Leslie Cowley:	… new territory gTLDs on ccTLDs and following that we will go on to the ccNSO council meeting. So as ever, we have fairly full agenda to be going on with, and I'll ask Hiro to start.
Hiro Hotta:	Thank you Leslie. Good morning. I'm Chair of IDN ccPDP Working Group, it was expected to have discussion yesterday afternoon, but there was no good time for that, so this slot was most to this time.

So IDN ccPDP Working Group to – it is a discussion intensely about the one vote per territory or one vote per member issue. And we need your mood or your opinion to move this discussion forward on this topic. So I'd like to introduce what the theme is. And Demi and Siavash will discuss or argue about this issue. So after that we want to have your opinion.

ccNSO IDN PDP Working Group Two, it's on the current Bylaws and the ccNSO internal rule does not consider IDN ccTLDs as you know. It's just about the ASCII IDN ccTLDs, but when IDN ccTLD registries are coming to our work, how should it be amended? So how to accommodate IDN ccTLDs in the ccNSO.

The main topics of the Working Group are, membership definition, maybe the IDN ccTLD registries should be the members and eligibility and selection of counselors of the ccNSO council and initiation of PDP. And maybe the most controversial – most important thing is voting, voting policy, development process, and

selection of counselors, ICANN Board member and so on and quorum for voting.

So about the voting, this is very important issue. That will – that may influence the basis of ccNSO, maybe we can talk about what cc is on the string. Working Group Three is under discussion and having no preference by now on one vote per territory or one vote per member; and your input is necessary and very important at this time to move forward.

So the solution space as I said, one vote per territory, in this sentence the territory means the country code listed in ISO 3166, or one vote per member, member is ASCII registry and IDN registry. So the solutions necessary to be considered here, for example, even currently one organization acts as the registries of multiple ASCII cc's.

And when we have IDN ccTLDs, one organization acts as the registries of ASCII plus IDN ccTLD within their territory. So far when we see the list of IDN ccTLD registries, most of them run by the same registry except these two. And IDN ccTLDs are operated by different organizations from ASCIIs like in Egypt, the ASCII ccTLD and the IDN ccTLD are operated by different organization, and IDN ccTLD in that territory does not correspond to the whole territory.

In some countries, the ASCII ccTLD and IDN ccTLD represent the same part of the whole cc, but maybe in some countries each IDN ccTLD may represent some part of the country and so on. I think

these are typical situations necessary to be considered. So let me hand my mic to Demi to talk about the one vote per territory. Okay.

Demi Getschko: Good morning to everybody, thank you Lesley for chairing the table, thank you Hiro for chairing the group, the Working Group. I will try to expose maybe some concepts to have some common grounds on what we will discuss later, but I will try to put this concept in a when, what, how manner.

First of all, when I suppose we would have to consider that IDNs is a reality right now, that we really don't have time to delay further the issue of membership and how they will participate of the ccNSO. Then the first difficult problem or not so difficult is to try to keep clear in mind what are the characteristics that differentiate the cc's from the g's. In the old times it was easier, because the cc's were delegated before ICANN, and so there is a timeframe thing.

Now we have IDN cc's that are just being delegated, then what I think is the stronger way to differentiate between cc's and g's is that cc's are territory-related, we have some relation to some territory, and the g's are generic or unrelated or related to all that kind of subjects. And this list of territories we are related to is the ISO 3166, all of us know from much dialogue.

The second definition I want to try to expose to you and see if you have consensus on that is that Latin cc's and IDN cc's are just

different forms of expression generated from the very same given territory. Then you have some territory, this territory can express itself in the internet using the old ASCII string or maybe using now another kind of strings, but it's always the same territory.

Then cc's either the ASCII cc's or other cc's are not all members in my opinion of the ccNSO; and you have to make efforts to bring them to the community as soon as possible, because the time is running out.

Just to strength the concept of territory, I take a part of the RFC 1591, where it is very well-known phrase that IANA is not in the business of deciding what is not a country, I suppose we can extrapolate this to the ccNSO, saying that this ccNSO is not in the business to decide what is or what is not a territory. Then we have to stick to something, and I really believe that ISO 3166 is the secure and the best way to preserve the concept of what is a cc, and keep us as a community differentiated from the g's.

Then, what we are trying to do. What we are trying to do is to include IDN cc's as an effective part of the ccNSO, but at the same time, we have to keep the concept of what is the cc as solid as possible. We cannot dilute this concept trying to make it more like the g's or something like this.

Another important thing in my opinion, of course, is to have to decouple the necessity of many tens, hundreds or how many IDN cc's for a particular territory is needed. We have to decouple this from the voting mechanism, otherwise we are not free to let the

cc's to have handed or tens or anything number of IDNs if you have to make a special arrangement for each case.

Then concluded more or less what I say – I said I think we have to go forward and include cc's an effective members of the ccNSO, and to keep the right balance we have right now, and the concept of the cc, we have to maintain the role of one territory, one vote, no matter how populated or how big, or how many different forms of expression and this form I'm referring to the old definition of IDN cc's as another form of expression of this specific territory.

The last question is how to do this, of course there is different ways to go forward with the voting mechanism, how you can – we can have an exhausting voting to check how the territory votes in any case, but I suppose this is a much easier problem to solve if we – provided we get consensus in the concept of what is a cc and what is an IDN cc. This was my points. Thank you.

Hiro Hotta: Thank you Demi, maybe I pass the microphone to Siavash to present another view of this topic.

Siavash Shahshahani: Thank you, thank you. Let me say as background that I guess everybody agrees that anyone which – who has a presence in the IANA database as cc will be or is potentially a member of ccNSO. So I guess there is quite a fair agreement between all of us that anybody who becomes a cc operator, whether IDN or ASCII is

eligible to be a member of ccNSO. So it's against that background that we are discussing whether there should be one member, one vote, or there should be one territory, one vote. That's the background of the discussion.

Now, to me this is not really a matter of principle, it's a matter of expediency and I'm going to argue that there is no overwhelming principle that forces us one way or the other. It's just convenience.

Okay, now to me the creation of cc's was not really – was an act of convenience. Not a principle, because as Demi mentioned in RFC 1591 it doesn't define what a territory is, it doesn't define what a country is. It just adopts a simple table that exists without much comment as the source of the cc's.

And designation of IDN cc's itself also was an act of convenience. No one tried to reargue what the nature of cc's is, it was just corresponding to the cc codes that were available and because of pressures that existed, ICANN decided to grant cc status to certain new registries.

And if you're talking about principle, violating one member, one vote itself may be considered an act of going against principle rather than or some kind of you know overarching principle.

Okay, now there are some serious objections to the one member one vote. I should mention that I started out being in favor of one territory one vote, but then I started to argue as devil's advocate and I became – I became so passionate in argument that I

converted, actually. So I'm arguing on the other side that I was not originally on.

Now there are some serious objections to this. As Demi mentioned it gives undue power to territories with IDN registries, especially those with multiple IDNs. As you know India, for example, has been granted seven IDNs to start with. So that makes eight votes for India, if you wanted to give each one of these registries – actually they were separate registries, each of them a vote.

Another objection is if in particular if a single registry is running several domains, that one registry becomes endowed with several votes, if you want to give one vote to each member.

Now, there are possible responses to this of course. One is that – well I put it here, should ccNSO parallel GAC and constitute units or is this a community of experts? I think this is a very important point. What a lot of us are afraid of is ccNSO gradually becoming a faint shadow of GAC in its membership, in its voting and in all the other aspects of this operation.

Now, if you're going to regard this as a community of experts, voting is not going to be that big a deal, it's just going to be a process of convenience.

Now, the other objection of the single registries or single entities representing several domains, this thing already exists, like in Norway and France, each operates I believe three country codes, and there's never been much of a problem. As far as I know, I can

be corrected; I think each of them has only one membership in ccNSO.

Now, there are tremendous difficulties associated with having one territory one vote, and this should not be underestimated. In fact, one of the reasons I became converted, was the process of trying to decide how to divide up this one vote that each territory should have.

There are various alternatives have been considered; none of them is really very easy to operate. One solution has been – one solution that has been suggested is that to let the territories itself decide what they want to do with that one vote. Now this sounds simple on the surface, but really it actually encompasses a lot of difficulties.

For example, one major difficulty would be if they cannot – if there are different registries, some for IDN, some for ASCII and they cannot reach agreement as to how they should divide up the vote. If they cannot decide on this, then that's where ccNSO comes in and has to decide. If it has several members from one territory, it has to make a decision as to how it wants to divide the vote, and this is not going to be a simple match.

It seems to me that with the increasing power of GAC and governments, what's going to ultimately happen if there is a conflict? This is going to be handed out to the governments to decide. And that may involve disenfranchising existing ccNSO registry that's in good standing with ccNSO. So this is what I've

said here. A possible consequence would be that a member in good standing could be kicked out or have its vote reduced without due process.

You know in cases of re-delegation these days there is a due process. Now, if you're going to give one vote per territory, we have to devise a due process procedure for how we want to deal with existing incumbent registries that may have their vote reduced or you know – or just completely destroyed by this process. Thank you.

Hiro Hotta: Thank you very much Siavash. So this moment, may I invite comments or opinions from the floor? Okay Annebeth?

Annebeth Lange: Thank you, Annebeth Lange, .no. You mentioned Norway, here I am. Hello. You mentioned Norway as one of those countries having several cc's. And I'm not sure if I agree with you if that is the same question, because .bv, .sj and .no, that's three different territories. And it's not the same in my view that if .no could have been written in several scripts. So to use that as a comparison will be wrong for me.

If we – so far .bv and .sj is not – they are not in function. We have it, but we are not running it so far at least. If it would have been two other registries running those, that will have been one case, and if we get them in preparation then it might be another case.

But I absolutely see your – your arguments, the difficulties about having to change the cc representative from a country or in the ccNSO and been substituted by the government, we don't want that.

But its arguments both ways, so I won't conclude yet. Thank you both for a very good presentations and good arguments on both sides.

Hiro Hotta: Okay thank you. Yes, Bart

Bart Boswinkel: This is Bart just to say currently there is an application from Channel Islands for both dg and ga, and we – the ccNSO will hopefully vote on the ccNSO council hopefully approves it, but then we have one registry running two ccTLDs, so in principle with two votes in the election and Board elections, et cetera.

Lesley Cowley: It's not the first time for that Bart.

Bart Boswinkel: France is member for one registry, for one ccTLD, that's the difference, that's why – that's why it was until now a factious example that we have an entity potentially running multiple ccTLDs as we know them. But now we will face the situation or the ccNSO will face the situation with one entity running two

country codes, and therefore we'll have – and applied for membership for both them and therefore will have two votes.

Hiro Hotta: Thank you, Nigel. Pass the microphone.

Lesley Cowley: While that's happening, I think just highlights that we're already aware of the need to resolve this issue anyway.

Nigel Roberts: Thank you, Nigel Roberts from .gg and .je. You partly anticipated one of the two points I was going to make, because I was going to stand up anyway. You're quite correct in that there is currently an application before council and I don't want to pre-empt the decision they make, but we hope it's a positive one.

But it's not technically correct to say that there is one application, one registry, although the registry operator is one entity, the sponsoring organizations, although I hate that term is – are two completely separate organizations.

The other point I was going – but it's actually quite true, we are a community of experts, we haven't been ruled by votes in majorities and so on. But this will change, and it seems to me that Siavash is entirely correct for a number of reasons. But that it's a wider issue, and the wider issue is this.

You said, I think it was Demi said this is a form of expression; a TLD is a form of expression. I've got – I agree with that, there's a lot of work going on in that regard, but that's violently rejected by some people. But if it's a form of expression, you will get countries and territories, and I'm not going to name them, because I can't – personally I can't apart from – but in which you not only will have different registries run by different organizations, but that those cultural, and linguistic, and script communities will actually be diametrically opposed to each other. And how do you deal with that?

So the only obvious thing is to say if you are a member of the ccNSO, you have a vote. But the obvious corollary of that is that you need to be looking at the ccNSO voting as a whole and not in regions in my opinion. Bart.

Bart Boswinkel: Just for clarification, the point where we got to – the first point Nigel mentioned it is the representative of the ccTLD who is a member, who will vote. And I assume that in case of ga and gg that will be the same person.

Nigel Roberts: On the application it is the same person, but that's only because we're very small at the moment and we actually haven't got that division in place, but it's very likely to be two people in the future, it's – just expediency it's me.

Demi Getschko: Of course we have already problems or issues in that cc, but I think if you want to go forward on this, we have to answer, we cannot leave an answer, the main question is this is – how will we define a cc and what is to be part of the ccNSO. We are in the middle of creating new g's that will be territorial g's, there will be cultural g's and so, and if we really want to preserve the ccNSO as a community in some way – defined in some form, we have to strive to get the definition.

And I supposed this is more important than begin the discussion on how these will be impact all the aspects as for example voting or so. Then in my view, we have to begin with strengthening the concept, and then we can discuss what is the consequence of this in the voting so and so.

Hiro Hotta: Views from other members? Audience? Hi Paulos.

Paulos Nyirenda: Thanks Hiro, Paulos from Malawi. I would like to agree with Demi that I think the fundamental concept of what a cc is, needs to be resolved in this, and maybe we can expand this a little bit and separate cc from ccTLD, what is actually – what is a country code, that creates the TLD.

So I think in reserving this we need to expand it a little bit more. And in that sense, probably we need to ask the difficult question is

a cc IDN a cc? Is it a country code? From Demi's slides, the expression is from the country, but I think a cc is for the country, and not necessarily from the country. So in the expansion, we need to look at the fundamentals. Thanks.

Hiro Hotta: Thank you, are there other views now?

Esahomley Lee: Esahomley Lee, .kr. I mean I'm just opening my eyes to the complexity of defining what a cc is, but I would just like to emphasize that – that we as a cc have been stressing, the difference of a cc from a g, and one of that is national sovereignty and I think that is one concept that really needs to be advocated and not taken lightly. And so I do agree with what Paulos just said in saying that it is not from a cc that's important, but that it is for a cc.

Hiro Hotta: Thank you. I think I have already consumed our allotted time, so a final short comment from Annebeth. Just make it short.

Annebeth Lange: Hiro, perhaps I could ask on behalf of other people who haven't been following this as closely, where are we on the timeline? What are the next steps? Clearly, there is a bigger discussion to be had here.

