stakeholders such as an observatory or prep meetings for Internet Government Forum.
http://durban47.icann.org/meetings/durban2013/presentation-internet-governance-panel-bonis-16jul13-en.pdf

Question from Nigeria: how to encourage people to participate in the model?
.NL: make sure you become better known (in a positive way).

IDN ccPDP Voting

Bart presented an overview of what went wrong during the IDN PDP vote.
Total members entitled to vote: 136
68 needed to vote
Only 65 voted

Split over:
Africa 12%
AP 50%
Europe 52%
LAC 52%
NA 100%

Issues encountered:
- Contact details were outdated
- Spam filters block emails from the ccNSO secretariat
- Low awareness

PLEASE MAKE SURE YOUR CONTACT DETAILS IN THE IANA DATABASE ARE CORRECT!

ATRT2 update - Brian Cute

Scope of work involves reviewing ICANN implementation of the recommendations of the previous reviews. Also looking at new issues. Thirdly the review process itself will be reviewed.
The questions provided to the ccNSO will help the group to write the final recommendations and report for final comment. Final report to be delivered to the Board by December 31st.
Please give input via the ATRT pages.

Security through cooperation

Moderator: Rod Rasmussen

Eduardo Santoyo, .co gave an overview of all security issues .CO is involved in. An impressive list.

Tarik Merghani, .sd – Removing of domains occurs regularly. If it is commonly accepted that content is illegal or harmful than the registry takes it down. Especial good cooperation with the government on the .gov.sd domain.

Cath Goulding, .uk
Three topics: 1. LEA initiatives (illegal pharma) and training (how to handle DDOS) 2. Cybercrime: there is a huge underground market for information on vulnerabilities 3.Registries and registrars are not law enforcement
Acts only on foreign court orders, not on informal request.

Andrei Kolesnikov, .ru
Requests to take down domains are sent to the police.

Becky Burr, .us
Cooperation with US dept of commerce. Difficult to apply a multistakeholder model for policy building. US presence requirements. Neustar DDOS attack mitigation services applied to .US.
WHOIS verification obligations.

Meeting with Board Members Chris Disspain and Mike Silber

Chris and Mike: Board is working very well. Big issues are making progress, background issue move along.

On strategy and planning:
PVR:Lack of measurable goals in the operating plan and budget make it pointless to comment
Chris: yes, this is a problem. The current exercise is build around a number of principles one is the need for measurable goals. 5-year plan will lead to 3-year plan with those goals. So we won't worry about what we (don't) have today as it will be replaced soon. From a 'how does it feel' view Chris feels that the staff is doing well. But it is going to be fixed in the next plan.
Mike: Correct, strategic planning hasn't been good in ICANN. Board and senior staff is aware of that. But we are working on that. We recognize and put steps in place.

On resources allocated to outreach:
Carolina: What is the current perspective on the outreach program and on spending (10-fold next year) and how does that relate to the current role of the regional organisations.
CEO recognized that this is a space where there is incredible opportunity. The CEO gets it that the ccTLD are his most important partners. ccTLDs are the best functioning multi-stakeholder model. CEO listens to feedback, so let ICANN know if there is a need for adjustment. Mike asking ccTLDs for a hot-desk for an engagement officer. So ICANN has a central place to organize a meeting or get a cup of coffee.

On Finances:
Byron: Where is the board on its thinking on the contributions model?
Chris: Nobody in the board raised any problem – there is relief that this will be the end of it. The rest of the community will need to be briefed with support from the staff.
Lesley: most importantly we need to establish common acceptance of the value exchange model. That is the area in which we could use assistance from the BoD and staff.

