
MARRAKECH – Joint Meeting of the ICANN Board & the ccNSO

Tuesday, March 08, 2016 – 09:45 to 10:45 WET

ICANN55 | Marrakech, Morocco

STEVE CROCKER: Welcome, everybody. This is the frank and meaningful exchange between -- who is it? -- the ccNSO and the board.

As you can tell, it's -- even though it's early in the week, it's already late for many of us. We've been here several days and are beginning to get a little punchy.

Kidding aside, we actually look forward to these sessions. They're short but we try to make them meaningful by getting into specifics and not shying away from whatever has to be dealt with.

So with that, our general posture is we like to listen, rather than come and tell you what the board is thinking, although we're happy to respond and answer any questions that you have.

Let me turn things over to Byron and we'll get started.

BYRON HOLLAND: Thanks, Steve.

Note: The following is the output resulting from transcribing an audio file into a word/text document. Although the transcription is largely accurate, in some cases may be incomplete or inaccurate due to inaudible passages and grammatical corrections. It is posted as an aid to the original audio file, but should not be treated as an authoritative record.

Yes, these -- this is always a good meeting when we have the opportunity to hear directly from the board, and in that spirit I'd like to kick it off with a first question around Work Stream 2.

As I'm sure board members have heard over and over and over again around volunteer fatigue, the pace of work, et cetera, I -- I'm not going to remind you of it, although of course I just have, but given the implementation phase of the CCWG and CWG outcomes, with the assumption that those are past, what is the board's thinking around the initiation of Work Stream 2 and how long will you potentially put that off to let implementation phase work get done?

So what are your thoughts on timing regarding Work Stream 2?

CHRIS DISSPAIN:

Byron, thanks. It's Chris Disspain.

It's actually interesting that you're asking us that question, because I had assumed that it was up to the community to decide how that would work.

I think the answer is that we stand ready to support you -- you, the ccNSO, you, the community generally -- in whatever, you know, time line you decide that you want to set. But I would -- I'd like to make a couple of sort of suggestions, if I may.

The first is that it's abundantly clear that the time line to get Work Stream 1 done -- by which I mean get the bylaws drafted, get everything sorted out -- is incredibly tight, and to -- I strongly recommend to us all that we concentrate our entire efforts on doing that.

In essence, we need to get the bylaws done and report to the -- to NTIA by June the 10th, and that is not a lot of time.

Once that's done, then I think it's time for the community to decide to -- it needs to prioritize the Work Stream 2 items, because I think to try and approach them all at the same time is just going to exacerbate the volunteer fatigue and so on.

But we stand ready to support and help in any way that we -- that we can.

Does that come close to answering your question?

BYRON HOLLAND:

Yes. In fact, I think it answers it quite well.

Let me reiterate what I think I heard.

And that based on the work still required -- and I will say under the assumption that it's past, given there are SOs, not the least of which is our own, who have not had the time to dialogue, have our final dialogue, council meeting, and vote yet, but under

that assumption -- it is important to us that we are able to get through the implementation issues first and then consider Work Stream 2.

So I'm very pleased to hear that the board, as I heard it, would be supportive of that.

Next question that we have for the board members -- or for the board in general is the issue around cost of this exercise. And there has certainly been discussion around how to have a more disciplined approach to cost management, cost clarity, potentially just the management of the logistics of the process, and I know there's been a fair amount of dialogue back and forth. Chairs of the various SOs and ACs and others have been part of that dialogue. It continues, from my point, to be a work in progress and I'd just like to get a sense of where the board is at or -- or Cherine, perhaps it's you leading that. Where we're at and what the current thinking of the board is in terms of the approach to creating cost clarity, the approach to supporting the community in terms of logistics, process, project management. How are you viewing that right now?

CHERINE CHALABY: Thank you, Byron.

So just for the record, the issue was -- came to the fore because the cost incurred over the last couple of years on cross-community projects have been quite substantial. For example, about 25 million in FY15 and FY16, and it's anticipated another 6 to 9 million in FY17.

So a discussion took place among the co-chairs as well as the SOs and AC leaders about is there a way of us working together as a community to begin to get better reliable estimates for projects before we undertake them, and then how do we -- once we have those reliable estimates, how do we go about managing costs.