Hiro Hotta:	First, we will have a Working Group meeting tomorrow from 9:30, so – in Orchard Room. So if you have something to say, please come to the Orchard Room at 9:30 tomorrow.
Demi Getschko:	In the overall scheme the Working Group it has – I think a couple of months ago published its interim report, and is now preparing its final report for discussion. And that report is – as it is part of the PDP, we hope to conclude it by – well, the Working Group hopes to conclude it by Dakar.
	So then it comes to a full discussion and then it will be part of the overall report to be submitted at some time. But this is – this is a very – and that's why the Working Group suggested to have at least a sense of the room, this is one of those very fundamental issues which you need to think through on where we needed feedback. And so you're more than welcome to attend the meeting tomorrow as well, because this will affect the structure of the ccNSO for the next couple of years.
Lesley Cowley:	Okay, thank you for that, clearly some further thought is needed. Can you join me in thanking the group today, thank you.

[Applause]

Lesley Cowley:	Okay, so moving on, the next session is the ccTLD News Session, which Patricio will be chairing for me, and we're very relieved to have Patricio finally arrived; I think he wins the medal for the longest journey to the ccNSO this week. Apparently, it took 42 hours to get here; not counting the trips to the various airports, but the ash cloud was a Chilean ash cloud.
	Could we also have the speakers up please, so we do a fairly quick swap around? And whilst you're all coming up, I didn't have a microphone last night, which is Bart very kindly stood in to say, welcome, et cetera. But now I have a microphone, let me properly thank the sponsors for the dinner yesterday evening who were Alda, Cera, Seanak .nz, Nira, Nominet, sgNIC and SIDN. Thank you very much, it was a very good dinner.

[Applause]

Lesley Cowley:	Okay, thank you very much, Patricio are you almost there, we seem to be missing a few people.
Patricio Poblete:	As soon as they –
Lesley Cowley:	Okay. So just so people know we're going to be running this session up to almost lunchtime, we have a lunch which has been

kindly sponsored by sgNIC, and sgNIC will just have a few words prior to lunch, then we'll be here again promptly at two o'clock please for the panel discussion on the impact of the new territory gTLDs on ccTLDs, which we're hoping – we're planning will be a lively and interactive session. Thank you.

Patricio Poblete: Okay, beginning this always interesting session, we're going to hear updates from various ccTLDs, the IDN, this session is always to learn what's going on in various parts of the world and also learn from their experiences, so we can apply them for our own work.

So we have a very big panel today, so without wasting any more time, we're go to the first presentation from Singapore, Michelle Sng, so go ahead please.

Michelle Sng: Okay, hi, good morning everyone. My name is Michelle from sgNIC. First of all, okay I know this when it's there already but I feel like to extend a very warm welcome to all you in Singapore. It has been great seeing you guys here. Hope you have had a wonderful few days here and many more to come over the next few days. Okay, I've been told to keep this short and sweet. Okay, so here goes.

A brief history, .sg was actually under the Technic Unit of the National University of Singapore. sgNIC was formed back in the

mid-90s, we were subsequently corporatized and in 1999 we became a wholly owned subsidiary of the Infacom Development Authority of Singapore.

Okay, so when we first started, we were the registry and the registrar also, but we shifted to a registry/registrar model back in 2002, okay, as of now, we have able 12 accredited registrars. Okay, eight local, four from overseas, and as it stands now, we have about 130,000 names; we are not a very big registry, okay.

But if you can see from the pie chart over there, an overwhelming majority of the names are all .com, .com sg and .sg. Okay 61% are .sg, 35% .sg, total is about 96%. Okay and the rest, the other 4% is taken up by .r, .edu, .gov.

We have ongoing some – some ongoing long running promotional schemes, there is four of them over here. Okay the first one would a buy one get one free. I think is quite easy to understand, basically if you buy .com sg, you a .sg for free. Okay, this has been running for at least five or six years, but it's still very popular, that's why we have kept it going.

And the second we have is ILove sg, okay, this is launched every August, and it's to celebrate Singapore's National Day. Okay, so it's month long event and we first started out, started this as an experiment back in 2008, same thing, it's proven to be quite popular amongst end users, and so we've turned it into a year – an annual event, an annual promotion.

Okay, the third one the Hong Bao Promo, for those who do not speak Chinese, Hong Bao actually mean rit packet, rit is an auspicious thing that's given out during special events like Chinese New Year, so we are thinking of riding on this popular name and borrowing it for our promotion scheme, so this will run every January and/or February, we have not decided yet, will it be a month long or two month long event. Okay, so what we do with all these promotions is that we work with our registrars, and we try and offer low rates to the end users.

Okay, and the last item you see over there, incentive rebate scheme, this is actually targeted at the registrars; it's a volume based discount scheme. So basically the more you sell as a registrar, you hit certain bands and then you get rebates from us.

So apart from promotions, we also have an outreach to the small, medium enterprises, SMEs, this SME program is actually collaboration between sgNIC and Singapore's registry of companies. So this program has been ongoing since December '07, and it's just – already its objective is to be a one-stop shop for small companies. What happens is that there is a seamless system between sgNIC and the registrar of companies.

So what happens is that when companies go online to register their business with the registry of companies, they will be directed to another page which asks them whether they want to reserve a domain name or not, okay. They can reserve the name for up to three months, and within this three months, they need to activate their name with any participating registrar. So since end of '07 to

date I think about – that's been about 13,000 names that has been registered under this program.

Other ongoing activities that we have, enforcement efforts, apart from automated checking, we also do manual checking on daily registrations coming in.

We have stepped up efforts in recent years, okay, to ensure the eligibility criteria is met, like for example if you are registering a .com registry, you better make sure that you are a registered business, okay.   We also try and ensure that the contact information provided by registrants are as accurate as possible, and we do check for sensitive and offensive words as well, I mean we have a reserved list in the system, okay, but I think people are getting quite creative these days, so they do come up with quite interesting permutations of offensive words sometimes.

Okay, we also work closely with other relevant agencies like the media, development authority, and we work with SingCERT quite closely as well to prevent malicious activities from taking place.

Okay, new initiatives. I think at the opening – if you are at the opening ceremony, the guest of honor did mention that we will be launching IDN ccTLD, Sunrise Phase 1 staring in early July. We initially launched IDN .sg back in 2009, so for this Phase 1, existing holders of all these again .sg names can come in to register, okay, but the prefix will need to match the IDN .IDN name that they are going to register.

Okay, so this would followed by Sunrise Phase 2 taking place in September where trademark holder and government agencies can come in, following by general launch in December this year.

On the DNSSEC front, we are currently conducting a test-bed only with the registrars for now, and after this has been completed, if there are tweaks to be done we will settle that, and then after all the tweaks and adjustments have been done, we will roll out our public test-bed. We are aiming for end of the year, hopefully we can meet that timeline.

Okay, and lastly Singapore, I think you guys have heard we are hosting a third node for the Packet Clearing House ICANN initiative, which seeks to provide a free DNSSEC service for ccTLDs.

That's it, sorry one last update. Lunch is sponsored by us today, so I hope to see you guys there later on, it will be held at the Asian Market Café, that's on level two of Fairmont Hotel. Okay, that's all for me.

Patricio Poblete: Thank you very much. We have about one minute for questions.

Vika Mpisane: You mentioned – oh, my name is Vika Mpisane from South Africa .za. You mentioned that one of your marketing companies is for the person includes having a person registering a third level name and getting a second level free. Have you not had a scenario where

somebody could get a third level name, but the second level name was already taken by somebody else, in that scenario, what's usually the approach.

Michelle Sng: Okay, for our domain registration policy, it's always on the first come first serve basis, so that is our usual response to them, I mean if someone else has taken your name, then you will have to – you will just have to find another one. That's the whole issue.

Paulos Nyirenda: Paulos again from Malawi – can I find out which one is your fastest growing sections, second level or third level?

Michelle Sng: As in the category extension?

Paulos Nyirenda: Yes.

Michelle Sng: Typically the popular ones are .com sg and .sg. So I would say those two are the fastest growing ones. Does that answer your question?

Paulos Nyirenda: Yes, it's okay. I was thinking that since the second level seemed to be newer, maybe they would be faster growing than the already existing .com at third level.

Male: Just a quick question, please, yes, just a follow up question to what Paulos is – I would therefore going to keep this model pretty much then, we call it mix to model, the way you have second level domains and the domain names and third level domain names, is that what you want to keep as a model, or you are transitioning from one model to another?

Michelle Sng: No, we are keeping that as it is, yes, thanks.

Patricio Poblete: Okay, thank you. We are going to move onto the next presentation from Malaysia, .my, and please and due to time constraints we are going to ask speakers to sit here and use this laptop. It seems our intention to save time is backfiring. Yes, please use yours then. Sorry about that.   So Norsuzana Harun is going to give this presentation from .my, please go ahead.

Norsuzana Harun: Hi everyone. (language) Good morning to all of you. My name is Suzana, I am from .my domain registry.   For information .my

domain registry is the registrator of all domain names that end .my in Malaysia, what we call in this country code domain name.

Okay, my presentation today will comprise of IDN at the second level of domain. I start with an introduction. I'm not really sure, whether you know Malaysia or not, but a brief information is that we are between Thailand and Nepal, that is Malaysia. So I hope you don't (inaudible) with my presentation, you might have to explain first, right.

Okay, Malaysia has multiracial races and the languages we have a Jawee okay, and then we have Chinese and we a Tamil languages.

Which languages are for Malaysia or Malay, whereas our official educational – education system uses a Latin script which is from the A to Z and from the 0 to 9. So people in Malaysia basically understand and are able to write all Latin script.

Many Malaysian have no issues to use Latin script domain name, whether it is in English, or whether it is in (inaudible) Malaysia or Malay. As you can see fashion in English will be spelled in – that way, F-A-S-H-I-O-N, and then the fashion mean by Malaysia will be spelled as F-E-S-L-E-N. So most of them are having no problem to write and read whether in English or in (inaudible) regions. At the end of us is more in the social community or cultural preservation instead of the commercial needs.

What about our IDN projects? So I especially call it as my IDN stand for Malaysia and then applies to the name. Okay, the objective is to represent Jawee, Chinese and Tamil characters in

my .my domain name, and as so to get knowledge and experience of using .my domain language and sharing with the internet community, which is in yet three languages, as it is a unique identity of Malaysian domain name and also enhance the DNS technology at .my ccTLD. That is as our preservation of the heritage.

Okay, in .my IDN development we are focused on four main items. We should have brought the language itself comprise of three languages Jawee, Atama and Chinese, but the policy of the IDN itself, mostly in the registration whatnot, and then for the technical and last but not least (inaudible), which is we have a very good support from our regulators which is MCMC, Mission Communication Multimedia Commissions.

This is a list of the support that we get for the language. I just give you example such as from the Institute of Language and Literature, the one (inaudible) for Malaysia; and get the technical support from a few of individuals and organization and also support received from the MCMC, National University of Malaysia, Faculty of Law and Multimedia Development Corporation which is called [MDEX]. And so I say we have a good element of support.

Malaysian communication in multimedia communications from MCMC, appointed us – .my domain registry to manage and maintain an internet electronic address presence and communication in multimedia at CNE in 1998. We have a very good support in organizing the IDN forum in year 2009, in the

development and also in year 2011 one special IDS and in our hosted by our regulator, which in this seminar over 100 participants attended from the Ministry, the government and educational institutions.

This is the features we would like to show you when we are organizing the (inaudible) seminar and the (inaudible) approach '11, okay. I also would like to share that our IDN was launched in year 2009 which is in Jawee, and then 2010 which is in Chinese and Tamil. We support three scripts, 357 participants registered .my IDN addresses at the close on the 15 November last year.

In order to roll IDN in Malaysia, we also do a market survey on IDN from 15 June to 21st July 2010, the object is to study the readiness of Malaysian local internet community accepting IDN in general, particularly in the three languages. 23 questions in the survey, 677 participants comprising .my domain registrants, school and government agencies. From that figure 74% say that it was the right time to introduce IDN in Malaysia and then 70% say IDN in Malaysia should be introduced at the second level. So we go to the direct relationship on our slide in the presentation.

Okay, we have set up our Malay language table to iron out on July 2010. Okay, what is the technical issues in Jawee? I would like to share with you a part of it. In Jawee such as if we have – the only digit 2 in Jawee is only acceptable and then we only accept the mixed Jawee alphabet in the ASCII number.

This is an example I say what will be acceptable in this one. But if there is twice what 2 in Jawee, this is mean 2, this is mean Rama. Rama, sorry, Rama is butterflies, okay. So if we have Rama and followed by 22 in Jawee it's not acceptable, only acceptable is for the first communication and for the last communication.

We also have an issue in the Jawee with the [hamza] or three-quarter, because it might be used in our daily Jawee but not in the UNICODE table and with that we cannot convert to the UNICODE. I would like to share with you some words in the Jawee like the [hamzah] equator, such as for the icing: this is the spelling for the icing, and this is the icing in the Jawee language, and then this is the (inaudible) in the Jawee and (inaudible) – all of that use is Jawee like the [hamzah] or three quarter.

In terms of IDN TLD implementation plan, TLD in Malaysia the entry language, as I said earlier but in the implementation, bottom line we will concentrate in the IDN TLD in Jawee first. We have launched the first stage in the late of April, and the end of January into April, and then now we are in the second phase, which is opportunity to assisting users, and after that we will be open to the public users.

Okay, this is the target which is for the first phases. So the application is open for the government agencies and government educational entities only. This second one is open for the existing .my registrants and the third will be open to the public.

This is how we represent IDN in Jawee followed by my TLD and then this is the fonts in the UNICODE.

Okay, I would like to go to the – my last slide. We also are curious on will IDN work in all major browsers and also is it the introduction or the use of IDN will affect the search engine optimization especially on the local content with a local language? So what is exactly the factor that me or you see in order to boost or to elevate the usage of IDN?

The principle is that if the URL, the domain name is IDN, which is an interactive language, but we also may be need to look into the content of the website itself, whether this is ASCII or whether in a native language, so in our country there are few of site that are using the native language, either Jawee, Tamil and Chinese. As of 16 June 2011, we don't have a very good registration only 24 Jawee IDN registered, and we plan that through this Jawee IDN TLD to the schools. With that I would like to end my presentation and thank you.