On strategic vision:
Roelof: with regard to the SOP procedure: early community input is great but probably we have gone a bit too far. There seems to be a lack of vision. At the moment there are only open questions.
Mike: true but this is a staff-lead process and we will watch it closely. We need to see something tangible to come out soon. Something more concrete.
Chris: yes, but there is a time-line so not an open ended process

On Internet Governance:
Young-eum: Where is the WCIT strategy?
Chris: we do a lot of things and if you would put them down you would have a strategy.
Lesley, so summarized:
By Establishing relationships, improve communication and Engage in the process ICANN will support and enhance the multi-stakeholder model.
(In two minutes the ccNSO Chair seems to be able to do what ICANN has failed to do over the last three years.)

ccTLD news session

za host presentation Vika Mpisane, .za
Role of Branding in making ccTLDs successful in growth of domains – a .ke experience Anthony Wambugu, .ke
Marketing of Prefecture Type JP Domain Names Yuri Takamatsu, .jp
http://durban47.icann.org/meetings/durban2013/presentation-marketing-prefecture-takamatsu-17jul13-en.pdf
How ccTLDs can take advantage of the Trademark Clearinghouse. Thomas Barrett - EnCirca, TM.Biz and PW Registry Corp
http://durban47.icann.org/meetings/durban2013/presentation-cctld-tmch-barrett-17jul13-en.pdf
Recent policy changes and Transition to EPP protocol in .UA Dmitry Kohmanyuk, .ua
http://durban47.icann.org/meetings/durban2013/presentation-epp-protocal-kohmanyuk-17jul13-en.pdf

RO updates

Slides will be made available on:
http://ccnso.icann.org/meetings/durban/presentations.htm

Capacity Building Panel Discussion

Chair: Lesley Cowley, .uk
Moderator: Byron Holland, .ca

Panellists:
Pierre Bonis, .fr / Baher Esmat, ICANN / Paulos Nyirenda, .mw / Keith Davidson, .nz / Carolina Aguerre LACTLD / Demi Getschko, .br / Abibu Ntahigiye, .tz / Scott Evans, Yahoo

Baher first provided an overview of the Middle-East "regional' strategy.
3 year strategy
Goals:

1. Foster two-way engagement with community
2. Build strong and competitive domain name industry
3. Promote multi-stakeholder internet government models

http://durban47.icann.org/meetings/durban2013/presentation-middle-east-strategy-esmat-17jul13-en.pdf

Byron: What does 'coordination' of capacity building mean?
Keith: In the pacific 'coordination' might mean more than people getting together and making plans. You might be taking someone three weeks away from their work for a one day meeting. Therefore active coordination is needed.
Scott: Organic initiatives fall of a cliff. Active, coordinate approach with someone in charge and metrics and goals is needed to maximize the efforts everyone is putting in.
Pierre: Why do we need to coordinate? Is it to avoid overlapping? We need to understand what the needs of the people are that need capacity building.

Byron: What are the objectives of capacity building? How do we know when we get there?
Scott: You might never get there. Technology just moves too fast. By the time you have built that capacity technolog has moved on.
Paulos: Agrees with Pierre. Very broad, includes many aspects. Important to see what needs to be coordinated. In Africa the various ccTLDs have a wide range of needs. AFTLD coordinates with its partners to achieve its goals. E.g. automation is an essential need. Only 2 or 3 are automated at the moment in Africa. So we need training.
Baher: From ICANN's perspective it is essential to strengthen the multi-stakeholder model. Capacity building needs to be a bottom-up process. Everyone needs to be able to define what is needed.
Abibu: African TLDs are not doing well in terms of ccTLD operations. But also on registrar level and IT guys in local institutions.
Carolina: We need cooperation – need the level of trust – and are able to liaise more effectively outside the region.

Byron: Are you seeing a wide range of needs or do you see different needs?
Carolina: Very diverse region so different needs.
Demi: Coordination and collaboration are two different things. Collaboration is the most important. Coordination is more for research. CcTLDs collaborate. Coordination of capacity building is about awareness. Make sure everyone knows what you are working on or what the benefits are of the way in which you do it. Such as DNSSEC.
Keith: Needs to be bottom-up. This is about partners getting together and making the decision what it is they need. No concept of one-size-fits-all.

Byron: So while capacity building is a global need there needs to be a regional focus?
Pierre: Coordination requires prioritization. E.g. DNSSEC roadshow in Africa doesn't make sense – at this moment – because technical knowledge of the registries doesn't allow them to implement it.

Byron: Who gets things done in a volunteering environment? How are we making sure that those organisations are not tripping over each other? E.g. What does ICANN know about ccTLD operations and why would they be teaching us?