And we decided that this is a new change to ICANN. I mean, that's really the guidance from the SOs and AC leaders that we've listened to. And this is a new cultural change to ICANN because historically we've never done that. No one person or no group of people have ever had the power of decision to -- you know, the power to decide on anything on their own or even on the issues of cost.

And also, historically we've undertaken a lot of these projects without the community knowing the exact details of the cost items and a tracking of these cost items.

So we have been operating in a consensus way, but the size of the project was not substantial and the need for actually

producing reliable estimates have not been so highlighted as it happened in the last couple of years.

So the decision by the SOs and ACs and the co-chairs was this is -- has to be a gradual change by the community. It cannot be all done in one go.

So we need to do it step by step.

And the first step that we all jointly agreed -- and the CWG has supported that -- is we should set up a very small -- on a pilot basis, a very small team of three to four people who will produce reliable estimates for us for the next stage of work of -- for example, let's say WS2 would be a good example of that. And then once we -- we see the benefit of that, we'll then collectively sit together again and decide, well, what do we do going forward with these estimates? Do we just put them in a drawer or do we actually create some cost control mechanism totally in support of the co-chairs?

So this is -- this is -- whatever we do has to be with the support of the community. This is not a top-down or a decision-making or any form of management thing that the board wants to do. This is a community support function.

So we came up with the idea collectively that we will set up a small team -- we called it a project cost support team -- on a pilot basis.

I'm pleased to report to you, Byron -- and I see that Mathieu is here -- that we have nominated four people in this team and that we are having a first meeting tomorrow with that team to talk about particularly the remaining costs for FY16 and the costs for FY17, and hopefully by the end of April we should have the first cut at those reliable estimates. Then everybody can sit together and then decide what the next stage is going to be.

So this is where we are.

Did that answer your question?

BYRON HOLLAND:

Yeah. Thanks, Cherine. And I think that's actually quite encouraging, the way you've framed it right now, that this is an endeavor that will be in support of the community and not driving or dictating or managing the community around process, project, and cost. So I think that will be very helpful.

As we know, this community with the -- with the strategic and operational plan working group has been very focused on ICANN's budget, ICANN's operating plan, the impact of activities on budget, so we would be the first, I think, to be supportive of

having real cost clarity on what the various projects and activities are.

So based on the early description of it, I think it's -- I think it's quite encouraging. Thank you.

CHERINE CHALABY: Can I also -- I don't know where Mathieu has gone, but --

(Off microphone.)

CHERINE CHALABY: Ah, Mathieu.

BYRON HOLLAND: Right there.

CHERINE CHALABY: Can I just also just bring a little bit some clarity on what is the role of the board vis-a-vis the role of the SOs and ACs vis-a-vis the role of the co-chairs.

And I give the credit to Mathieu to bring clarity to this.

So basically, for any project to take place, let's say a cross-community project -- let's talk about WS2, to be a concrete example -- the co-chairs of those that are requesting the

resources -- and the resources could be people, could be meeting, could be outside consultant -- there's a cost associated with them.

So this is their role is to plan the project and request the resources.

The SO and AC leader's role is to really put a value on this. Is this something the community wants to do.

It isn't the board role to actually make that judgment.

When this then comes to the board, the board has the role of doing two things, mainly fulfilling its fiduciary responsibility. To (a) check that the costs are reasonable and (b) they are part of the annual budget cycle. I.e., they are funded properly and the community knows that.

So that's -- and I would like, if Mathieu would like to, to just add to this because this is an idea that you brought a lot of clarity on that. I don't know if you want to talk about it.

(Off microphone.)

MATHIEU WEILL:

Thank you. Mathieu Weill here, ccNSO appointed co-chair to the accountability working group. So thank you, Cherine. I think that your description of the discussions was extremely good and

accurate, and indeed, it's extremely important that the relationship on the cost management involves the various groups and the volunteers who take, you know, a lot of their own time into supporting the initiatives.

The sponsor -- the ccNSO and the chartering organizations, because they're the ones who have the legitimacy to initiate or stop relevant initiatives, and the board because of its fiduciary duty, obviously, and that's the board decision to allocate or not allocate resources to the -- to any project.