Patricio Poblete: Thank you and we almost without time for questions now, but if somebody really feels strongly about one question. Okay, thank you, and moving on to .fo. Okay, to .fo, Isak Jacobsen is going to present about this, set up and starters of .fo today for Faroe Islands.

Isak Jacobsen:	Thank you and hello. .fo. As he said my name is Isak Jacobsen and I'm Chairman of the Faroe ccTLD council. And some facts about Faroe, where is it, is always the first question I get. We are in the middle of the North Atlantic Ocean, it's only a little group of islands, 18 on that position on the globe. And that's the square kilometers of the island, it's not big. And the distance from north to south is only 130 kilometers and east and west is 75.

The population is just below 50,000. The capital is Torshavn, with a population of 20,000 approximately. The language is Faroese it's the language of the Vikings. It's a self-governing country within the kingdom of Denmark and we are not a member of EU. And we've got a flag called (inaudible) and it looks like that.

The National Geographic Traveler voted the Faroe Islands for the most authentic unspoiled and likely to remain so, and we are very proud of that title.

The structure; the University of Torshavn together with the Faroese IT Association and the Ministry of Industry together – put together an independent fo council. It started in 1993 at the University of Torshavn, and the first domain name that came in 1995. The Faroese IT Association and the Ministry of Industry elected the first fo council in 2001, and Navision-based administration system was implemented in 2001.

The fo council produced the first set of rules in 2002, and the present council was elected in 2004, the new regulations for implementing in 2006. FRED check administration system was

implemented in 2010, late 2010. The fo council is appointed by the Faroese IT Association, manned by two representatives from the private sector and two from the public sector. And it's a self-owned institution governed by the regulations created by the council and approved by the Ministry of Industry.

There are no employees at the fo council. It's a hobby. All the members have full-time job elsewhere. There are two lawyers and two IT specialists, and the Chairman is the former President of the Faroese IT Association, and both the lawyers are working at the National Data Security and the IT – head of IT at the University of Torshavn is also a member.

The fo council is a non-profit organization, not regulated by national law, rented out domain names for one year at a time, with the obligation to prolong the contract for one year at a time. Today we are managing 3,080 domain names. So it's not a big ccTLD.

In the beginning .fo domain names were first and foremost for Faroese companies and people, and you had to prove your right to the name; and not abuse third-person rights; fo administration should check both content and usage, and the administration system was insufficient and very much – required much manual work.

Now we're loosened up bit on the regulation, and you can now use for instance 1.fo, a.fo, fi.fo, 123.fo and so on. And we can block names of national or public interest like city names or island names and so on. And we do not check contents or usage. Only a court

order will make us consider whether or not to take down a domain. FRED is in action and performing good and it's not labor intensive.

Our internet future, we have like a broader name server base in collaboration with the PCH and the DNSSEC also in collaboration with the PCH and implementing IPv6. We need to update FRED, and we are thinking about liberalizing the regulations even more and maybe open for registrars. Today there are no registrars, it's only the register.

The administration is outsourced to a local security firm.

And when you're applying for a fo domain name, you first have to identify yourself with a copy of your passport or social security number, and then you have to prove the right to a name with sufficient documentation from national or international registry. And then you can apply with the A-application, we have them split up in A and B applications. And then you can rent the domain for one year. You don't – we don't sell the names.

If you can't prove the right to a name, you can apply with a B-application and then the name will be published under nic.fo and then the national newspaper for one month, and if no one objects with a valid documentation for application, the name will be approved.

The application fee for A domain is 400 Danish kr, and B 900 Danish kr. And the annual fee is 450 Danish kr.

This is the front of end of the administration, when you apply for a Faroese domain name, that's the Faroese one, and this is the English one, a little bit shorter. And we have a regional tutorial how to apply on each page.

FRED server is running on version 1.10, and I know that 2.3 is available, so that is something we have to do, and it's running a Read Hat Fedora for 9.5. And the picture that you see here is the table of the FRED server, it's a complicated system. And it looks like a very nice curve, if we can keep on doing as well as this, it will look good and then this one is from 2009 to 2010, for one year. And this is for half a month, the last half month. That's it. Any questions.

Patricio Poblete: Any questions.

Female: Hello.

Isak Jacobsen: Hi.

Female: Hi, it's interesting. I didn't really get – how many domain names can they have, as many as they want?

EN

Isak Jacobsen: Yes.

Female: Yes, but they have to define themselves in advance.

Isak Jacobsen: They have to –

Female: To identify themselves through a passport or – and then also to prove a right to the name?

Isak Jacobsen: Yes.

Female: Yes, okay. So how long time will the process take to give them the domain name?

Isak Jacobsen: It is a self-sort system, and it's prepaid, so if it's an A-application, you get it right away. But if it's on a B-application, where you can't prove the right to name, it takes one month.

Female: Okay, thank you.

Patricio Poblete: Okay, well thank you.

[Applause]

Patricio Poblete: Nominet presentation please, that's Nominet Singapore.   Next
                           person.   Our next presentation is from .uk about the new policy
                           process by Alex Blowers.

Alex Blowers: Thank you very much. I appear to have two microphones which is
                           very exciting. So this is going to be rather different presentation
                           from the very interesting presentations that we've just had, and it
                           really focuses on one particular thing which Nominet is doing
                           which we've had some interesting questions from members of the
                           community, and we thought this would be a good opportunity just
                           to update you.

                           The background to this is that for some time Nominet has been
                           thinking about how we can most effectively make policy for the
                           .uk space in a way that takes into account the interests of the
                           broader community at large. And in particular make sure that we
                           reflect the public interest in our decision-making.

                           Last year the Board took a decision to reformulate the way that we
                           make policy and this came about at the same time as a change in
                           the Constitution of Nominet to include an explicit commitment to

EN

take the public interest into account in all our decision-making and indeed as this slide says, put the public interest at the heart of what we do.

So the process is intended to deliver a number of things, but I just want to highlight one of the key points on this slide really, which is, it's critically important for us that we maintain a high standard of self-regulation and independence in the way that we take decisions.

The question of how this space operates remains an issue that's under political scrutiny in the UK as it is in many countries. There is a strong goodwill towards the idea of self-regulation, but I think it is definitely necessary now to show that we are a relevant organization that can continue to evolve the way that we do business in a rapidly changing environment.

I'm not going to talk through every step of the process, because I think that would probably be slighted tedious for you, but I want to highlight three things about the new process, and in particular the fact that anybody – any stakeholder can bring to us now an issue for consideration in our policy process, and so this is a very, very open process. And anybody who believes that they have a stake in what we do and in the .uk space, can come to us and say there's an issue they would like us to consider.

What that then leads to is the development of an issue brief that we will share with as wide a range of stakeholders as we can reasonably get to, and we form an issue group with those

stakeholders, which in turn we hope then generates useful recommendations for the Nominet Board to consider. So that's a kind of super concise version of the process.

Now when you launch a new process of any kind, obviously the first thing that you want to have some really easy, early cases or quick wins; you don't want to have to deal with anything really difficult. Unfortunately, in an open process where anybody can bring issues, anybody can initiate a discussion, you can't necessarily choose the issues that you're going to be confronted with, and actually two of the things that have already come onto the – come into this process are quite difficult and quite controversial.

One of these is how should we work with the law enforcement authorities in the United Kingdom in those cases where they've identified that domain names are being used, associated with criminal activities of various different kinds. What should Nominet's role be when such cases are brought to our attention by law enforcement authorities?

That's proven to be a very interesting and actually quite controversial question for a whole variety of reasons which will be probably be clear to many of you, not least that the – there is a – I think a very wide range of criminal activities potentially caught within this ranging from civil abuses right through to very, very serious criminal cases, and the question of how we should prioritize and focus.

But also critically how a process that we manage interacts with the rights of individuals who may be subjected to this process including the human rights, their rights to a fair hearing, their rights to freedom of expression, et cetera. So trying to build consensus around the right way forward on that is certainly going to be a challenging issue.

Perhaps less obviously controversial for the community at large is the second issue which is around what policies we should adopt and processes when we get to the end of the life of a domain name registration, but actually very controversial within the industry, and one of the things that's become clear is that the different parts of the industry that perhaps have different business practices in relation to what happens at the end of the life of a domain name registration, would really like to have a debate about almost the ethics of some of those practices.

So one of the big challenges here has been to reach out to people who probably don't even know that any of this really has potentially affected them and we're doing a lot to try and bring in stakeholders particularly from the business communities, small and medium sized businesses, who are really affected by this, but may not actually realize that, and a lot of work is going into that. We hold a public forum which is very well attended, and we really see that as an important complimentary part of this process.

And really finally just to conclude going back to where I started about the degree of scrutiny to which what we do in this space, what Nominet does in the UK but I think generally what all of us

do in this space and the question of are we entitled to self-regulate; I can say that we have had very, very positive reaction from all stakeholders, including political stakeholders to the efforts that we're making with this new policy process to be more inclusive, more open, and to take issues genuinely – on their merits that are raised by any parts of our stakeholder community.

So early days, we'll see where we get to with some of these challenging questions that have been identified, but at the moment we feel this has been a very positive step forward for Nominet and a good example of trying to adopt a multi stakeholder approach at a national level. Thank you.

[Applause]

Patricio Poblete: Questions.

Roelof Meijer: Yes, thank you, Roelof Meijer from .nl. I take it that during the development of policy on a certain issue, that you have both online and offline sessions with stakeholders. Do you formulate a proposal on certain subjects of for instance on your taking down domains that are invoking criminal activities, do you have a proposal that you put forward and that can then be amended. Or do you have an open question, and you take in proposals and then choose a solution?

Alex Blowers:	So that's a very good and very interesting question. The way that this works is that anybody can bring a proposal to us, but we – we reserve the right to do two things with the proposal. First of all, to make sure that it actually is relevant to what we do in the .uk space. So it's not about some really highly interesting question, but actually nothing to do with what Nominet does. And I think that's an important kind of check in the process.

There's a quite considerable appetite actually for any kind of forum where issues around internet governance in its broadest sense can be discussed. So we have to bit careful about making sure that we don't end up dealing with issues that really are jolly interesting but nothing that we really have any right to take a view on, if you will.

The second thing though is that we reserve the right to take an issue that's been brought to us, and package that in a way that we think reflects the issue in the broadest sense, and brings all of the relevant parts of the debate into play.

So for instance the issue on domain name expiring it was originally brought to us as a proposal about could we discuss a specific – a specific end of domain life practice called expired domain name tasting, and we were really being asked to comment on that particular business practice and we said well, that's not probably not an appropriate approach, it will be better to look at the issues in the round more broadly, so that we can take a more balanced

approach. And not if you like being asked to comment on the – the ethical nature of one particular business practice.

So we have to kind of get our balance right, but the important thing is that anybody can bring the issues to us in the first place.

Roelof Meijer: Bear with me, please, just a slight clarification. Do you use the process also for issues that arise within your own organization? Or is it only a procedure where stakeholders bring issues to you?

Alex Blowers: Well, I think going back to where we started from, the important part of this certainly in the initial phase is to make sure that there is a place where others can bring issues to us and we can then take that forward.

My own view is it would be perfectly reasonable and acceptable to Nominet itself to identify issues that we believe should go through the same process. I don't see any reason why we wouldn't want to do that, but in a sense if you start a process, and the whole value of it is that other people can bring issues to you and ask you to look at them, it's probably not a great place to start if you then then say, and by the way we think the first six questions that we'd like you to bring to us are the following, this kind of a timing issue there I guess.

Female:	Hello, Albert Daniels from .lc is following remotely and he has a question; what has been the involvement of government in this new approach to policy formulation, similar to ICANN or direct involvement?
Alex Blowers:	Yes, that's a very good question. We – one point that I skated over quite quickly in the presentation was that we have something called the stakeholder committee, who advises – advise and guide us in this process. Exactly how that advice and guidance will work over time, I think remains to be seen, but that is a place where very explicitly government can participate and can give us advice and guidance through the stakeholder committee. So we like everybody in this multi-stakeholder model, we are conscious of the need to take government's legitimate interest into account here, but they are a stakeholder in the process, not as it would be stakeholder in the process. I hope that answers the question.
Patricio Poblete:	Okay, just one more question.
Female:	Just a short question, Alex. Do you weigh the things – the answers you get in in some particular way, or do you do that decision yourself afterwards?

Alex Blowers:	Yes, so I think one of the important points about this is that what we're not doing is we're not removing the discretion of the Nominet Board to take its own informed view of the right way forward. So recommendations can be made by an issue group, we are aiming for consensus, that word that always comes up when we're talking about multi-stakeholder model, and we're aiming for consensus recommendations.
	I think if there is a consensus recommendation the Board would take that very, very seriously in its decision-making, but ultimately Nominet reserves the right – and the Nominet Board reserves the right to take a view of what is the right way forward. I think that has to be the approach in the final analysis.
Patricio Poblete:	Okay, thank you again.

[Applause]

Patricio Poblete:	Next we'll hear from .cd, Chris Tschimanga will present about the .cd prospective, Bringing Back its Value Where it Belongs.
Chris Tschimanga:	Thank you very much. Well, I just want to give a bit of an idea of how we planning to strategize and plan to restore our image.

We recently got our re-delegation, and the way… Obviously the history also play quite a big part where like in 2005, we were about 15,000, we had 15,000 domain names, and in 2007 – 2006 we went down to less than 1,000. And so we looking at basically to restore the image, and looking at also the needs within the country. We still believe that the .cd and the meaningful of our domain we got a failure to get it back to where it belongs.

Just so starting up, I just want to give a bit of an idea of where the DRC is located is in the central of the continent. And the population basically we about 60,000,000, and being – having nine countries around us, we still – looking at the .cd in the music industry and the role that our country play basically in all surrounding country, the music industry and the CD, it's quite in demand I should say. So this is basically where we look at it, and we got it on a certain period where like the infrastructure, which had been going on within the country, the fiber has already been established and has been tested, and we still think that now that the connectivity issue that we had in the past will actually assist us a lot in terms of boosting our numbers and ensuring that the .cd get really promoted very well.

And other indicator that the re-delegation that started probably in about – since 2001 and we only got it in this year in February, and at this stage, we got 3,600 names, and we now planning objectively to – to establish a new organization for the .cd, so that we can relaunch, and we just start on that basis.