Keith: ISOC is deploying IXP in Africa but it is not coordinated. ICANN is deploying root zone mirrors at the same time. Without coordination. Coordination of secondary servers hosted between ccTLDs. Etc... So much better top to bottom approach where we say: this is what we need to do. And then get it done with the partners.

Paulos: The need for coordination is high. For some AFTLD activities it is taking the leading role and supports the different initiatives. When money is flowing, coordination becomes critical.
North African countries are an issue: difficult for AFTLD to coordinate with them.

Scott: I see most organisations coordinating well on a practical level.

Abibu: AFTLD should be the coordinator. There doesn't seem to be a danger that one African country would attract the lion's share of the capacity building at the expense of the others.

Baher: ICANN is neither trying to expand its turf nor duplicating efforts.

Keith: There is the ISTAR Group meeting 3 times of the year. It might be down to add another level to that group so staff can use it to work on coordination.

Pierre: Different areas might require different coordinators. AFTLD for cc issues. Afrinic for IP issues. Etc.

Carolina: We are not just talking about volunteering anymore. This is a mixed market. Providing capacity building in legal and commercial issues attract different partners. So the landscape is much more complex.

Byron: What is the future of capacity building? Collaboration and cooperation is more informal – network based. At what point do we need more disciplined coordination?

Scott: Situation is going to force a more formally based coordination. Yahoo wants to use the ccTLD spaces but they need to be more secure. The new gTLD competition will require that.
There is one critical need: increase security in ccTLDs. Yahoo is willing through work at regional workshop bringing in marketing experts.

Byron: Why is Yahoo worrying about the ccTLDs and not about the 1000 new operators that will join in?

Scott: The gTLDs haven't experienced any significant security issues while there have been significant issues with ccTLDs. And it is increasing.
Issue of trust is fundamental. Without it, it won't be possible to work together and take up our roles of caretakers of the DNS as common good.

Byron: This is not necessarily about something that is broken but about the question how we can optimize what we do.

Keith: The trust is under more threat than ever before as we might not trust each other so much in the future with people running gTLDs in the room.

Summary by Chair:

Cooperation communication and collaboration

Too many organisations involved. Risk of tripping over each other.

Nobody pushed back on the need for capacity building.

Discussion was about the optimization.

Models that work well in certain areas don't necessarily work in others. Language issue is important.

Not just about technical capacity, education is very important too.

Things aren't broken but are we really doing our best with the resources we've got?

We heard about ICANN's regional strategies but these assume a leading role for ICANN.

Our landscape is changing. It might require a transition from an informal to a more formal model.

Will the trust in our community be put under pressure by the market forces?

gNSO Report

The GNSO PDP

The Policy Development Process (PDP) was under discussion within the council and other joint sessions in Durban. A set of slides were presented in several sessions which aimed at debunking some of the typical arguments which attack the PDP. The ultimate aim was to point out that the 'PDP is not broken'. Some of the defences to criticisms of the PDP were;

-   **PDP is slow argument** - PDP is no slower than other similar processes (Eg IETF or ccNSO). The average PDP takes 2-3 years to complete from request to issue report to Board Vote.
-   **Lack of consensus argument** - 8 out of the last 9 PDPs have resulted in consensus recommendations (the failing one on the highly publicised topic of vertical integration).
-   **Lack of participation argument** - All GNSO Driving teams are open to anyone interested.

Jeff Neuman (Neustar) vigorously defended the PDP stating that although it can be lengthy, it is relatively simple and should not be the 'poster child' for why the GNSO is broken. It was further stated that it's not the process of PDP that has issue, but often the will of the people working on it to come to consensus. He also pointed out that there are other alternative mechanisms to the PDP which can get faster advice out to the Board.

GNSO Policy and Implementation Discussion

This topic came on the radar during the last ICANN meeting in Beijing. Although it's not generally consider easy to develop clear rules as to what is policy or implementation, a drafting team aims to develop processes and identify roles and responsibilities for different stakeholders. The charter for a working group was adopted by the GNSO Council. Tasks of the group will be to;

-   Develop a set of principles that underpins any GNSO policy and implementation related discussions.
-   Develop 'policy guidance' that can be used instead of a PDP for developing policy other than 'consensus policy'.
-   Develop a framework for implementation related discussions
-   Develop criteria to be used in determining whether an action is addressed by a policy or implementation process.