So I think it's -- it may be we need to leverage the experience from the recent years around the transition project to continue the journey into greater maturity in terms of financial management within ICANN. And certainly, as Byron said, the SOP working group within the ccNSO has a number of ideas on that, and it would be great to have in -- maybe in six months' time a little bit of postmortem exercise about this so that everything can be laid out on the table.

But so far, we welcome the initiatives from the Board Finance Committee to help monitor costs more closely, and I'm delighted to learn, as you said, Cherine, that the team has been appointed and we look forward to being informed and also engaging with them.

Thank you.

BYRON HOLLAND: Thanks, Mathieu.

If there are no further questions on that, we'll move to the third item on our agenda, and that's an informational update on the ccNSO policy development process on retirement of ccTLDs and their review mechanism for decisions relating to delegation revocation and transfer of ccTLDs.

And for that, we have Becky Burr.

BECKY BURR: Thank you. And good morning, everybody.

The board, I know, is well aware of the multiyear process that we have been working on to clarify procedures consistent with the policy for delegation revocation and transfer of country code top-level domains, which culminated last year in the framework of information -- framework of interpretation which was adopted by the board and for which we are all very pleased as a major step forward.

You will recall that our final report identified an absence of policy that could be interpreted with respect to retirement of ccTLDs, and that is an area that we -- there simply is no guidance

in RFC-1591 and for which we flagged the need for a policy development process.

In addition, 1591 references an appeal mechanism for resolving disputes regarding revocation of ccTLDs, for example. And that mechanism, although referenced in 1591, is simply not in place.

In connection with the CCWG accountability work, the ccNSO and the CC community more generally determined that it did not want to simply walk into an established policy through the CCWG on this and elected to exempt a delegation and revocation and transfer decisions from the scope of the independent review process under the CCWG in deference to policy to be developed by the community consistent with our charter.

So we have two policy development processes or one linked policy development process relating to retirement and dispute resolution, independent review.

We will be talking about the processes and the procedures that we want to follow. It may be two consecutive PDPs. It could be one linked PDP. We're going to be discussing that with the ccNSO tomorrow in day two of the ccNSO members meeting. But we expect to come out of this with a plan to launch those policy development processes with respect to retirement and

with respect to decisions -- review of decisions relating to delegation, revocation, and transfer.

BYRON HOLLAND: Thanks, Becky. Are there any questions for Becky or comments on this issue?

BECKY BARR: Chris just noted that there will be --

CHRIS DISSPAIN: I said I don't think there will be.

BECKY BARR: Oh, I just thought you meant in the course --

CHRIS DISSPAIN: In the course of the event, there will be.

BECKY BARR: If this is anything like the delegation and redelegation working group and framework of interpretation, there will be lots of hard questions along the way.

CHRIS DISSPAIN: Precisely.

MIKE SILBER: Becky, any idea of timing?

CHRIS DISSPAIN: Say that again, Mike. It wasn't clear. Mike, say that again. It wasn't clear.

MIKE SILBER: Any idea on timing? Any thoughts or guidance?

BECKY BURR: I do not yet have an idea on timing. The way we have handled these in the past has been quite deliberate. So I think we will launch the PDPs quite shortly and get a sense from the group as to how long the process will take. But I don't have a prediction at this point.

BYRON HOLLAND: It's something that's definitely high on our list in a post-CCWG world. And, in fact, tomorrow as part of our ongoing member meetings, this is a topic specifically on our agenda.

Any other questions or comments on that? Before we move on to a couple of other questions that board members had

requested of the ccNSO, I just wanted to reiterate some comments made yesterday in the public forum; and that was around PTI. And late in the forum, there was some discussion around initial comments and presentations made by staff yesterday morning on this subject that caught community members by surprise.

And I would just like to reiterate and reinforce our comments on that, that while we've worked closely -- community members have worked closely with staff, I would ask the board to be aware of the fact that community members were most definitely surprised by some of the language used and some of the suggested structures or at least the perception of what was being suggested.

Our expectation working closely with staff is that they would recognize both what we believe is in the letter of the CCWG, CWG, as well as the spirit of what's in there and that before making what appeared like pronouncements on structure and process, that they review it first with the community.

I think that would be very helpful for all and help us avoid the kind of situations that we find ourselves in yesterday, arguably we find ourselves in today, and that we're going to have to back out of. So not only is this strictly a structure, it's also a perception of the structure and language issue.