So we intend like to perform the organizational – developmental to better administrate and effectively manage our .cd and name space, and we also looking at building the confidence and regain the credibility of the .cd. We are a proper go to market plan. We also think that we can reestablish the image as a premium via the promotional effort and aggressively grow the name space, just before the launch of the new gTLDs, because we understand that on the market, there also a few – a new gTLD which might come also on the Board, like a .music, which might also – well impact on the plan. So we want to launch and ensure that you know before that we – we turn the image of the .cd.

And we're also looking at basically lowering the price, because we understand that at this stage, that few register who are selling our domain to a price where it goes up to $250 US, $280 US per name and – which is quite expensive. And we really looking at lowering the price, so that we – it can be affordable to all.

So some of the key factor that we think how we can achieve that is you know bringing the trust so as I indicated that we trying to – we're planning to minimize the transitional – the transition and we also looking at basically to do some exercise on the organizational development, and also to refine existing policies and practices.

And in terms of our nexts, we're looking at changing the brand, the previous brand that we had with our previous manager of .cd, and also looking at aggressively going to advertisement and also to look in also under endorsement with a couple of good registrar who are well known.

And under affordability, as I've indicated the price, we really looking at going, because on the wholesale price, we're looking at $35 US, which is still quite expensive, we really want to make sure that we can lower in the price so at least the registrar who are still selling it to about 300 or 250 or around that can also – can also lowering that and basically we're looking at growing that in numbers.

Accessibility is also important to us, because the website, the way we need to ensure that when people are registering they don't really have more an exercise in terms of response time, and also ensuring that we also using international more like others on ccTLD in the market.

And on time to market obviously before the new gTLD, because we quite also concerning that when the new gTLD launch, we do not want to be in a position of where like this few competitors and we and the .cd might actually lose its branding.

And in conclusion, so we definitively think that we can achieve that, and within the region and locally with infrastructure and as well as looking at a few other – looking at the number that we've got of the population, because understand that talking to some of the colleague one for the Jordan, where the population is 6,000 and they managed to double there in terms of the number of the domains going to – they're 6,000,000 and they doubled the level of the domain to 12,000,000. So it's quite inspirational for that to our side to looking at how we can achieve such goal.

And so we intend to promote locally and we intend to promote also internationally on the music industry, as well as local diplomatic and seeing on how we then can achieve that. So basically, this more or less how we intend to achieve that and to rebrand our ccTLD and ensuring that you know in the market we can still get the value of it. Thank you.

Patricio Poblete: Thank you.

[Applause]

Patricio Poblete: And now time for some questions, there's one over there.

Eberhard Lisse: Eberhard Lisse from .na. What registry software are you using or what backend are you using, or are you outsourcing, or are you doing it yourself, and what happened, and where?

Chris Tshimanga: Yes, at the moment, we getting good service from registry ISP which is from Malaysia and on the long run with the training and we intend to also ensuring that the training and the capacity building will be done. But we believe at this point in time running it from registrars be going forward in terms of minimizing the

transitional, it's basically done on the registry, so although we do still… Okay, that's basically it, yes, that we're running from registrars.

Patricio Poblete: No more questions then. Okay, thank you.

[Applause]

Patricio Poblete: Australia, okay I guess we have time to switch. Okay next presentation is from Australia, Building Awareness for the .au ccTLD, Jack Simpson.

Jack Simpson: Thank you. Thank you very much for having me, Jack Simpson is my name. I'm the marketing communications manager at Ausregistry. I'm here to talk to you today about how we build awareness, or how we have built awareness for .au in – at a time when the industry has become – the ccTLD market is becoming quite competitive or about to become quite competitive.

Before I get going, au runs on a model based with a regulator which is out of – we are the appointed registry operator and we also operate a registrar channel as well.

So the challenge for au for us particularly this year is how do we generate broad reaching awareness for au, which is Australia's domain of course, in a time when the market is about to become extremely competitive with the introduction of new gTLDs.

At the start of this year, we set out to achieve this challenge through a communication strategy that's about highlighting the assets of au and its role in the events in Australia's digital economy, we needed to reinforce au's position as the domain name of choice for Australians. And we needed to reinforce au as a critical element of au, of Australia's internet infrastructure.

We were presented with a nice situation this year. We had two big milestones for au in 2011, in March we achieved the two millionth au registration, and in June we were celebrating its 25th year since delegation.

So the strategy, we went there and I think this is really important to touch on here is that when we're talking about a piece of technology, it's really, really important to build a so what factor into your community. So we set about to position au as a piece of technology and a national asset that was built on patriotism and ownership, and as a consequence we will build value through that, value through the product and being able to tap into patriotism of Australians.

So the message that we went out there wasn't that au was simply a domain name, it was – we set out to achieve that ever Australian is

part of .au, and the achievements of this year, is our achievement, not just the achievement of [ARIN AUS] registry.

So our approach to go to market this time around and all for this particular year was a joint approach between our and Ausregistry, how to set out to talk about policy regulation and registrar benefit, and Ausregistry was there to provide the messaging and support for technical infrastructure, stability and security of the au registry.

We choose our major discipline from a marketing perspective public relations, we thought we had a great story to tell this year. And we really wanted to go outside of the technology industry. We wanted to go to major daily press, print, and broadcast media. And we also had decided to celebrate 25 years of au that we would support this initiative with a gala event to reward the industry on the achievements of au.

Marketing 101. We're very fortunate here – we're very fortunate in Australia to have two very great domain name personalities in our country supporting au, one being Chris Disspain the CO of auDA and the other being Adrian Kinders, the CO of Ausregistry. So when you head to the media and you build a PR story around these two personalities, it's a fantastic thing and I guess they would say that they were doing my job for me, but it certainly made it lot easier for me to achieve, or in order to achieve.

I'm going to talk a little bit now about the two million names campaign which we ran in March of this year. The message that we decided to head out there and talk about to highlight their

achievement was that Aussies were driving au success, not Ausregistry or auDA, we want to make sure that the Australian community was aware of this achievement and they felt part of it.

We went out there with a massive PR campaign, we achieved some great results with that, you know in a market in Australia which is somewhat limited from a media point of view, we were able to achieve coverage in major daily newspapers, and we were also able to get some broadcast coverage with Adrian being featured on Sky Business News, which for us was quite a significant achievement. We think we got to three or four million people with this message and it was certainly a great achievement for us to move forward.

Results specifically, we're printed in 21 newspapers across the country we were published in 25 online news services, we were mentioned in more 7 radio broadcasts, reported by Network Ten Early News which is a broadcast [free to ware] channel in Australia, and obviously I mentioned Adrian's live interview with Sky Business News Channel.

Moving onto the celebration of .au's 25th year. There were two main components to this campaign. There was a gala birthday event rewarding the industry within Australia for their achievements within .au, and industry stakeholders we were specifically targeting where obviously out of Ausregistry our registrars, our technical partners and of course we had media involved in that particular event.

The event was supported with again a national PR campaign to build awareness for this achievement. So as I'm sure you can imagine the challenge from a marketing point of view, was to go out there and try and get two pieces of coverage for the same – essentially the same product within a period of three months.

The gala event featured 125 VIP attendees, it was really, really important that we built a theme into this that was relevant to not only the media, but to every Australian as well. So the theme that we chose to focus on was An Evening to Highlight the Role of Technology in the Advancement of our Society. And we held the event at the Melbourne Museum which fortunately had an exclusive tour of King Tutankhamen. So basically we wanted to be able to highlight the role of communication played in ancient society.

Here's some shots of the event, we had a great night, the – we were able to get some keynote speakers in there to really highlight the role au plays in Australia's digital economy, it was fantastic.

Supporting PR, this ran on the day of the event, Australia celebrates 25 years of its own domain name again calling back the personal nature of .au and the role that it plays in the Australia. Again, we were able to achieve mass press coverage with this – we even got on the front of our tabloid press, with an au Happy Birthday headline there.

auDA also ran supporting advertising which basically approached key leaders in Australian business and asked them to provide

testimonials for the .au domain. This is an education campaign that's running for six months and at the moment, it's in the market, and it's working wonders for us and for auDA.

There is also au campaign, 35 pieces of media coverage, radio interviews in Melbourne, Perth conducted by Chris Disspain, so again it was Chris and Adrian doing their thing and of course the six months advertising campaign that I mentioned before.

So I think even though I could certainly talk about this for a long time, the message and the moral that I want to go across here is that if we're able to build and position a ccTLD as a partner and a national assets, you will certainly go a long way to achieving broad reaching awareness. Thank you.

[Applause]

Patricio Poblete: Okay, questions. Yes.

Male: Chris and Adrian, is Chris an asset or a liability?

Jack Simpson: Chris is certainly an asset.

Patricio Poblete:	Any other questions?
Jack Simpson:	Thank you.
Patricio Poblete:	Okay, thank you.

[Applause]

Patricio Poblete:	Now we have the regional organization updates. So let us thank all our speakers of this part of the session again.

[Applause]

Patricio Poblete:	Now the regional organization that has become now part of this ccTLD new session, so let's hear what news they have. Okay, we'll begin with APTLD.
Jian Zhang:	Hello everybody, I'm Jian Zhang from the APTLD. You all know who we are, we're one of the original organizations in the AP region, so – but every regional organization has their own region

focus. So today I'm going to talk a little bit our recent activities in our region. You already heard a lot of updates from our members, .sg, .my, .au, you know you already got a rough idea what's going on in our region.

Our membership is still keep growing. So far we have 61 members in APTLD, also we regular have three meetings a year, ever since last ICANN we didn't have our member meeting, formal member meeting, but we do have many meeting in the Pacific, in New Caledonia in April, so probably – so I'm going to particularly talk a little bit about that Pacific meeting.

It's a combined meeting with Pacific IGF, although you know it's quite hard for everybody to reach there, still it's well-attended. More than 40 people in the workshop representing 13 ccTLDs most from Pacific region, Peter Thrush Dengate was there, Chris Disspain was there, of course Keith was there, so it was quite a well-attended.

The topic has been discussed during that workshop, it's like different ccTLDs running in different models, DNSSEC and the security, IPv6 enablement for ccTLDs, new gTLD impact on ccTLDs, delegation, re-delegation issues, how to promote your ccTLD either as a national entity or some commercial – with some commercial values as .tv, .cc.

Also a particular – a particular topic has been discussed during that meeting cost of internet access in Pacific. Because for some small islands as there is still you know – that's still an issue, the cost of

internet. We also have very good feedback from the local ccTLDs, local ccTLD gave a rundown on a certain topics, like the registry running model is already assigned in-house or outsourced, or what kind of relationship registry has with governments, with local internet community; how the policy is set up, or your registry IPv6 enabled, DNS enabled? So actually we got better idea local ccTLDs you know in Pacific Islands.

For example, like the delegation re-delegation issue that was quite an issue in the region, because in early years, some ccTLDs on Pacific Islands, they outsourced or contract their ccTLDs to third parties, but in recent years they realized that national identity, also that's something you know [sovereignty] regarded. So they try to you know get it back, also with more and more government wants to get involved, so that's quite an issue there. Some of ccTLDs there even has gone through the delegation re-delegation process.

So that's actually that's something you know really nice for us to know. We know what their local issues are and you know how we could help on that. I already heard you know there's some – probably some concerns in other regions too, right.

Also IDN ccTLD the first 24 – 27 IDN ccTLD delegated are from our AP region, so we're – there is a hot topic in our region. We're participating strongly in IDN policy development, like IDN cc PDP, IDN cc PDP 2, as you already heard its update, earlier this morning, the GAC IDN Working Group and the way IP projects conducted by ICANN staff.

We are closely collaborating with other international forums, particularly other regional organizations, like CENTR, there is some initiative – the initiative has been started between regional organizations like website we run. Thanks, Peter, for helping us on that, and also like the data, the status data sharing project we just now started to work on that. Oh by the way, we conducted some ccTLD maps on behalf of regional organizations, the max are committee .Asia booth, so feel free to stop by to pick up that map.

The challenges I had – we're facing, IDN ccTLD has been the key driven force for APTLD over recent years, so we've been thinking what is going to be the next. Maintaining on the gross – growing membership is still a challenge for us, especially you know our very diversified region also with you know big scope of our region is quite a job for me.

And the membership types and fees, especially with IDN ccTLD introduced, we are facing the same issue as now ccNSO, like what you already heard this morning, IDN Working Group 2 update, and now we're facing the same issue of membership – IDN membership and the voting and the fees, that's still under discussion, also the developing strategy for compelling more engagement in international forums. That's pretty much it for me. Thank you.

[Applause]

Patricio Poblete:	Any question for APTLD. Okay, Peter.
Peter Van Roste:	Hi, good morning everyone. My name is Peter Van Roste, General Manager for CENTR, CENTR is the European organization for ccTLDs. We have about 50 members, and we're based in Brussels.

What I wanted to do today, just take you through two of the issues that we've been discussing since the last ICANN meeting, they might be of interest to you, they might be in particular interest to some of the things that we could be doing with the ccNSO in the future.

The first one is a quick overview of a survey we did in the margin of the IANA Notice of Inquiry. So we asked our members what they actually thought about IANA, we asked them to put their specific timelines and statistics on the way that they – they received their service from IANA. We used that information then later on, obviously to – to put more flesh to the bone to our response to the NOI.

And the second thing I wanted to touch on is the preparation for the IGF in Nairobi. We had a very healthy discussion at our last general assembly, basically asking ourselves the question, should we continue our involvement. And I think this is a topic that should definitely be on the agenda for maybe one of the next ccNSO meetings as well.

So just jumping into it, the survey was answered by I think 28 members, most of them answered all the questions. And we asked for a couple of things; the first thing we asked is the most important one, how long does it take you to get your name server changes approved and processed through the whole system. So how long does it take for them to appear?

21 members ended up with a timeframe of seven days or less. The more than 15 days was a very particular case, by the way, these slides are available online, so obviously I cannot expect you to see all the details. So that one case that took more than 14 days was the old one out, there were delegation issues related to that request. But so the large majority had seven days or less.

If we look to that a bit more in detail, and again apologies for the slides, but this is basically part of our response to the NTIA, out of those who responded seven days or more, only three felt that this was a reasonable timeframe, an acceptable timeframe as we named it. The others pointed out that the system needs improvement and later on in the details they were able to explain what in particular they felt should change.