GNSO with the Board

Jonathan gave an update to the ICANN Board speaking on improvements and activities related to GNSO functionality, internal workings, workload management and the PDP.

Regarding the validity and criticism of the PDP – the slides defending the PPD were again presented also adding that the PDP is not the only process available to the GNSO. Selected comments from the Board in response to the GNSO update;

-   The multi-stakeholder model can be prone to issues with agility. How can we be more agile in policy development? An example was given – the Locking of domains subject to UDRP – did that really require a PDP?
-   Fadi Chehadé reaffirmed the general view that the PDP is not broken and that we should stop being so defensive about it. It's not perfect, but what are we comparing it to?
-   On the Policy and Implementation topic, Fadi proposed to create a hotline on policy vs implementation within the Generic Domain Division.

Concerning the GNSO motion for a bylaw change (see GNSO motions below) to address situations where the Board acts inconsistently with GNSO advice, the Board responded;

-   Crocker: I don't think it will make much difference
-   Chalaby: I don't think it will help you
-   Chehade: I'm fine with a bylaw change. GNSO 'advice' should however be defined

These comments and the general discussion lead eventually to the withdrawal of the motion in the GNSO Public Council Meeting.

New gTLD Program - Status update

Christine Willet gave the new gTLD program update beginning with a graphical time line of events which led to the Board recently approving the RAA and RA as well as first new gTLD contract signing. It was mentioned in the presentation that the first new gTLD could be delegated as early as 5 September. Several points and stats on the program;

Application Stats – From a total of 1930 application in June 2012, 97 have been withdrawn and IE (Initial Evaluation) results have been already posted on 1,200. Contracting requests have been made on 31 applications.

GAC Advice – A total of 28 items of advice/information request with 15 having been fully addressed. ([See more details](#))

Initial Evaluations – Results are being released in batches of 100 per week and are expected to be complete by 30 August.

Objections and Dispute Resolution – 263 objection filings under categories Community opposition, String Confusion, Legal Rights and Limited Public Interest.

Pre-delegation testing – PDT is operationally ready and applications are being invited to the testing once their contract is executed. Beta testing saw 45 tests conducted.

Trademark Clearinghouse –Sunrise service will be live on 23 August and Claims Service to be live on 26 September 2013. (In another dedicated session, service providers IBM and Deloitte stressed dates for the TMCH are 'hopes' and not commitments). In another session it was noted there are only 150 trademarks currently registered in non-latin scripts with some in the room considering the lack of awareness of the TMCH in developing regions an issue especially considering the fact that IDNs have priority in the new gTLD program.

Uniform Rapid Suspension (URS) – To resolve clear-cut cases of infringement the URS is a compliment to the UDRP. Price is up to 500 USD and it is considered a fast process. Two providers have been appointed – NAF and ADNDRC.

Service Level Agreement Monitoring – to ensure Registries are providing required baseline of service in areas of DNS, RDDS and EPP. In September 2013 full DNS testing will be operational as well as WHOIS and EPP testing.

EBERO – Currently discussing master agreement with EBEROs with each provider to go through readiness testing and simulation before end of 2013.

Centralised Zone Data Access – there is a requirement to provide zone data and a new model for zone file access has been developed.

Thick WHOIS PDP

The working group on this topic published its initial report concluding that there are more benefits than disadvantages to requiring thick WHOIS for all gTLD Registries. Recently the public comment period closed and the group are now reviewing comments and will submit a final version to the GNSO Council for consideration. Questions still remain on the potential of implementation timing schedule.

Locking of Domain Subject to UDRP proceedings

Currently there is no requirement to lock names in period between filing complaint and commencement of proceedings. The 17 recommendations of the final report (submitted 5 July 2013) were presented by Michele Neylon to the GNSO council. The recommendations intend to clarify and standardise the process for locking a domain name subject to UDRP proceedings. Recommendations relate to;
- definition of 'locking'
- Registrar required to apply lock within 2 business days following request for verification
- Removing obligation for complainant to notify the respondent at the time of filing, but add automatic extension of 4 days to response time upon request
- Development of educational materials to assist informing affected parities of new requirements and best practices.