So on behalf of certainly the ccNSO and, I think, you also heard from other co-chairs -- other community members, it will be very important, not only the details but the perception of the details.

Now, with that --

CHRIS DISSPAIN: Byron, may I just briefly respond to that, Byron, if that's okay with you?

BYRON HOLLAND: Please do.

CHRIS DISSPAIN: Just to let you know that we have -- we are in the process of, if we haven't already, setting up a small group, subset of board members, to work with staff and with the representatives of the CWG on the PTI so that we avoid missteps along the way.

It goes back to what I said earlier about we have very, very little time. So we all need to roll up our sleeves and get on with this.

I think -- and I don't know where Bruce is, but I think Bruce has already organized -- thanks, Bruce -- has already organized a small group of board members to be the sort of board reps in that whole process. And we've got another one in respect to the bylaws. And we've got another one in respect to the RIRs, SLA,

and so on. So we are intimately engaged to ensure this gets done in a timely manner. Thank you.

BYRON HOLLAND: Great. Thanks, Chris. That's good news and very encouraging.

MIKE SILBER: Byron, if I can add to that. I think it's an unfortunate position we find ourselves in. And a lot has to do with the very tight timing, and a lot has to do with the fact that we have actually seemed to increase tensions in the last two years rather than decrease them through this process.

And we're in a situation where staff were presenting a first blush which caused very negative reaction. And people said, well, you should have discussed it with us first. The question is: Well, with whom and when?

Others said, Well, you should have put it in a paper as a proposal. But then they wouldn't have been able to do that in time for the meeting and then people would have complained.

And I agree, communication is not always great. And it's very easy when you walk into a room where there's a slide up on a screen which captures just a very small element of a plan which is being evolved -- PowerPoint has many problems with it. But

when you walk into a room on that basis without having had the background and without having -- you know, if you miss the first two minutes, you think that staff are imposing a plan when, in fact, they were putting a straw-man proposal up to gather responses.

And I think that if we can just try and see each other in the best light possible rather than the worst light. There were a few speakers at the mic yesterday who made that point. If this is a straw man, I have the following problems with it. And that was really useful. But there were others going, Staff are imposing this. They missed the whole point. This is wrong, et cetera.

So just going forward in this proposal -- and it's not just staff that I'm defending. But your colleagues, everybody in this process, treat their interventions as in the most positive light and respond to them with respect and a degree of empathy. And I think we can actually make the moves to get this done within the very short time that we have.

BYRON HOLLAND: Thanks, Mike.

MIKE SILBER: And you never thought you would get a warm fuzzy from me.

[Laughter]

BYRON HOLLAND:

I know. I'm almost at a loss for words right now.

[Laughter]

Do you know my friend Mike? And what have you done with him?

And I would say that's what I'm trying to do right now, is just set the stage for making sure we don't have those kinds of glitches in the future. I mean, there are biweekly calls. There's a very good working relationship with ICANN staff on -- sort of on the forefront of this issue. And I would say, in part, that was part of the surprise factor. I'm sure we can walk this back and find the common ground that we all know we're working towards there.

There were a couple of board questions that had been raised with us. The first was around diversity-related issues, and then the second was around feedback on CCWG.

But before we go there, I'm going to hand it over to Katrina, the ccNSO co-chair, to make a couple of comments on diversity.

KATRINA SATAKI:

Thank you very much, Byron. Good morning. Katrina Sataki, ccNSO.

The ccTLD community is diverse by definition. We accept that, and we celebrate it. So it has never been a challenge for us. We are diverse.

We have ccTLDs that are run by governmental institutions. We have ccTLDs that are run by private companies or academic institutions. Then we have liberal rules for registration and many ccTLDs. And then there are many ccTLDs with quite strict rules.

And we have big registries, and we have small registries. And since you're asking what ICANN can do to support us, it's the small registries I would like to talk about.

So as I already mentioned, diversity has never been a challenge for us but participation is. And participation is very high on the ccNSO Council's agenda.

And for small ccTLDs, it's quite hard to participate in a meaningful way in all the work of ICANN.

So if you ask what you can do, then perhaps I'd say you could increase the number of funded travelers for ccNSO.