The second question how long did it take to get any other changes, a very similar picture there; probably moving a bit to a longer deadline, obviously when there is no urgency, and what I mean other, when we say other changes, we mean names of the CEOs or company details or telephone numbers.

So and I'm jumping very quickly to the conclusion here, but how did that lead to their rating of this, what was the level of satisfaction with the IANA performance, and 16 of the 21 – I'm sorry, 28 were satisfied with the service; four were partially satisfied, no one indicated that they were not satisfied, and those that were not responding fell between partially and full satisfied, but they had some very specific requests that they wanted to see solved.

We asked then in detail again, slides available on the site, we asked them in detail on what could be improved in the communication, security and et cetera. So we highlighted the specific elements of the provisioning of the service, very quickly on communication, the obvious one at that time which is now kind of obsolete, is the E-IANA and web interface EPP, so an automation of the communication channels and the interface.

The other big one and worth highlighting was the security level. Most of my members found that there were significant gaps in the security of the communication channels. People asked for encrypted communication channels, email in particular, and a few technical solutions were suggested to solve that problem.

More in general, how could IANA improve its performance, one answer that's got repeated quite a few times was IANA should not take one week off between Christmas and New Year, that is kind of unacceptable. IANA's response to that is by the way there is always a help line available for those who really, really need it, but

it should probably be more general service level, even during holiday times in general.

Okay, so that was it for IANA. The next one IGF.

Why did we even ask that question? Well, within the central community, we've been participating now for five years in IGF, and we've seen that the interest to actually provide resources amongst our members, but also amongst other regional organization's members is rapidly declining. So we were asking whether it was still worth for us to put in all the effort and the resources, flying people to exotic places, setting up a booth, and spending the time there during the week to organize workshops, et cetera.

The answer in short is yes. It is worth it. It is worth it because especially at this point in time, IGF needs all the backup it can get, even if we don't see an immediate return on investments, it's still worth to participate. So we will continue our involvement, we will continue our involvement in two ways, we are coordinating activities amongst the regional organizations such as APTLD, LACTLD, and AFTLD to bring everybody together and organize a booth at IGF, and probably more relevantly we launched again a proposal for a workshop to be organized by the four regional organizations. The theme is – the title is Emerging Issues in the ccTLD Ecosystem, The Next Decade Challenges. We are obviously under the emerging issues theme at IGF, and the really good news is that yesterday, I received an email that our workshop is approved.

So now we start looking for speakers. If you're interested to participate in IGF and you think you have something to contribute to that forum, please contact your own regional organization, they will be very interested to hear your story.

One thing we will take in mind for the next IGF, is that we do need a broader outreach. Our community has probably, a bit naively focused too much on a very small group of attendants within IGF, and we should definitely broaden our perspective, and we are currently thinking about other initiatives that we could do in the margin of IGF whether there is a daily breakfast with ccTLDs where we invite say 10, 15 people every day, or something along those lines, that we'd reach out to governments, representatives from across the globe in a different way than just having them sit in a meeting room during our workshop.

And that's basically it. Thank you.

Patricio Poblete: Are there any questions?

Peter Van Roste: Okay, thanks.

Patricio Poblete: Thank you.

[Applause]

Lesley Cowley: Thank you Peter, thank you John and thank you Patricio for chairing that session. We're now shortly going to move to lunch. I'm not sure if we still have somebody from sgNIC to make any comments about their very kind sponsorship of the lunch. No, I thought I lost them earlier on.

Okay, so we'll move directly to lunch, and thank sgNIC when we see them later on. We have some instructions as to how to get to lunch, very important. So firstly on the way out of the door, Kristina will be handing out lunch tickets, this is a test of your navigation skills and memory.

So the lunch is at the Asian Market Café for which you need to go down to the second level from the main escalator, turn left via the Quest Salon, and go down that corridor to the Asian Market Café. Hopefully, I'll see you all there. I'll follow somebody who goes first. And we are back again at 2:00, please.

[Break]

Lesley Cowley: This is the panel discussion about the impact of new territory gTLDs on ccTLDs. And I'd like to pass over to Vika from .za who

has very kindly offered to Chair together with Keith Davidson from .nz who will be moderating this session. Thank you.

Vika Mpisane: Thank you Lesley. My name is Vika Mpisane from the .za domain. I will offer to stand as well in addition to chairing while I do the introduction, because I'm not too tall. I think this is better, get to see me a little bit clearer.

We are beginning upon a discussion on the impact of the gTLDs on ccTLDs and the vice versa. I think as an intro, I'll make just – I'll give a background to what informs this particular topic, to what we seek to achieve out of this panel discussion. It's a panel discussion, therefore what it means is that we are not making decisions, but we are seeking to be better informed as the ccs and as the community. Excuse my throat.

I think of particular importance is, we've all heard, we all saw, we announced it on Monday when the announcement went that the Board has now said let's go, let's all start running, when it comes to the new gTLDs. It's been a long coming work, the first decision in Paris in 2008, when the Board at the time decided that okay, let's start investigating this. We are certain now we will do it, so let's start the preparation process. And from there is now is a little more than three years, if not three years as such.

So we know that new gTLDs are going to be a reality, that is not doubted – that is not questionable at all. Now, we saw it in the past, if you were to go back and do a bit of a historical session,

look when we had your .info and the .biz when they came into play, that they're coming into play had some impact on ccTLDs. Some may argue it was positive impact, others may say it was a negative impact. Overall, I would probably say it was still a good impact, because they forced the ccTLDs substantially to forecast on committing better.

Now the question then is what will be the impact of these new gTLDs that we will see as from next year, around this time, or maybe later next year entering the market. The fact of the matter is not all the new gTLDs really may affect the ccTLDs and not all the – not all the new gTLDs may affect us directly. They will become by now a brand specific gTLDs, maybe they impact, maybe really minimum when it comes to the ccTLDs and then to other gTLDs, but they are certain specific kind of gTLDs, the geographic ones or the city gTLDs and maybe you can say cultural cTLDs. This will have to co-exist with ccTLDs in their regions and their countries.

Now the question then becomes one of the key questions, in fact you can sum them up in pretty much two broad areas, and this is what the panel will be looking at today. The one aspect is on the marketing/end user aspect of these co-existing gTLDs. You have UK with its well-known co.uk and org.uk. If .Liverpool enters the market, if the .London enters the market, what does it mean to the end user, you know the small business guy who doesn't really understand much about this, he only understands that he needs a website, you know to be online. What potential impact will this have and how should that be managed?

Where it also at some point, but since you've got take down and did Zulu, and I'm from South Africa and there's Zulu people in South Africa. So there was a question of mind at .za what will be the likely impact of .Zulu on .za. You know what would be the likely impact of .Capetown on .za. What would be the potential confusion is there would be confusion, will it bring any benefit.

How do you manage in Germany, .de doing very well, the biggest ccTLD in terms of statistics. You have .Berlin entering the market, and when .Berlin comes into play and then I have a name, as an example, music .de, and now I have .Berlin, or I have .Hamburg. And then suddenly there is music .Berlin. Music .Hamburg. You know the potential confusion in light of the fact that those names may well be owned by different people, in fact may be registered by different people. So there is this huge marketing aspect that we'll cover today.

And then there is the governance aspect. That is even more interesting. If when we're preparing for this as the program working group, with involvement of the Chair and Keith and Byron at some point, whilst we're still forming this up and conceptualizing it nicely, then NORID happened, you know and came up with a very interesting document that is going to aid us in understanding or in – getting into an in depth discussion of today. Because the knowledge report brings the governance aspect, the regulatory aspect, you know.

What are the potential regulatory issues when there is .London in addition to .UK? .London belongs to ICANN, it's a gTLD, but its

serving and is a name under the UK government. Shouldn't the UK government have a say and should the US and the UK government have a similar say over .London as in .uk? What's the correlationship and should they be managed?

So that's basically where this whole discussion comes from. We are not making decisions, but as a community, let us always be known for sharing information, that has always been known for sharing best practices. We are looking at this matter from a best practice and knowledge sharing point of view.

At the end of this, we will then see if there are any imaginations that could be worth further exploration, where the next meetings, or maybe in between ccTLDs and gTLDs. It's of particular importance to emphasize this that the purpose or the point of departure behind this discussion is that some of the gTLDs will coexist the TLDs. We do not approach this from an angle at all that may intimate that a new – I mean that the ccTLDs may be thinking of new geographical, cultural ccTLDs as being antagonistic as ordered. No, that's not the purpose. ccTLDs have always been exposed to interpretation, the paperwork is just to understand the potential impact and the relationship, how should these two co-exist.

We then get at the panel, and we have our panel you see, on the table. I believe we'll get all of them to introduce themselves, one by one, probably all of them we know. If you don't know all of them, maybe it's just one or two. We know all of them, but they will introduce themselves.

And I will get to sit down, because from here on once, Keith Davidson, he will be responsible as the moderator. He will be asking questions that this panel must – this panelist must answer. In addition to that you'll be giving you guys on the floor to ask questions. This will be very much open. So let us get the ball to roll. Thanks, Keith.

Keith Davidson: Thank you very much, Vika. And as opposed to Vika, I might remain seated because I'm not nearly as good looking as he is.

Okay, what we're going to do is firstly have a presentation from the government of Norway and .no on just doing a further elaboration for those who were in the GAC ccNSO session this morning, about what Norway's done to develop a model.

And Ornulf thank you very much for taking time out from the GAC to be here, and I understand you probably can't be here for the entire hour and a half session, so after the presentation, I understand you may have to return to the GAC. So this is the scene stealer and the sole presentation for today.

So I think we'll get under way and then after the presentation, we'll open the floor to questions and introductions from the rest of the panel. I think Olivier from ALAC is not here yet, and he did say that he was committed to about 2:30, so he'll come and join us later. So I'll save the introductions till then, but can I hand over to Annebeth to introduce the topic. Thank you.

Annebeth Lange:	Thank you, welcome back from lunch, those of you who are here. I just wanted to say first that it's not Norway's report. We have been a member of the working group, and it's a government report. When we made the government, and the GAC representation from Norway's side tried to tell the Ministry in Norway that this will come, and you have to be prepared. And that's more than two years ago.
	So then they sat down a working group and the responsibility was given to Ornulf's agency, so they took this into consideration and got a lot of the different people from the internet community to join. So that's it. So Ornulf, I give over to you, Ornulf Storm from the Norwegian Agency of Telecommunication. So he will present the report a little more thoroughly than we did this morning, and I will add with some aspect from the registry's point of view.
Ornulf Storm:	Thank you very much Annebeth, and as Annebeth said, I'm from the Norwegian regulator and also we represent Norway in the governmental advisory committee. I have to do to get the – up on the screen, the presentation, but as Annebeth said it's – we had participants from – well, internet community in that respect, we had a law professor like we had the ccTLD, we had representation from the Norwegian property office, and also for – from businesses consumer protection agency.

And of course as Annebeth said that we wanted to be proactive and be prepared for what is coming and therefore the Ministry then established this working group. And the mandate is sort of broadly covered by the bullet points here. It's to firstly assess the desire and need for a new geographical TLD which could have a national importance.

As we know it has been working in the – in the GAC, we have been very much occupied by the geographical names as we see this as a sovereignty issue and it is quite important for us to have control over national geographical names. So that is very much the reason for why we have been very interested in this. And therefore, so we regard this as a public resource in light with other resources that we manage.

We were in the working group going to review assignment procedures for how to select, if there were more applicants, et cetera, so that was also one of the – the tasks that we were going to do. And also then if we're going to allow this, what requirements wanted we to put on registry of this type, and also are we, as a government going to then develop standardized procedures for providing support on an objection, according to the guidebook.

And as an overall we were tasked to then propose a management model for handling this kind of applications. And then also we were tasked to then propose any changes in legislation in Norway covering these aspects.

The main conclusions, I will just briefly go into this, and of course it can be read thoroughly, it is more covered in the report, but we had a long discussion on the desire and need and one of the – the conclusions we came to was that it was not then sort of eminent need for this kind of top level domain in Norway, we had a look at the Norwegian domain name market and we saw that currently the Norwegian ccTLD .no currently is serving the Norwegian market very well.

So there are no urgent need or requirement for this kind of TLD, and therefore the conclusions we made that this kind of TLD would then – should then give an added value to the domain name market if we wanted to allow this to be included into the root. And a new kind of innovation, new ways of using domain names or other IDs that could add more than just pure competition.

And we also then ended up with several conditions, which we would put on a registry if we wanted to allow this to happen in Norway, which I will come back to in more detail. And also that's together with the conditions we want to do the letter of support et cetera, would then – and changes to legislation would then define a management model, and also we then recommended what kind of assignment procedure and selection method we would like to have in Norway.

I mentioned a little bit of this. It is what we as – based on the conclusions or evaluation of the Norwegian market that we made this kind of conclusions. The Norwegian businesses are very – are

using – heavily using .no in addition to also .com. But the main preferred domain name is .no for Norwegian users, businesses.

And of course as we also said it will be difficult to predict and of course, if like other countries would then make use of their capital city names that could of course influence the Norwegian market in the respect that it would be more desirable to also allow and implement like for example the capital of Norway .Oslo. So that would also – possibilities were to affect and influence the Norwegian market.

We also came to the conclusion that in addition to have legislation amended, because currently we have a regulation on domain names in Norway, just it's a framework regulations, it's not detailed but it's a framework regulation, and therefore we also have – made some proposals for amended that to include geographic top level domains in – to be covered by that regulation.

But in addition to that, we recommended to have a separate private law agreement with a registry for Norwegian top level domain and that – and of course quite importantly in that agreement, we must have as we saw it clauses in there that the agreement must be interpreted according to Norwegian law, so that would be under the Norwegian jurisdiction to sort out any conflicts.

And also regarding to – for protection of consumers, it will be very important to have clear procedures for example if the registry is going to be phased out, if they go bankrupt and so on for a certain period to stay up for the protection of consumers, and also relevant

issues identified is for financial strength and stability and things like that.

And of course since we wanted to post conditions on the registry, it would also be utmost importance of being able to – be able to exercise those in case of any disputes. And therefore, as it is now in the guidebook, a possibility in case of disputes with that government providing a letter of support, ICANN will then comply with a court decision that has been made according to such a dispute. So that enables the governments to provide to said conditions and be able to – to exercise those rights.