[See presentation for summary of all the recommendations](#)

The motion was taken off the agenda in the GNSO public session and is to be re-considered at a date to be decided (Soon). It was taken off as the IP Constituency raised concerns about not following proper procedure.

The Domain Name Association

Adrian Kinderis (ARI Registries) gave an update to the relatively new Domain Name Association (DNA) –The project is being developed by a set of people from within the ICANN community however intends on making transition to a more global effort. The aim of the Association is to represent the interests of the domain name industry by "advocating the use, adoption, and expansion of domain names as the primary tool for users to navigate the Internet".

There have been a few progressions over the past few months however essentially it's most in infancy stages (although moving relatively quickly). Although the Association is not affiliated with ICANN it is apparent that they have received some financial support.

Some general points made from a presentation on the Association;
- Intent of the DNA is to build trust, exchange ideas, educate and raise awareness of domain-related issues.
- Interim board established with Adrian Kinderis as Chair.
- Charter and Initial bylaws adopted for the non-profit (incorporated in Delaware)
- Membership structure in development with a membership drive already in Durban.
- www.thedna.org is the site where most content will be.
- Educational website (www.whatdomain.org) – soon available in 6 languages and aims to be a reference point for education in domain names.
- Next steps: Finalise budget, finalise membership structure. Registration fees are likely to be tiered with hope to be as inclusive as possible.

Registrar Accreditation Agreement (RAA)

ICANN staff is working to implement the recently Board approved RAA through early Registrar adoption and global outreach efforts. The topic of the letter received from Article 29 Working Group regarding illegal nature of the RAA in Europe was brought up in some discussions – this remains a concern particularly for the Registrar Stakeholder Group.

Protection of Red Cross, IOC/IGO Names

ICANN adopted measures to protect some names (eg Red Cross/Red Crescent and IOC) to which are now on a 'reserved names' list prohibiting their registration at the second level in new gTLDs.

The Group published Initial report on 14 June includes policy recommendation options.

Click for presentation – covering some of the work of the group.

IRTP Part D

The Inter Registrar Transfer Policy (IRTP) is an existing policy currently under review. The current PDP (part D) deals with charter questions relating to; transfer dispute resolution policy, IRTP related penalties and usefulness of forms of authorisation for inter-registrar transfers.

The group have finished reviewing input from the stakeholder groups and are reviewing charter questions and development of initial report. The group had a face to face working session in Durban and expect to produce the initial report by August.

GNSO Public Council Meeting

Stakeholder Groups and Constituency Leaders provided updates to the GNSO Council.

There was a relatively low attendance to this session probably explained by the limited interest in the agenda. A discussion took place on the GNSO Review noting the next steps; Board needs to confirm or re-tool the review framework, review the audit process and timing before GNSO can prepare.

GNSO Motions Summary

1. ICANN Bylaw recommendation
The motion is to amend ICANN bylaws to include a formal consultation process in the event when the ICANN Board takes action which is not consistent with GNSO advice. Consultation should include reasons why they did not follow the advice in their final decisions.
Result: **The motion was withdrawn with a rationale that much of the issues had already been resolved and discussed over the weekend along with assurances from Fadi Chehade on the matter. Some remarks followed the withdrawal stating it is still an important issue and that 'verbal comments' can be easily forgotten.**
2. Motion to adopt the Charter for the Policy & Implementation Working Group
The motion seeks to conclude the work of the drafting team by adopting the proposed charter for the policy and implementation working group.
Result: **Motion passed**
3. Motion on the Adoption of the Locking of a Domain Name subject to UDRP Proceedings Policy Development Process Final Report and Recommendations
The motion seeks to conclude the work of the working group by adopting the final report on 'locking of a domain name subject to UDRP proceedings'.
Result: The motion was taken off the agenda to be re-considered at the earliest time given procedure aspects raised by the IP Constituency.

GAC Report

Introduction

The GAC meeting in Durban was attended by 59 countries and welcomed 5 new members (Madagascar, Namibia, São Tomé and Príncipe, Swaziland, and Zambia). The Brazilian delegation brought its vice-minister to support the country's position on .amazon, which helped to put this discussion high on the agenda. The vice-minister could return home with the requested negative advice against the .amazon application. .wine/.vin discussions kept the GAC members in the meeting room until the early hours of Thursday morning and prevented them, just like in Beijing, to join the gala event on Wednesday evening.