BYRON HOLLAND: I'll just pick up on a couple of points. By definition, we have geographic diversity. Our council is just one member shy of 50/50 gender diversity. So I think very strong on that front.

There's size diversity as we just talked about across the board. Large registries and small get to participate as councillors and vice chairs and chairs.

I think a diversity within the ccNSO standpoint, we are in good shape. But Katrina raises a very serious issue for us which is making sure that registries of all sizes and geographies are able to participate in the fullest way possible in this environment. I would just like to echo exactly what Katrina has said.

KATRINA SATAKI: Even more, we have ccNSO members and ccNSO non-members. So every ccTLD is welcome to participate.

CHRIS DISSPAIN: If I could just -- Katrina, Byron, thanks. First of all, Bruce and I both learned the other day, in fact, it's gender balance we are supposed to say, not gender diversity. Apparently genders are not diverse, but they need to be balanced. And -- that's what we were told.

But in respect to the possibility of additional funding, I think that my recollection is that we haven't revisited -- CCs haven't revisited their -- which we call it support-from-ICANN model for a very long time.

It might be a sensible idea to have a little group of you guys get together and consider how things have moved on and changed and whether you want to put a proposal to us to adjust in some way the model that we're using at the moment. And I'm sure that --- all in the staff if you do so. Thanks.

MIKE SILBER:

If I can add to that possibly. Firstly, Chris, the notion of gender balance is premised on only two genders. As soon as you move beyond the traditional two-gender approach, then I think you need to talk about diversity and not balance.

CHRIS DISSPAIN:

We can have this discussion in a balanced and diverse meeting after this meeting.

MIKE SILBER:

But on the more important level, there's been a fair amount of discussion.

And I see "Mike Michuki Mwangi" for some reason. The transcript no doubt will be fixed at some later stage.

On the more important question of participation, encouraging participation, funding, and the like, Bertrand de La Chapelle raised to me a very important issue a number of years ago during the launch of the new gTLD program where he started asking people, Well, what is the impact of new gTLDs on your SO? And this was very much focused on the GNSO. But given that there are several ccTLD managers who have thrown their hat into the new gTLD space, it's maybe apposite for you as well.

In addition, some of you are now facing I wouldn't say competition but you are facing other registries in countries selling names that have a local meaning, whether it's a city or a language which may not be used. I think that there are some changes that are happening from the new gTLD program.

More importantly, though, is the empowered community is going to cause very significant changes to how ICANN operates. And I don't think it's just the board, but I think it's across the community that there are new --- which may never need to be enforced but I think that all of us need a degree of introspection to decide do we have the ideal structure for our communities and then it goes beyond that into what Chris was saying, which

is, And are you receiving the appropriate support, funding, assistance to do the work that you need?

And this is one of those situations where you really don't want to get to a review for an external party to tell you what you need to change because we've seen some of those reviews either achieving nothing or going spectacularly wrong.

And my suggestion is that the ccNSO, once the workload from the transition has calmed down to a mild panic, it might be worthwhile to actually starting to look at some introspection in terms of what you want to look like in three or five years' time.

BYRON HOLLAND:

Thanks, Mike.

And some introspection actually is on our proposed agenda for the next year or so. So I would take your point, and that is part of our coming agenda.

Do we have a mic? Yes, we have a question.

Asha?

ASHA HEMRAJANI:

Thank you, Byron. And thank you, Katrina for mentioning -- this is Asha Hemrajani for the record. Thank you for mentioning the diversity of geographies and the diversity of sizes. This is the

two areas I'm -- in particular I'm more interested in the geography -- pardon me, the diversity of geography.

So I wanted to understand -- and you may have covered it. I may have missed it. But I'd like to understand a little bit better about -- I'm glad that this is recognized. So what are your steps in going forward? How do you think you can improve the diversity of geographies in ccNSO? Thank you.

KATRINA SATAKI:

Thank you very much for the question. Country Code Top Level Domains are in every country. So as diverse the countries are around the world, as diverse are the ccTLDs. We have -- we have very strong regional organizations that work with ccTLDs in their regions. Then we all come together under ICANN umbrella and continue working here.

Our council -- on the council, they have representation from each ICANN's geographical region, three councillors from each geographical region. They are elected by ccTLDs in those geographical regions.