So basically to summarize the management model, the framework, would be to have amending the regulation to include this kind of public resource and also have this contract with a set of conditions for the registry and – and basically this forms this sort of three way relationship that we as a government has a contract with the registry and also of course ICANN has a contract with the registry, but the requirements the Norwegian government has put on the registry will be enforced by a private law contract, according to also what ICANN has complied – well, will comply with in case of any disputes.

And one other thing we also then of course looked at was how to then make a selection. If there are more than one and what sort of barrier or bar should you place basic requirements for? Are we going to just give to anyone that wanted to apply, or do we want to set any sort of main, sort of requirements, and sort of skills and so on for the entity that want this.

And we then had different sort of first come, first serve basis or how to then select and we ended up with what we call the beauty contest so basically to have an open announcement to the market and invite interested parties to them sort of made an application and of course in this announcement it would be sort of a basic requirement that we would – we wanted them to be able to cover and then enter into negotiations for how we can then set the detailed requirements that we want to have to regulate in a contract.

So basically that sort of summarizes some of the conclusions that we made in the report. And of course then it's – then the next thing is if we're going to allow it or not and so on, and that's probably a national – well, it is a national decision of course, and then based on the different circumstances and different markets, you have in the different countries, and then of course you have different relationships between the existing ccTLDs and the governments in the different countries. And that of course could also influence and affect the – the decisions taken.

So I think I'll give the floor to Annebeth and say a little bit more about this possible impact. Thank you.

Annebeth Lange: What we know is that the government has the – has been given through this applicant guidebook the possibility to give support or a non-objection. And in my view if I decide in a country to give a non-objection, that's the same as more or less to say go ahead. But

if you give support, you should give some kind of – of criteria as a percentage. So whether these are heavy restrictions on the one that wants a geo TLD in a country or not, that will in my view decide whether it's too much impact on the existing ccTLD that will differ from country to country and on what criteria the government decides to set.

But there are things that can happen, is it's in consumer confusion, it can be difficult for someone in a country to understand that if you register under .no, then a certain set of rules apply and you know them, you know everything about .no, and your existing cc and then it comes another geographical, that seems to be national in a way, and you – most users might expect that this is approximately the same rules. This goes for the registrars, they are used to – you can use all the registrars in the county, at least in Norway, we have an obligation in the framework to use all the Norwegian registrars and in Norway we have two ICANN accredited registrars so that inflict the market if ICANN impresses on to say that it's only ICANN accredited registrars that's allowed to register gTLDs, even if it's a geo.

What about the dispute resolution? In a way we have a very good Norwegian dispute resolution that functions very well for .no disputes and I think it will complicate things if there's someone for example had a domain name under no, and then another one took it under .Oslo, it could easily be two companies that can be in parallel, but it can also be that the one under no wanted to fight that .Oslo and domain. And if he then had to go to the UDRP, it's

objectionable I think that's proposed for – for the new gTLDs, instead of go to the Norwegian ADR, when you can write in Norwegian, it's very quick, it's reasonable and it will give you decision much easier.

So whether it's a competition for the cc or not, that will – it depends on the rules I think, but it can also be a kind of an – new – new incitement, no. Yes, what I wanted to say was a new way to find that you have competitors, so you have to do it even better, what you do today, you have to prove –

Male: Incentive.

Annebeth Lange: Incentive, that's the word, to do things even better than you do and to try to get the customers to go to the safe secure one that they know what to have and they don't know what they will get. So we'll see how it develops, thank you.

Keith Davidson: Thank you very much to both of you for that presentation. And I think there is some really important points here. Firstly, Norway has been through this process and decided these are appropriate rule for Norway, and I think it's the process by which they got there by having a multi-stakeholder in country group, you know which is rather strange for a government in some parts of the world to do, but a true engagement in a multi-stakeholder model that

comes up within a principle-based framework, and then you've determined what your appropriate policies are.

But I think the use of this particular model is if any country or any prospective registrant of a new – oh, sorry, registry for a new gTLD goes through the principle framework, it answers many of the likely issues that will arise through the process. So a government can simply go through and say you said no to the principles and then shake it, and out will fall that government's particular position on this. So it is very interesting. And thank you very much.

Annebeth Lange: You've given the link, haven't you?

Keith Davidson: Yes, yes. So I think without sort of looking at anything – any of the decisions that Norway have made specifically, are there any questions about the model or the structure? Any general questions? If not, oh Vika.

Vika Mpisane: Yes, just a quick one. As all of us present about a requirement for Norwegian gTLDs to comply with Norwegian law which in itself tends to overlap with the requirement to comply with the different framework is that ICANN is California based, and have you had that in mind? Do you have any pre-supposition that list of how they could be reconciled?

Singapore
no.41
19-24 June
ICANN
2011

Ornulf Storm: Well, yes, that's of course could pose a problem like the requirements post on the ICANN registry agreement, if that would then conflict with the Norwegian law and that is something we have to look into the detail, if this case happens like with consumer protection or intellectual property or other laws.

And then of course also if we are – have to waiver any Norwegian laws or clauses in laws, then we have to say if there are any exempt clauses in those laws or if it's actually – if it's possible at all to exempt from certain regulations in Norway, but that we have to investigate in – when the times come in detail.

But that might happen that there's a conflict of law and if we are not possibility for making an exemption as a government entity making a contract, then it will be not legal for us to enter into such a contract. So therefore we have to look at that in detail, but that is of course a possible conflict area.

And that's also what we have thought about that of course, according to ICANN in Articles of Incorporation, they should respect local law. So maybe can renegotiate and change in the registry agreement based on that, the registry applicant will not get a letter of support unless they have amended slightly or in certain areas. So that also will be interesting to see if that also would be possible or not.

Keith Davidson: Steven –

Steven Drake: Steven Drake, .as. Is there any additional material above and beyond the slide set available on this, and if so, where?

Ornulf Storm: The presentation if it's not already on the ccNSO agenda page as a link it will be shortly, and there is a hard copy here and there is a link on the GAC ccNSO slide from this morning to the same report, and it's in English.

Keith Davidson: Okay, any further questions or comments?

Dennis Jennings: Dennis Jennings, I'm here wearing my .Irish hat rather than other of my many hats and affiliations. But my question is to follow up – I like the framework, I think it's very well thought through, and I think it will be very useful for – certainly for other European countries. But the jurisdictional considerations, I'm interesting in exploring what if the TLD is outside the jurisdiction, and while it may be approved early in its life cycle, what happens being outside the jurisdiction if then becomes a rogue TLD, have you thought about the implications for that and how that might be addressed?

Ornulf Storm:	Well, and of course the jurisdiction thing is then of course with the separate agreement we will then make with the registry will then make sure that they have a presence, local presence in Norway, so that they are under the Norwegian jurisdiction and Norwegian law.
	And of course if they move out of the country and then violates the contract terms, we will make then – we can take that violation to court and have a court decision on that, and then we can have a re-delegation, according to the post-delegation disputes rules that are now in the applicant guidebook. So that's – we can enforce then if they violate the contract terms in any way, we can also up – well, at the most sort of extreme measure to make a re-delegation, take it out of the root or move it to someone else.
Keith Davidson:	Thank you, and I think we need a final question for this particular session, because we need head under panel discussion but Sabine.
Sabine Dolderer:	Yes, actually I have a follow up for Dennis' question and the question you just answered. I do know that Norway is not a member of the European Commission, but its affiliated to some extent and therefore within the European area, there is a free market requirement which means that there is a sort of – I'm not sure if it's really happened for Norway, but I think the question is do you have – thought about that is –

Annebeth Lange: Yes, I know that and what we experience in Norway is that when it's a kind of obligation, then it's irrelevant, if it's something that we can gain, then it's not. So when we try to get into .eu, they said no, you're not part of the Union. So we keep .no and things for ourselves, so far. But of course I understand but it might be a problem, but then at least you can say that it should be within the European area. So that's up to every country how they will do. Like I say, within Africa, within Asia whatever. So a lot of problem might arise later, I agree.

Keith Davidson: Okay, thank you and I think it's time that we said our thank you's to Norway for the very interesting presentation, and your model fascinates me as you can tell, and I think you've shown some genuine thought leadership in this regard. And I think we will all get to appreciate this as we get down to levels of detail and certainly Annebeth is freely available to the ccNSO members and freely willing to talk about this.

So can – because Ornulf is likely to leave us, can we record our appreciation to Norway now, thank you very much.

[Applause]

Keith Davidson: And moving along, can I now each of the panelists to introduce themselves, firstly by name, secondly by whether they're a

prospective or an existing TLD, and then thirdly whether they're a ccTLD or a gTLD. So well, Annebeth, you're staying, would you like to start.

Annebeth Lange: Well, you know me.

Keith Davidson: For the record.

Annebeth Lange: I'm Annebeth Lange and I'm of the legal section and policy in Norway, Norwegian registry.

Dirk Krischenowski: I'm Dirk Krischenowski, founder and managing director of .Berlin, the initiative for all Berliners, and what was the last part I need to say?

Keith Davidson: ccTLD –

Dirk Krischenowski: Oh, okay, geo TLD means gTLD in the ICANN legal framework.

EN

Sabine Dolderer: My name is Sabine Dolderer, I'm CEO of .DE, an existing ccTLD from Germany.

Dennis Jennings: My name is Dennis Jennings, I'm here as an advisor to the .Irish prospective TLD, and a possible Board member of – in fact, I've been invited to be a Board member and have agreed to be a Board member of the .Irish TLD company, when that is set up. I'm also having worn many hats, internet hats over the years, I was actually original founder of .ie and the .ie was run from UCD Computing Services for many years, while I was Director.

Fabien Betremieux: I am Fabien Betremieux, and to answer your question, I am both a cc and g and both a current and prospective TLD registry because at AFNIC I do registry services development, and as such I'm also the project manager for the consortium that will provide registry services to the city of Paris, .Paris. So I'm here both on behalf of the .FR and .Paris, although I will obviously not speak for the city of Paris, but in my capacity as a project manager on the registry site.

Edmon Chung: Everyone, this is Edmon Chung from .Asia, a gTLD, we are probably one of the first geo or territory gTLDs and maybe one of the first to actually open this Pandora's box, so I hope – we feel that we have had a positive experience in the Asia community and

happy to share the experience with this panel and in this discussion. Thank you.

Jonathan Shea: Good afternoon, everyone. I am Jonathan Shea from Hong Kong representing the .HK ccTLD.

Keith Davidson: Thank you and two places to my right, Olivier, just an introduction and you're not affiliated to a ccTLD or gTLD.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: That's right, Keith. I'm Olivier Crépin-Leblond, Chair of the At-Large Advisory Committee, and I am actually a gTLD and a ccTLD user.

Keith Davidson: Excellent, excellent, did you bring your wallet with you?

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: I'm afraid I'm absolutely skint at this time, so I might need applicant support.

Keith Davidson: Excellent. Okay, we've divided the discussion really into two discrete areas today, and the regulatory and policy development area, and then more a marketing area secondly, but as a first

question to the panel, and I don't think I'll require a compulsory answer from anyone, but I'll pose the question, and if you would like to respond, please do.

So in the regulatory regime in a case where there is national TLD legislation that potentially applies to the existing ccTLD, should the gTLD the geo gTLD be subject to the same law? And that's the challenge.

Dirk Krischenowski: That's a very good question. It depends on the legislation of the country. In Germany we are lucky to have a really business friendly legislation on top level domain names as it regards to gTLDs, as well as to ccTLDs and the law says that these TLDs should be operated in the private sector. And from the regulatory perspective, I wouldn't add anything else, any specifications or whatever to this, this – at least Germany looks like a very good legislation for – and a very good framework, and we have a – Sabine can tell you for sure, very good experience with having ccTLDs at least and hopefully also the geo TLDs in the future like .Bavaria or Berlin or Hamburg, in the same – managed like the ccTLDs.

Keith Davidson: Thank you. Just before we carry on, we were expecting David from .ie online, he is online, welcome, David. Do you want to just introduce yourself for the record.

David Curtin: Yes, hello everybody my name is David Curtin. I'm the Chief
                       Executive of ie domain registry, so I'm responsible for all aspects
                       of operation in the .ie name space.

Keith Davidson: And my apologies for omitting that along the way, David. And so
                       please feel free to somehow indicate to us if you'd like to speak on
                       any of these issues, thank you. Sabine.

David Curtin: Thank you, Keith.

Sabine Dolderer: Yes, according to your question should the gTLD – geo TLD
                       should be the same – should be the same legislation as the geo
                       supplied actually, sitting on the side of Dirk who actually feel to be
                       the founder of .Berlin, and speaking for all the 12 .Berlins in the
                       world, I'm not sure which local legislation you actually – which
                       law you actually – that should be because there are Berlins
                       obviously as I learned from Dirk Brazil and the US and where else.
                       So which of the 12 – maybe 12 of them should be used.

                       I think it's very important that it's known which law actually
                       applies. I'm not sure that it should be the law from what I think if
                       you look at Hannover, I think there is huge Hannover in the US,
                       and a huge Hannover in Germany. So I think there is a – it's a

very interesting question, but I think there is no unique answer for that.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: Olivier Crépin-Leblond for the record. I actually totally agree with this. In some countries the ccTLD is subjected to very stringent rules, some of which I mean that you need to have a company that is actually registered that has a Charter, et cetera, et cetera, and so I think you can't really say well, should we be using the same rules for the local names and the country codes as well. It depends on where you are.

Keith Davidson: Well, and an indication that no one size fits all I think. Annebeth.

Annebeth Lange: Yes, well I've already said what we do in Norway, but it depends on which country you're in of course, but one thing for the consumers' point of view is that you expect .com, everybody knows that .com, that's some global thing, it's American, and you know what you're buying or if you register a name under .com, that you would suspect that national name, whether it be a county or a city it would have more likeness with the ccTLD, so it's not – either way it could be somewhere in between, that some of the national rules could apply for the gTLD and some couldn't, some doesn't fit, and that's why the government in Norway tried to make two ways. Some of it can be used, and some of it can't, because of

– ICANN is a gTLD, and then you can supply it if you want with a contract.