Most of the GAC meetings were open but the key discussions on the new gTLD advice were held behind closed doors.

The new Iranian GAC member stood out during discussions for playing the role of bridge-builder fully using the diplomatic skills he must have learned as the country's representative at the ITU in Geneva.

New gTLDs

In Beijing the GAC had put 14 strings on hold. ICANN was asked not go further than the initial evaluation of the applications for .shenzhen (IDN in Chinese), .persiangulf, .guangzhou (IDN in Chinese), .amazon (and IDNs in Japanese and Chinese), .patagonia, .date, .spa, .yun, .thai, .zulu, .wine, .vin.

In Durban the GAC unanimously agreed to object against .amazon and its Japanese and Chinese IDN versions applied for by Amazon Inc. Also .thai received a negative advise.
That brings the list of strings for which the GAC clearly says to the ICANN Board that they should not be accepted on 6:
 .amazon (+ Japanese and Chinese IDN version)
 .thai
 .africa (the application not supported by the African Union Commission) (Beijing Advice)
 .gcc (abbreviation for Gulf Cooperation Council) (Beijing Advice)

Another string that was likely to get this negative advice, .patagonia, was withdrawn shortly before the ICANN Durban meeting. A statement by a representative of .patagonia during the open forum on Thursday caused some commotion

---

[1] This application was originally for .dotafrica – the second .africa application
[2] The GCC is a political and economic union of the Arab states bordering the Arabian Gulf, namely Bahrain, Kuwait, Oman, Qatar, Saudi Arabia and United Arab Emirates.

when it mentioned that the decision to withdraw .patagonia was taken after an ICANN Board member had informally given the indication that ICANN would follow the GAC if they would agree on a negative GAC advice.

For 4 of the 14 strings, the GAC wants that 'relevant parties' involved discuss and come to an agreement on the use of the string. So long ICANN should keep the application process on hold. For these 4 strings the GAC members had received indications that such talks between the applicants(s) and or other parties were ongoing. A good example of this is the .spa application. Spa is a city in Belgium, a brand of mineral waters and there are also the associations representing the wellness sector.
This advice is for the following stings: .spa, .guangzhou (IDN in Chinese), .shenzhen (IDN in Chinese), and .yun.

.wine and .vin (the French for wine) were 'the' point of discussion during the Durban GAC meeting. An compromise had to be found between two opposite visions. One vision, defended by amongst other the US, Canada and Australia, was that .wine/.vin no longer needed protection because there was no sign of ongoing talks between involved parties. The other vision, supported by amongst other, the European Commission and several European countries was that because the situation since the Beijing advice had not changed, the Beijing advice was still applicable and .wine/.vin couldn't be released.
The GAC was unable to reconcile both visions before the end of the Durban meeting. As a result the GAC agreed to take 30 days additional time with a view to conclude on the matter.

The GAC has no longer issues with the applications for .persiangulf and .date. ICANN can continue the normal application process for these two strings.

Similar to the advice on .islam and .halal in the Beijing Communiqué, the GAC in Durban acknowledged that the Government of India has problems with the strings .indians and .ram but the GAC itself doesn't take further action.

ICANN granted the GAC's request to provide 'appropriate preventative initial protection' for IGO names and their acronyms (based on the "IGO List of 22 March 2013"[3]) until after the Durban meeting. However, if the GAC and ICANN do not reach agreement, the registry operators will only be required to protect IGO names (and not their acronyms) identified by the GAC. The GAC asks ICANN to assure that the protection on the second level remains as long as the GAC, ICANN and the IGO's are working on a solution.
The GAC identified specific groups of strings that need additional safeguards to obtain consumer trust and mitigate the risk of consumer harm. These strings are linked to Consumer Protection, Regulated Markets or are considered as Sensitive Strings. The non-exhaustive list contains amongst others strings linked to children (for example .kids), the environment (for example .bio), finance (for example .lease), intellectual property (for example .data).
The Beijing Communiqué had identified specific groups of strings that may need additional safeguards to obtain consumer trust and mitigate the risk of consumer harm ('category 1 safeguard advice'). These can be split up in three groups: (1) strings linked to regulated or professional sectors; (2) strings associated with market sectors (with clear/regulated entry requirements); (3) the strings .fail, .gripe, .sucks, .wtf [4]. ICANN launched a public comment period[5] on this part of the GAC advice. but in the mean time also communicated to the GAC that it was unclear what additional safeguards the GAC had in mind. This topic was touched upon during the meeting between the GAC and the Board's NGPC but there was no in depth discussion on the he safeguards. The Durban Communiqué underlines the GAC's willingness to cooperate with the NGPC do clear out these safeguards.