Again, everybody is welcome to participate. And ICANN traveling around the world to different locations, different geographical regions, of course, it also helps ccTLDs in those regions to participate.

I do not remember numbers by heart -- maybe Bart does -- how many ccTLDs we have in each region. They, of course, differ by size. Geographical regions differ by size. But, for example, in North American region, I think we have all the ccTLDs represented on the ccNSO. In some other regions, there are still ccTLDs that they are officially not members of the ccNSO. But, anyway, quite often they participate actively in the work of the ccNSO. You don't have to be a ccNSO member to participate.

Does that address your question?

BYRON HOLLAND:

With 157 members of the ccNSO, I would say we do have good and broad geographical coverage. Oh, look at that ask and ye shall receive.

[Laughter]

There were five members from North America which effectively is 100% because ICANN North American region is unique. There are 26 members from South America, 34 from Africa, 41 from Europe, and 51 from Asia-Pacific. So from that perspective, I think it's fair to say that we have very good, broadly speaking, geographic coverage. And, anecdotally, we cover the sizes from the very smallest CCs to arguably some of the world's largest

TLDs regardless of GNSO or CC stripe -- other, sorry, gTLD or CC stripe.

So geographically I think diversity is fairly well covered and that's -- those are member numbers. As Katrina said, again just to reinforce her comment, we don't preclude non-members from participating. Any ccTLD manager is welcome to come to our sessions, whether they're officially a member or not. And a number of them do. And that's where we try to reel them in and become members.

Another question? Oh, you have a mic?

SALAM YAMOUT:

Yes. Good morning. I'm Salam Yamout from Lebanon, speaking on my own behalf. In Lebanon we have a problem where the government is trying to become the registrar for the ccTLD so it's like kind of a forced redelegation. And yesterday I hear, kind of the same thing is happening in Turkey. So my question is, who can support us? Is it ICANN staff, is it ICANN Board, or is it the ccNSO council? Anybody.

CHRIS DISSPAIN:

Hello. It's Chris. You won't be surprised to know that this happens sometimes. The answer to your question -- the straight answer to your question is that there are a number of individual

ccTLD managers who would be very happy to help you -- I'm one of them -- who would be happy to help you, at least to understand the situation and to guide you through what you might need -- what you might need to do. Becky and I and a number of other people in this room have spent the last five years of our lives working on the Framework of Interpretation stuff. So we know that -- we know that backwards. But the -- the unfortunate fact of it is, is at the end of the day it's a battle for you at home and there's not very much that we can do.

I can tell you that ICANN's position has always been where there is a -- where there is a -- an issue going on in a country, in a sovereign territory, to tell the parties to go away and sort it out at home ICANN is not involved in solving the problem. ICANN is involved in making the -- the changes, if any changes are agreed according to policy. But individual ccTLD managers will be very happy to advise you and help you and guide you through the things that you might need to do. I hope that's helpful. And tomorrow or tonight, if we're at the cc drinks I'll come and talk to you. Thank you.

BYRON HOLLAND:

And I might add that on the ccNSO Web site all of the work of the Framework of Interpretation, Fol, is there. It is a considerable amount of documentation, but given -- given your question, you

may be interested in reviewing some of the overview documents that are there. On the ccNSO Web site under Framework of Interpretation or Fol. Rinalia.

RINALIA ABDUL RAHIM: Thank you. Rinalia Abdul Rahim speaking. I was reviewing the implementation challenges of the Africa regional strategy and something was flagged to my attention. There is a problem of late or slow response from ccTLD redelegation requesters in Africa, and it could be due to connectivity, it could be due to capacity. And I had discussed it with ICANN staff, and their way of addressing it is perhaps a -- having capacity building workshops for ccTLD operators to impress on the importance of responding on time. On the connectivity side, I don't know what we can do. And I also know on the IANA department there is a constraint on service level performance, and I was wondering what the ccTLD community is also doing about it, to address the problem.

BYRON HOLLAND: Thank you. Becky, did you want to respond to that?

BECKY BURR: Yes. I'm not precisely sure what it means for re -- what the slow response was -- requests or redelegation requests means but I

suspect that it is something that we did address in the Framework of Interpretation, talking about the need for clear communication with ccTLD managers when there is a revocation request or a redelegation request as that may be. We are working with Elise and Kim on implementing processes to ensure that the FoI, the Framework of Interpretation, is fully implemented and that those communications are robust.