Keith Davidson: I think also, am I right – is my memory right that under the ICANN rules that capital cities trump noncapital cities, so there's a pre-emptive right to any capital city name and so on, so you know and I think that sort of match of the problem that there are duplicated names across the territories, and I dare say most registry operators or prospective new gTLD operators will want to exploit the entire market that they can, so whether they may be based for one city and have some rules in that country and in some external rules, they can all apply.

So jurisdiction is important, and I guess the add-on to this question as if a geo gTLD is subject to a national top level domain legislation as the ccTLD is, how would you imagine that that regulatory framework could be reconciled with ICANN's regulatory framework itself? Is there any way reconciling the state of California, US corporation against local law? And we sort of had part of the answer to that from Norway, but just – does anyone want to brave enough to tackle that as an issue? Excellent, Dennis.

Dennis Jennings: Well, I'm not sure that I'm going to really answer that question, but I'll make an attempt, Dennis Jennings here for the record. I think that the Norwegian framework is a very interesting

framework for those that gTLDs that are clearly identified with the national territory and are appropriate there.

And a light regulatory touch such as in Ireland for the ccTLD for .ie would be appropriate for such gTLDs. But I also think that for the non-territorial gTLDs, I think that Ireland, just speaking for Ireland would be – I'm not speaking for Ireland or the Irish government, but just surmising for Ireland that the general thrust would be to try and create an environment, that is not only attractive for business as you know, probably know but the Irish economy is very largely dependent on foreign direct investment and multi-nationals locating in Ireland to serve the European market.

And I suspect that the Irish government will take the same view in relation to the domain name industry and try and create a very light regulatory framework that both encourages gTLDs to be based in Ireland, and provides a framework that provides some level of assurance, regulatory assurance that such gTLDs have an oversight framework that is in the interest of the consumers, that they're good gTLDs in some – in some sense, I would certainly expect that for .Irish.

Now .Irish is not a – it's not a geographic TLD, it's quite different. The intent is to serve the 70,000,000 to 100,000,000 people around the globe that if you ask them, you think of them in some way as Irish, no matter their race or religion or color or creed, they sort of have – you know they put on green on St. Patrick's Day, or they feel they're Irish.

So .Irish is trying to address that diaspora whereas and David can speak for .ie, .ie is the territorial type of ccTLD, and but I would expect that the Irish government, which I know is very supportive of .Irish in principle and in practice, will want a regulatory framework that while not as tight a country, territory, nevertheless provides some assurance that .Irish can be trusted. And I think that's the difference that we're going to see in countries like Ireland.

Keith Davidson: Thank you, that's an interesting observation. Edmon and then Sabine.

Edmon Chung: Thank you, Keith. I don't know whether this is you know is in response to directly your question, but hopefully our experience could contribute to the discussion. I guess generally I mean as a gTLD, .Asia is also sort of a macro region TLD. We are – we pay a lot of attention and are sensitive the national laws within the region and we observe that most of the – the laws, if there are, usually are very specific to the ccTLD and names the ccTLD in a way.

However, there are certain laws that I think are relevant overall. Especially where the jurisdiction within which the registry is operating, for example privacy laws, and that plays a lot into the WHOIS, and you know how the registry operates, so you know

that's certainly something that is – that is important for you know gTLDs and territory TLDs.

The other things are reserved names. This is one of the things that we run into, and there are – sometimes not necessarily laws, but at least you know within different jurisdictions, there are different views of reserved names, and I think as a territory, especially for us a macro region I should say, a sort of integrated or – an integral way of viewing it as probably important.

And I guess overall, you know some of the experience we had, for example, you know looking into law where we operate from Hong Kong, and also some of our registrars, because you know our registrars are also bound by their you know jurisdictions in terms of the privacy laws there, you know and the cyber laws and one of the good examples in the last couple of years, in terms of China and some of the changing requirements for operating registrar and you know their registry and you know those type – those type of – may not be laws, but at least industry guidelines that – that happen in different jurisdictions, when you talk about territorial TLD, that is cross border, I guess.

Keith Davidson: Thank you Edmon, that's quite a useful point. Sabine was next, but then I have Olivier and Annebeth.

Sabine Dolderer:	Actually I can make it very short, because Edmon takes a lot of my points I want to take. Every entity over here, every organization actually is naturally subject to the local law where they actually are residing. So and there is no exemptions because they have a contract with ICANN, whatsoever. So that that's basically a fact, so I think that is something we actually can constitute, so every geo gTLD wherever it is residing is subject to their local law.

And then the next question is what if – when local law is different from what actually the contracts with ICANN actually are – are supposed to be or with regulations coming from ICANN, and there is of course yes, there is of course interesting discussion material.

I know from registrars in Germany who – with a single registry – work with a single registry model for .net and .com where they actually are providing the WHOIS service, and were obviously worked currently under the contract with ICANN, they are supposed to publish with the WHOIS conditions are not – not allowed according to German privacy laws, the data protection laws, and where actually there is a conflict.

And I know that are discussions with ICANN, but and difficult discussions with ICANN, but – and I don't think there is a real solution yet. So there is not a real – I know from registrars who simply just publish because ICANN tells them unless nobody complains and others where they got complaints, they stopped it and followed the model we actually have implemented for our was because they think that's much – much more appropriate for the

German market, because we may actually have had the discussion with the German data protection offices already.

But there is – I think there is – there are a lot of open question which have to be addressed in that space, but I don't think that there's a question does local law apply? Of course it applies.

Keith Davidson: Okay, I have –

Dirk Krischenowski: As a geo gTLD applicant, we have already put 100,000 euros per year for the laws use and legal cases which we expect to come up with a geo TLD, with a ccTLD, many potential complaints or so might not happen because they are so powerful and have all the money, but with the geo TLDs, some parties might feel that they can give a new try to sue them on some points and some points which I'd like to highlight to be a little practical here, what comes with a contract of ICANN is for instance, as gTLD registry, we have to publish our – we have to give our zone file with all the data of the applicants to a hearing – yes, point at ICANN escrow service and people might – might get access to this.

This is not allowed in Germany and many other countries, they don't publish their complete zone file, this will for sure have some lawsuits in the future for this, or we have the point of which comes newest or latest guidebook, and that two letter codes have been excluded on gTLD applicant or registries have to – have to reserve

these two letter codes, and this is at a time when many ccTLDs and also gTLDs have recently released all one and two letter domain names. So there will be lawsuits for sure in this case in Germany.

So these are only two points and we see several other points coming up, there are – and there will be a legal challenge forum all the new gTLDs to take this into account and have enough money to go through all the legal costs.

Keith Davidson: Thank you back to our original speaking order, Oliver and then Annebeth and then I think we need to move on, unless anybody has anything. Olivier.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: Thank you very much, thank you very much, Keith. I want just to build on what Dennis Jennings has said. He mentioned .Irish can be trusted and he wishes .Irish to be trusted. I've just come out of a session on competition – metrics for competition consumer trust, and consumer choice. And of course, this whole issue of consumer trust was particularly important.

That workshop worked on metrics to try and find out whether consumer trust is there. It is a complex set of parameters, of course for users it means technical trust that the domain is going to be run properly. There is of course trust on the identity of registrants and also the stability of the registry with which they're

dealing with. And for registrants it's important for them that the registrar that they work with is also one that they can trust.

I think that when one looks at that really, the important thing is to make sure that consumer trust for a geo TLD is the same as the current country code TLD. If not, exceeds that. It's a minimum requirement, really. You don't want to have geo TLDs to be the poor child of country code TLDs, and it's something which should, as a community strive for. Thank you.

Keith Davidson: Thank you. Annebeth.

Annebeth Lange: Yes, just shortly, we can have situations where the government want to set some criteria for a TLD, according to their, not only the law, because then it's impossible, but if they want to make a contract that brings into – in some criteria that's in conflict with the registry contract between ICANN and the new gTLD then we might have the situation that they come with the support letter with these criteria, under these condition, you can have the .Oslo for example, and then ICANN say no, you can't have that, because we can't accept this and that.

So I expect that we can see situations like that, that the government on one side, the only way they can give it – want to introduce it in their own country, is under certain conditions and ICANN says no. So we'll see how that ends.

Keith Davidson: Fabien.

Fabien Betremieux: Yes, if I may contribute to this discussion, we've a picture of what is going on in France on this topic. The legal framework for TLD for domain names, let's say has been renewed recently and it excludes explicitly or it actually only includes ccTLDs that are named. So it doesn't cover gTLDs. But what happens in France is that geo TLDs at least the only that's public right now, .Paris is actually thought by an administrative authority the city of Paris.

So the city of Paris has a very strong incentive to – by itself reconcile the local – the legal framework of France, the laws of France with its obligations within the regime of the new gTLDs at ICANN. So that will not – that may not require legislation, but in practice by the policy choices of the city of Paris, there will be some kind of reconciliation done *de facto*.

And then the courts may also play a role down the line in case of specific litigation, it might refer to the legal framework in place even if it only covers ccTLDs, and applied to cases that would emerge in geo TLDs. So I just wanted to say that given what's happening in France, there may be a case for – actually there may not be a requirement for a priori reconciliation through legislation of these two frameworks.

Keith Davidson: Thank you, again that shows the rich tapestry of difference doesn't it. I think you know following Edmon's point regarding privacy laws and the location of the operation subject to the local privacy laws, you know there are also other potential constraints or freedoms that we might establish yourself that in other legal aspects, like intellectual property law and so on, and also potentially security and stability end, and a jurisdiction considering the geo TLD may be its asset, and look to either nationalize the asset as critical infrastructure or some similar sort of legislation, so just – that's not really a question, but you know thinking about it, Edmon have you had any other experiences of other forms of legislation impacting you know that are reasonably significant in that regard?

Edmon Chung: Thank you Keith. Fortunately, the short answer is no. But I think a few things I think. In terms of .Asia as a I guess as a macro region TLD, probably our pressure for being nationalized might be – might be smaller, but with – if it's within a particular national boundary, then I think you know it's probably a possibility.

However you touch on a few other subjects especially on intellectual property rights laws, right now a lot of jurisdictions I think are looking into copyright and trademark laws and they – we continue to be I wouldn't say solicited but at least when those discussions arise in Hong Kong and in some of the other jurisdictions within Asia, we pay special attention to them, as they develop, because there may – they may eventually you know down

the road be certain implications for us. And when we talk about intellectual property rights, and copyrights those are – there are – right now most of the attention perhaps is directed ISPs or hosts, but there – I can let I guess others – ccTLDs might have gotten those information as well.

There have been discussions about it bringing that same concept to domain names and take-downs of domain names and I think there will continue to be some pressure on gTLDs regardless of whether of their territorial to – to abide by these type of laws if they are created, and also you know as TLDs ourselves, rather we are cc's, g's, whether territorial or not, these are you know – these are legislations that will affect our operations I think.

Keith Davidson: So I think maybe seeking to sum up a little bit, yes, the issue of jurisdiction and geo TLDs will be a testing issue, and issues well worth contemplating and I'm not sure how much flexibility ICANN will be able to demonstrate as – you know in terms of any variance to the contract. But I think it is something that's better to be thought about in advance than after application. Edmon.

Edmon Chung: Just as a quick note, I think you know for example .tell actually did get a special exemption because of the UK privacy laws with their contracts, so there are precedents on – in terms of you know local jurisdiction, where the gTLD is operated out of.

Keith Davidson: Thank you. So I think – yes, there is, the pinch in those to try and you know assess in advance before your application what – you know how local jurisdictional issues might impact on your application and potential contract variance.

Can I just move through the panel in terms of any final comments on the regulatory or legal regime just one by one if anyone wants to make any comment of anything else of pertinence and then we'll move onto the marketing aspect.

Sabine Dolderer: Actually maybe I have an interesting addition to the presentation from Norway what the current status of regulation in Germany is, according to those geo TLD or gTLD actually area.

And as most of you may know in Germany there is no domain regulation at all and DENIC independent from the government. But in the tele – there is currently a telecommunication law change actually on the way with regard to who is responsible for answering questions from ICANN if they are occurring any questions, with gTLD with geographic names and it's a very small add-on that actually – which – that it's primarily in the hand of the federal states and they're actually in the hand of the federal – actually the federal states or cities and that if there are conflicts the more important – actually town has one and is responsible for – to answer the question, but that's actually all what is done in – towards regulation in Germany.

Keith Davidson: Thank you Sabine. I have Dennis then Ornulf.

Dennis Jennings: I was going to suggest, Keith that you might ask David Curtin on the phone to comment on that, he's better placed than I am.

Keith Davidson: David, do you have any comment.

David Curtin: Yes, I do indeed. The – as a lot of people will know that there is legislation in Ireland that covers the .ie name space. It doesn't cover .com, it doesn't cover .eu, so it's quite narrow. So how it impacts some of the new gTLDs, I would suggest it has not yet been considered by the Irish government.

I would agree with Dennis that the Irish government would like to have a benign environment for business in general, and they over support of e-commerce initiatives, however, in our experience I would caution that getting joined up thinking from government and regulators can be extremely difficult. You will find getting decisions from the right officials, and in particular getting documentation from the Ministry – official documentation from the Ministry in support of anything can be very, very, very difficult. And while you know junior officials might support an initiative, getting that in writing, or getting a letter of support is

quite another matter. So I think other countries might experience that as they – as they go forward.

Keith Davidson: Thank you, David. And Ornulf.

Ornulf Storm: Yes, thank you Keith.   Well just a comment on the sort of jurisdiction and possibilities for ICANN to adapt to different requirements. I think in the light of the high focus on the multi-stakeholder model, as contrary to an intergovernmental organization, I think if ICANN would be – should be mindful about the sort of new emphasis on this, and the emphasis on the focus on including governments and including matters, a model that can be accepted around the world.

So I think in the light of that, I think ICANN should very much think about this to make sort of adaptions to this kind of changes in the registry agreements, and I think that could then – could be a good thing for the domain name market in the world, if they actually will do so, and then that will enable more possibly geo TLDs in the different countries.

Keith Davidson: Okay, thank you for that. Can I have the last – no, I think we do need to move on, and we might be getting to a level of detail and I know there is people in the audience who want to ask questions, but I think we need to leave the subject of the legal and regulatory

now and move onto competition and marketing. And so panelists, can we keep our answers really as concise and tight as possible, and then we should be able to open up for some questions from the floor as well.