The GAC wants to start a discussion with ICANN on the protection of national, cultural, geographic and religious names in future new gTLD rounds. Some GAC members were hoping to already have some concrete dialogue on this in Durban but it didn't come to an in depth discussion. It doesn't need to be said that this discussion is very relevant for ccTLDs and needs to be followed with great attention.

The complete GAC Advice on new gTLDs can be found on page 2-7 of the Communiqué[6].

---

[3] http://www.icann.org/en/groups/board/documents/resolutions-new-gtld-annex-1-item-1b-02jul13-en.pdf

[4] The Beijing communiqué contains in its annex I a non-exhaustive list of +/- 190 strings such as .kids, .eco, .poker, .dentist, .city

[5] 23 April to 4 June 2013

[6] http://durban47.icann.org/meetings/durban2013/presentation-gac-communique-18jul13-en.pdf

Highlights of some of the not-New gTLD related GAC sessions

GAC – ccNSO session

The ccNSO gave an update on the IDN fast track and the IDN ccPDP. The questions and comments from some of the GAC members learned that they were a bit confused and mixed up both processes.
The European Commission asked the ccNSO not to delay the work on the IDN ccPDP
Keith Davidson gave an update on the Framework of Interpretation working group and Bart Boswinkel updated the GAC on the work of the Studygroup on the use of country and territory names as a TLD and its two main recommendations to set up a policy working group to review the current definitions and propose a consistent framework and to request the BoD to extent the current protection until a new policy is in place.
ccNSO Chair Lesley Cowley started a dialogue with the GAC on how both groups could interact better and get more out of the joint GAC/ccNSO sessions. GAC members welcomed the idea, but not much concrete came out of it.

Briefing from the Geo TLD Registry Group

Dirk Krischenowski (dotBERLIN) gave a presentation to the GAC on behalf of the Geo TLD Registry Group, a group of more than 50 geo TLD applicants. The Geo TLD Registry group asked the ICANN Board to be recognized as a new stakeholder group within the GNSO.
During his presentation and the following Q&A Dirk mentioned several times the similarities there exist between a ccTLD, the code for a country, and the geo TLD, for example representing a city.

GAC – DNS update

On Thursday morning the Alexa Raad en John Matson from Architelos briefed the GAC members 'the Top Level Domain Market'. They presented some statistics, past evolutions and made some predictions for the future of the market.

ICANN European Strategy - Informal Consultation

European ICANN VP Nigel Hickson organized an informal consultation on the 'possibility to have a Regional strategy for Europe'. The invitation also went to the CENTR mailing list.
Of the +/- 20 participants half were European ccTLDs (.uk, .fr, .no, .be, .lv, .ee, .eu, .ch/.li), the other participants ware mostly linked to ALAC. The European ICANN Board members Erika Man, Bertrand de la Chapelle and Sebastien Bacholet also participated. There were no government representatives, not surprisingly, since the meeting was at 8am on Thursday morning few hours after the GAC finished its overnight marathon session.

The European ccTLD urged ICANN to clearly on some fundamental questions, before starting to discuss a strategy:
-   What does ICANN wants to solve with a European Strategy?
-   Who would be involved in such a strategy?
-   What is the end goal of a strategy

The registries were also worried about the integration (or better feared the lack of it) of the 'European strategy' in ICANN's overall strategy plan. And there was a clear demand to keep ICANN's lobby work towards the European Institutions clearly separated from ICANN engagements initiatives.

The meeting concluded with the clear message that a lot already is going on in the European countries, registries take initiatives, there are strong and active organizations like RIPE NCC and CENTR, … and therefore ICANN should look at the field before developing a European strategy.