But one problem that we did note was the need to have very clear communications between IANA and ccTLD managers when those kinds of issues arose. And so I suspect that is what -- that's the issue you're referring to. But I'd be happy to talk with you about it afterwards. But it is -- it is a -- the clarity of communication, the need for robust communication, particularly with ccTLD managers who are not in good contact with IANA in the ordinary course is -- is an item that we addressed.

MIKE SILBER:

If I can add to that, I'm sorry, I don't buy it. IANA sends plain text email. I can't see connectivity -- connectivity exists across Africa. In many cases it's very slow and it's not ubiquitous, but a ccTLD administrator has an obligation to ensure that he or she is connected. And it's not an excuse. And I think that we also need to ensure that we understand that if you look at the RFC, this is a

commitment to the community. It's not a right in terms of the administrator. And in fulfilling that commitment, the administrator gives it in undertakings to the global community as well as the local community. So I'm not really sure where the issue is.

BYRON HOLLAND: Thanks, Mike. Jay.

JAY DALEY: Hi. Jay Daley from .NZ. Firstly, I don't think we should guess why people are slow in responding to these type of things. I think we should survey them and get some proper data about it. That would be very useful and that could then drive the actions we need to address this.

MIKE SILBER: Already underway, Jay.

JAY DALEY: Great. Okay. Secondly, on the SLA point, and I'm speaking as a member of the SLA working group here so understand this. The previous SLA -- the current SLA that's with the NTIA is for an end-to-end process that includes taking into consideration any time a ccTLD requires. That -- because some ccTLDs can take a great

deal of time, that requires a very lengthy SLA timing to be in place.

Now, oddly on the SLA working group was firstly, that was unfair on IANA because they were being judged on performance of other people, not themselves. And, secondly, that that distorted the true SLAs because you were waiting so long for some people.

So the new SLAs that will go into place for post-transition IANA will only measure the IANA portion of things and the clock stops when they hand it over to the ccTLD and ask the ccTLD for their input. That doesn't mean that we won't be measuring the full end-to-end process, but there won't be targets for the end-to-end process because that wouldn't be fair on IANA.

BYRON HOLLAND: Thanks, Jay. That was very helpful. To the other side again. Mary.

MARY UDUMA: Thank you. My name is Mary Uduma from Nigeria, and I haven't been part of the afTLD. I know that in Africa we have had some countries that have had difficulties getting their TLDs delegated. Some do not understand the process. And at afTLD level been

trying to reach out, and reaching out means that we need to educate them, do a lot of outreach.

We also have some communication issues, language issues. So probably that is also a factor that affects this process. But with what is happening in African region now, with now ICANN has graciously opened a service center for us, I think we will be closer and we'll work closely with them. We have just finished African DNS forum, and some of those issues are the things we discussed at the DNS forum. And aTLD has been organizing registry courses for the region, so we hope that those that are left out, some are still managed by administrators off site, some of the CCs managed by administrators outside Africa and we're trying to bring them in. So we hope that going forward with the new structure coming in we'll be stronger and we'll be able to reach out to those people that would also get educated on how to go about the process of getting their CCs delegated. Thank you.

BYRON HOLLAND:

Thank you, Mary. I'm going to call this agenda item to a close, since time is short, and move on to agenda item number 2 which is ccNSO feedback on CCWG accountability. And I am going to say that I'm going to speak a little bit about process because we are just at the beginning of our two days of ccNSO meetings of

which a significant amount of time is dedicated to this very topic. A reminder that our council meeting is 5:00 on Wednesday where we will be voting on whether or not to support the proposal going forward to the board.

So I do not want to presuppose what the discussion or the outcome will be, but I did want to make the board aware of the fact that over the next two days we've devoted substantial time, not quite 50% but near 50% of our two days of meetings to the various aspects of CWG and CCWG. And I know there will be significant discussion, debate, insights shared and exchanged, et cetera. In Dublin, for the third proposal, we had general, though certainly not unanimous consensus, for the third draft and that in a sense will be our jumping off point as we spend considerable time over the next two days discussing this subject, the differences between the third draft where we had general though not unanimous agreement and the fourth and final draft.