Okay, looking at the competition and marketing aspects, you know most of the geographic and cultural gTLDs announced today, purport to the citizens of their cities or culture. And as such though will give alternatives to ccTLDs in which they already reside.

Should a ccTLD act in cooperation with or in competition against such geo TLDs, you know should and I guess we know the answer to that. Should .de cooperate with .Berlin, .Hamburg and so on? And is it a registry function to compete or is it entirely left – should it be appropriately left to the registrars to make the competition market. So there's the challenge, any takers. Sabine and then Dennis.

Sabine Dolderer: Actually that's a – I think should a registry compete, I think competition is not something you can choose to do, because it's by definition that there is the consumer has a choice, or if there different possibilities the consumer can choose, there is of course a competition.

The question is how do you act as a registry that there is competition. There is – already of course there is also competition with .com, there is competition with .net already and with .eu of

course too. So there is a lot of choice the customer has and the registrar has and of course the registrar is free to choose whatever it does. The question is how do you do that?

And I think from any perspective, we have chosen to basically – yes, show the advantages of – for our model – for our domain is and convince the person with our services, and that's of course – that's the choice we have, then and should we compete or cooperate.

I think that's not a neither or; of course, we have also common interests with regard to let's yes, DNS, stable DNS was a stable internet and was a short of confidence user expectation in Germany, I've done – I think if .Berlin messes up, I think that will also actually concern our customers that we might mess up also. So I think there is both and you have to find the balance. And I think – and that's basically what we're trying to do.

Keith Davidson: Dennis and then Annebeth and Fabien, then Edmon.

Dennis Jennings: Well, for the number – Dennis Jennings here for the record and a number of response to that. First of all, of course there should be competition, that's in the interest of the consumer there should be active and vigorous competition but in fact in Europe and in Ireland direct collusion and trying to minimize competition is against the law and to competitive practices are illegal.

Having said all that, that doesn't mean there should necessarily – that there should be unnecessary competition. And in the particular case of .Irish and .ie, since .Irish is addressing a global diaspora and .ie, I'll let David speak for .ie, of course, it's essentially addressing entities that have a real and substantial connection to Ireland, there isn't any natural competition there. But there will be normal competition.

Keith Davidson: That's some complimentarism I think. I've got a speaking list, I've got Annebeth, then Fabien, then Edmon, then Ornulf, then Olivier and then Jonathan.

Fabien Betremieux: As far as the .fr and .Paris are concerned, or more generally .fr and geo TLDs in France, we see that there is natural – like a natural and – natural competition because those TLDs – we'll address the same potential market, that's a fact. And new geographic gTLDs will offer some level of differentiation so there is competition for – by definition.

But we feel that these initiatives are also complimentary because as the .cat has shown, there will bring new commerce to domain names, and somebody that comes to the domain name system in France will through let's say the [bizedh] which is the LcTLD initiative from the western part of France for the Bortoine community, they will also consider going for the .fr because that will make sense.

And so basically registrants, there will be new registrants, current registrants of the .fr may consider some local regional gTLDs, because that might make sense for them, they will like the differentiation approach and they will like to show they're belonging to a specific community, or they will want to associate themselves with the visibility provided by these new TLD, so there is definitely – there will definitely be complimentary issues that are like a bench that's there, and anyway the ccTLD for us will still remain a necessity for somebody that wants to – that wants presence in France, for instance. So at least in the short term, that's not a threat on the ccTLD.

And one more thing in terms of registration, when .eu appeared, although it's not a gTLD, its geographic TLD that covers obviously the same – actually it's the French territory, there were fears and announcement that .eu will kill .fr. And that did not happen. And the market share of the .eu in France never went over 5% to 6%. So that's why we think there is competition but it's complimentary.

Keith Davidson: Well, I guess with slightly over two billion internet users in the world, and under 200 million domain names we just did, you know there's an awfully big untapped market, and of course I think you're looking back historically over the last new gTLD process with the launch of .Asia and .info and .biz and others.

I think that actually stimulated the ccTLD market quite significantly. So whereas a lot of ccTLDs imagined that this would be a difficult time going ahead and having to market more and so on, I think it actually was very complimentary in terms of increasing awareness and opportunity for domain names. Back to topic. Annebeth.

Annebeth Lange: I agree with most of these things that has been said, that it's not neither or, it will be competition and competition is good, but it should be under fairly equal conditions. And in some areas it will be good to cooperate the same way we do, to share best practices and going from each other. I'm more concerned about the registrar competition. A lot of the smaller countries, they haven't a lot ICANN accredited registrars, and in some countries that can create a big problem.

And Norway is among them, and I'm sure other countries also have a big registrar of course but only very few that's accredited by ICANN.

Keith Davidson: Thank you Annebeth. I'll close the panel speaking order with the list I've got, which is Edmon, Ornulf, then Olivier, then Jonathan. So Edmon.

Edmon Chung:	Thank you, and I think you sort of spoke to my intro already. So I think – overall, I think the numbers and the experience from .Asia you and I think .eu and some of the new gTLDs that came along really proves you know – it stimulates the interest and one of the things that – you know number one in terms of competition is really the competition against .com and the awareness, because most people in the world today still really knows just .com, and probably the ccTLD, and in the future the reality is that the awareness of more of the other possibilities are going to be one of the things that would be brought about.

And this type of choice, and we always talk about choice of TLD and consumer choice, but you know I guess in our experience, this is really a choice about not one or the other, but you know one and the other. So I think you know one of the things that was said is this complimentary concept and not really cannibalization type of situation. So we're really building a bigger pie.

And one of the things that we are seeing definitely seeing in the marketplace is this moving away from this myth about one website, one domain sort of concept. I think this has been one of the things that people argue about but in reality, more and more, especially the more savvy websites definitely don't only use one domain, they're using a portfolio of domain names to drive traffic, you know search engine optimization, all sorts of things, and the way that the industry, the tech industry and the domain industry looks at this is going to change over time.

And I think one of the sort of analogy that is I find really interesting and really good is if you look into for example the real estate industry, and you know as strip malls are being built in suburbs, you know it's not going, the McDonalds will be opened in different – different areas I mean, and different branches and that's the power in the real world, the power of chain stores, or the power of having multiple presence is to drive traffic to their business.

And I think that's – that's going to be an important part, going forward as well, with different TLDs and multiple domains and a portfolio of domain names really in terms of a website, or a particular operation on the internet utilizing this sort of network of domains.

Keith Davidson: Excellent points, Edmon, thanks for that. Can we keep our responses really brief, because we're into our last five minutes and I would really like to open some questions from the floor. Ornulf, thank you.

Ornulf Storm: Yes, thank you. I'll be very short. Yes, of course many things – good things has been said and it's quite important to facilitate competition and also as Annebeth in the beginning also said that competition with a geo gTLD with a ccTLD, can sort of drive the existing ccTLD also to sort of make things better and cheaper. So that's – in that respect competition is good.

But I think also one sort of factor that geo TLDs must compete with the existing ccTLDs is consumers satisfaction, I think that's really important for them to then be able to satisfy the market to be able to have possibility to compete. Thanks.

Keith Davidson: Thank you very much. I may revert the last –

David Curtin: Keith, may I make a comment, please?

Keith Davidson: Certainly David.

David Curtin: David Curtin here, sorry just very briefly, the point that Annebeth made in relation to the ICANN and the registrars and the trust issue, I think that's critically important and maybe in another forum probably deserves to be further discussed, and initially in the draft proposal this was proposed to separate the roles of registrar and registry and I thought that was a very positive idea. Now, I know that's gone, and I think that raises issues then about fair competition, not at the registry level, but at the registrar level. So how can we ensure that registrars are trusted if they are both – if they cross shareholdings or joint ventures between a registry and a registrar. That's probably something that governments might be

interested in when they start [1:24:29] fair competition issues. Thank you.

Keith Davidson: Very good point, thank you David. Can I take the liberty of reversing the last two speakers' order and go to Jonathan first and then lastly Olivier, because I think you know you're hearing from the supply side, so it will be appropriate for someone from the consumer side. So thank you, Jonathan.

Jonathan Shea: Thank you Keith. I think it's worthwhile to point out firstly that we are talking about a number of different scenarios. In Hong Kong, with .he and .Asia, one would think their product is one scenario where you have location of economy based ccTLD versus a regional TLD. Well, [Paul Pauleen] had thought this a scenario, because it's a city versus a country scenario, and .Irish and .is ie another thing, because it's talking about more a cultural or a group of ethical TLD versus ccTLD. So I think that's the first part that we have to really note that. And there are really slightly differences among all these three scenarios, and the situations are not quite the same.

Secondly, I – as Edmon said, we are really proud, Hong Kong is the first – probably the first city where people do have more choices in addition to the hk, they have .Asia and or course the incumbent gTLDs.

In terms of competition, I echo all the other panelists what they have said. Even without a new gTLD, we already competing small or less with .com, .net, .biz, anyway. So once you read this in a lot, with the introduction of new geo TLDs or some of the new gTLDs.

We, as a non-profit organization, I mean we run our ccTLD registry as a non-profit organization. We advertise choices to the customer. We advertise on growing the internet together, promoting the use of internet to the community, benefitting companies and individuals alike. So our mission is not to monopolize the market, it's rather to offer choices, we let the users decide which are the best for them. And I fully echo Edmon's point that even within .hk, we are promoting the concept of one website, many domain names.

We just introduced our IDN TLD .Hong Kong and China's character, and again we sell off – point out to users that you know it's very useful to point your .hk and the .Hong Kong domain name to your website, and they may already have an existing .com or .Asia domain name, and they can now point this domain name to the same website. The different versions of the website, for example the Chinese version, the English version, so there are many creative ways to utilize the different top level domains.

However, on the more – maybe negative aspect –

Keith Davidson: Jonathan, is this the long response or the short response.

Singapore
no.41
19-24 June
ICANN   2011

Jonathan Shea:	Just one last closing.

Keith Davidson:	Very quickly please.

Jonathan Shea:	New gTLD or geo TLDs may – would cause confusion to the users, especially the commercial one, because they are always very about being sort blackmail, and they have to protect their brands and they have to register domain names and actually we all need to educate the market and the users on how to handle the proliferation of top level domains. Thank you.

Keith Davidson:	And actually he has a very valuable final point. Thank you Jonathan. Olivier.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond:	Thank you very much, Keith. I actually remained back at the question on competition and consumer choice. Competition is good, consumer's choice is good as well. One doesn't stop the other. You can have consumer choice under the same umbrella but I personally prefer competition.
	I've lived through the telecom revolution in the 90's, the telecom deregulation and at the moment we had more choices to whom was

going to provide us with our telecom needs. There was a – the whole market became a lot larger, and the choice for consumer was a lot more than when it was just one or two national operators.

So competition is very good. The only thing I would say though is that we do need to think further down the line, five, ten years down the line, we have to hope that all of the new gTLDs that are going to be created will not fall under the one, two, or three overall umbrellas. Thank you.

Keith Davidson: Excellent. Thank you very much. Now panel I think we've had an opportunity to have our say. Is there anyone in the audience who has a burning question, you know like a really significant question that gets right to the core of these issues. All right, is there anyone with a mediumly important –

[background conversation]

Keith Davidson: No, any issues that are of extreme relevance to what we have discussed.

Male: Well, let me say that I will try to follow the example of the panel then. And it's something that came up when Annebeth made the remark that a conflict between national law and the criteria of the

application guidebook might actually kill an application for a geo TLD before – well, in the communication with ICANN on those criteria.

And then I thought it seems to me that are at least two ways in which a government can actively and actually do that very effectively and the first one is communicating in its letter of support that they insist that national data protection and privacy laws are applied to the WHOIS.

And the second one that national or European brand owner laws are applied in the Sunrise of that particular TLD, so insisting that there is no difference in the treatment between the brand holder that uses the brand and the brand holder that doesn't use the brand. Those two things are in conflict with the applicant guidebook.

So would that mean that this application would be killed immediately? I would like to know if this a discussion that was held in the GAC? For a geo TLD, of course, not for any TLD, but the geo TLD.

Keith Davidson: I think that's an ideal question that we'll record, rather than answer. We are out of time, sadly. And I suggest you carry on the dialogue with Annebeth and Ornulf afterwards. I think the time police are knocking on my door, and so I'll hand back to Vika or Lesley.

Vika Mpisane:	Okay thanks Lesley, thanks Keith, and then thanks to all our panelists. Interesting discussion, I think I'll just do a summary of key points that are mentioned here, because we looked at only two areas, the regulatory framework and the marketing aspect of it.

It's quite simply to summarize. I think from the regulatory point of view, what's emerging is that local laws will in a number of cases have an impact on geo TLDs; that there is a need therefore for a constellation of different legislative frameworks, largely from the data protection point of view. Somebody raised also the issue of reserved names as an issue that may apply beyond just the ICANN registry increment.

But their key provision is that will not apply to all geo TLDs. ICANN has shown also through .tell, that's what Edmon raised has shown .tell that it's willing to accommodate some flexibility where there are some overlaps between the national law where a registered TLD is based and its own regulatory framework.

The ICANN framework is likely to apply where a geo TLD name is a name that is used in more than a single state, so in that case they wouldn't bend it so much for the consolation.

On marketing, I think there was, because of the time that we are look at it, which was quite limited, there is a clear point to this conversation is that competition is acceptable, it's not a new thing. It's been there to be developed and edited. It's both competition and consumer choice that come into place and we should accommodate that.

The industry has grown just a single domain name per business to a portfolio of domain names per each business, because businesses are using domain names for – to drive SEO, to enter into traffic.

So those are the two image and points. Thanks.

Lesley Cowley: Can you join me in thanking Vika please and all of the panelists. Thank you.

[Applause]

Lesley Cowley: Okay, that is the end of our ccNSO meeting, a couple of housekeeping points, please could I encourage you to fill in the meeting survey, that will help us guide how we do future meetings, and also any suggestions that you have for improvements, so that we can implement please.

Thank you for your participation today. Those of you that are traveling, a safe and nondelayed travels. We look forward to seeing you in Senegal. We now have an half an hour coffee break, following which we'll go into the ccNSO council meeting, very happy for anyone who wishes to come and observe the council meeting. It's an open meeting and that will follow after coffee in this room at 4:00. Thank you.

[End of Transcript]