So that's our process, and we'll be taking -- the councillors will be there listening, engaged in the discussion, getting a sense of the communities, feel for the room, et cetera, and that will inform our decision on Wednesday afternoon. And I hope you can appreciate that not wanting to short-circuit or presuppose what the outcome will be, I'm not going to provide any more editorial than that at this point. Any questions or comments on that? Or any other business? Roelof. Okay.

ROELOF MEIJER: Thank you. Roelof Meijer for the record. It's just a clarification. I think the transcript caught you right, Mr. Chair, saying that this is size diversity across the board. Maybe it's a clarification. I don't think you addressed the ICANN board in that, but that you were referring to the size of CCs within the CC community, right?

BYRON HOLLAND: That is correct. That is what I meant, yes.

ROELOF MEIJER: Thank you.

BYRON HOLLAND: Thank you for catching that.

ERIKA MANN: Thank you so much. I have one other question. Do you have fresh data or data at all if there are changes which you see in your ecosystem after the introduction of the gTLDs? There is something different happening than what you have seen until then?

BYRON HOLLAND:

That's a good question. I'm not sure four minutes is enough time, but let me give you a general overview from my perspective. And I will say that I'm speaking now as a ccTLD manager, but certainly I have insights from my participation in CENTR, ccNSO, and certainly the research we do at home in our own strategic and operational planning.

For mature legacy ccTLDs, the growth in our registries or domains under management has significantly declined. I would say across the board on all mature legacy ccTLD registries. So whereas in -- as recently as 2012 or only a couple few years ago, most of us would have been experiencing double digit growth. Many of us now are at zero. A couple have entered very small negative growth or are certainly in single-digit growth. So there are a number of factors at play. Of course, there's been the adoption curve, early adoption, mass adoption, and we are naturally experiencing a maturation of our industry. Many of us in different parts of the globe have experienced challenging economic situations in our home countries which affect adoption. The various platforms, alternate platforms, be it Facebook, social media, whatever, certainly play into it, or some would argue. Some would argue that's not having an impact, but I would argue it is having some impact. And, of course, new gTLDs, particularly when they're city or geo related, are starting to be felt in different jurisdictions. I don't think there's any one

silver -- magic answer to your question, but all of those things are compounding to change the dynamics of our industry, as I see it. And that changes our outlook and how we behave. One can do very different things when one is experiencing 10, 15% growth year-over-year versus 1, 2, 3, 4% growth, -1% growth. So how we have to act is changing and particularly in a significantly increasing competitive landscape.

ERIKA MANN: Can I raise a quick additional one or is somebody else in the queue?

BYRON HOLLAND: Steven.

This will be quick. Going back to the ccTLD outreach topic that we were engaged in a little while ago, I think we would be remiss to not acknowledge the efforts of our regional organizations, particularly the one I'm familiar with which is APTLD which is doing tremendous outreach efforts to CCs that do not participate in ICANN but do participate in the regional organizational meetings. And at those meetings there are ICANN updates, and we had a briefing on the CCWG stuff at the latest APLT meeting. So I think for completeness those should be acknowledged.

BYRON HOLLAND: Yeah, absolutely. And we do work well and often with our regional organization counterparts. And Katrina did mention that and acknowledge it. But I would certainly echo Steven's comments. You had one final question, one quick final question?

ERIKA MANN: No. Maybe not a question. I will follow up by email. And I have an interest in understanding how the market is changing, and I think it would be good to have a deeper understanding.

Just one quick one, is there a single place where all the -- the data which you accumulate or around the globe is -- I can find information? Is there a single location?

BYRON HOLLAND: I'm not sure about a single location for all the data. Though VeriSign accumulates some decent data. Not to denigrate their work, it is a little generic and not specific to CCs. Regional organizations do good work on this front. I am a member of CENTR, as are some of my colleagues around the room. CENTR does very good work on its region. So I would say look at the regional organizations to begin with, then VeriSign data provides some supplementary, and Zook data can also be very

helpful. So if you're interested, those would be the three first places I would look.

And with that, keeping us exactly on time, unless there are any final comments from you, Steve.

STEVE CROCKER: No. Well done, everybody. Thank you.

[Applause]

BYRON HOLLAND: Thank you very much.

[Applause]

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]