
CLAUDIA RUIZ:

Good morning, good afternoon, good evening to all. Welcome to the third webinar of the five mandatory ATLAS III webinars. Today's will cover the introduction to the ccNSO. Our presenter today is Bart Boswinkel, ccNSO Senior Policy Director.

We will not be doing a roll call for this webinar. However, we are taking attendance for the first ten minutes of this call. After that, your participation will no longer be a valid entry for the required attendance matrix.

If you are only on the phone bridge, please join the Zoom room as soon as possible as this is an attendance requirement. We have French and Spanish interpretation for this webinar, so a kind reminder to please state your name when speaking to allow for the interpreters to identify you on the other language channels, as well as for transcription purposes.

Please also speak at a reasonable speed to allow for accurate interpretation. All lines will be muted during the presentation and open for questions and answers at the end of the presentation.

As you have noticed, we are running this webinar on Zoom. The features are similar to Adobe Connect, but in order to view the participant list and chat pod, please click on the bottom of your screen. You will only be able to see the chat transcript from when you joined the call, nothing prior to that. To raise your hand, please just click on the "raise hand" icon.

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

I will now turn the floor over to you, Joanna Kulesza, co-chair of the ATLAS III capacity subgroup. Over to you, Joanna. Thank you. Hello, Joanna, are you there?

JUDITH HELLERSTEIN: She seems to be muted.

JOANNA KULESZA: Hello. Testing my audio again. Is the Zoom audio working alright?

CLAUDIA RUIZ: Hello, Joanna. Yes, now we can hear you. Thank you.

JOANNA KULESZA: [And now I've been muted again.] Can you hear me? Is the audio working? Just a very brief introduction, I'm trying –

CLAUDIA RUIZ: Yes.

JUDITH HELLERSTEIN: Yes.

JOANNA KULESZA: Brilliant. Thank you so much. Again, thank you, Claudia, for the introduction. Thank you to the ICANN staff team [who have brilliantly

supported] and helped with setting up this webinar. Sincerest thanks to Bart for agreeing to run the introduction to ccNSO. Thanks to everyone for joining us this evening, this afternoon, this morning. And without further ado, over to you, Bart, for the introduction to the ccNSO. Thank you very much. The floor is yours.

BART BOSWINKEL:

Thank you. And I assume the audio is well, so you can hear me. First of all, thank you for inviting me. Originally, Joke was intended to do this introduction webinar and I'll do tomorrow's, but unfortunately for you, you'll have to do it with me both today and tomorrow. So apologies on our behalf.

Secondly – and I find this interesting – I just scrolled through the participant lists, and as a start and to see if you can play with Zoom, could you raise your hand if you dealt with the ccNSO or are aware of the ccNSO? Just to see how many people are and how many aren't on this. So there are not too many. And if you dealt with them in the past. Okay, I don't see any more hands, just a few. It's not too bad.

So those of you who've dealt with it, probably, it will not be very inspiring. But still, I hope you can learn one or two things. Thank you. You can lower your hands now.

So without further ado, let me start with the webinar. Can you go to the next slide, please?

So just a brief agenda for what we'll be covering or what I'll be covering today, is, what is the ccNSO. For those of you who are not very familiar,

we thought it might be interesting to understand a little bit more about what is a ccTLD, because the ccNSO and what is a ccTLD are closely linked. AND then a third relevant part would be why is the ccNSO relevant and not just for the ccTLDs but also in a broader context. And then I'll go into more detail into the ccNSO itself, in the structure, its policy development processes or the limited scope, etc., and the key topics under discussion or of interest to the ccNSO and its membership. And if you want to learn more, there'll be some references [inaudible] as well. Next slide, please.

So, what is the ccNSO? There are different ways of answering this question, and I will do it in two steps. One is looking at the official bylaw definition, so that's article ten.

As some of you will know – and I've seen one person in the webinar who was closely involved in the creation of the ccNSO – the ccNSO originated in 2002, 2003, in the evolution and reform process. So it was not one of those structures that were created and established at the beginning of ICANN itself in 1999.

So if you look at the bylaw definition, it's first about developing and recommending to the board global policies relating to country code top-level domains. You'll see the country code top-level domains part is emphasized, and I'll go in a little bit more detail about this in a minute. But keep this in mind, the ccNSO and country code top-level domains are closely related as concept but also in real life. And it coordinates on behalf or for the ccTLD activities with other ICANN supporting organizations like the GNSO and the ASO, which are the supporting organizations, and committees like the ALAC, the SSAC, RSSAC and the

GAC, and constituencies, and in particular the constituencies under the GNSO.

Now, this is the official definition, and there is one important part to it as well, and that's on also included, and that's important to keep in the back of your mind if you talk about the ccNSO. The ccNSO may also engage in other activities authorized by its members, and as I'll start looking at what is the ccNSO in a few minutes, you'll see the ccNSO is engaged in a lot of other activities, not those developed or enumerated and listed in the bylaws, but particularly in this area, in activities authorized by its members. Next slide, please.

So as I said, one of the core concepts and that's closely related to the ccNSO is ccTLD or country code top-level domain. Why is it so important for the ccNSO? Only ccTLD managers, so those entities that manage a country code top-level domain, or others would call it operate, but in the context of the ccNSO, it's important to understand it's about managers. Only ccTLD managers can member of the ccNSO.

And I'll go into a little bit more detail about the membership, but to understand this, what is a country code top-level domain and hence what is a manager, first of all, country code top-level domains are those top-level domains that have a string of two ASCII letters in principle, such as UK, JP, Japan as you can see.

These two letters correspond to the country, territory, or other area of geographic political interest. And all these two-letter codes are listed in the ISO 3166-1 list, so it's an ISO standard that determines whether

there is a two-letter code assigned to a country and whether a country or territory name is included in that list.

And this is a fundamental concept because one of the reasons why this list was chosen in 1995, I believe, is that IANA at the time was not in the business and did not want to be in the business of determining what is and what is not a country. And the understanding was that ISO as a standardization body did have a process in place to determine this, and hence, the basic policy document for the ccNSO or for the ccTLD creation and delegation, RFC 1591, clearly states and refers to the ISO 3166 standard and to its maintenance agency to determine what is and what is not a country, and also about assigning the two-letter codes.

So currently, there are around 256 – I'll go in a little bit more detail – two-letter codes included in the list, and hence, that is the number, in principle, of the ccTLDs.

What is also important to understand around country code top-level domains and their managers – and this again goes back to RFC 1591 – is that the rules and policies for registering domain names within the ccTLDs are determined by ccTLDs and therefore vary significantly. They reflect the national and local laws, customs and policies. So that's a main difference between the ccTLD top-level domains and the generic top-level domains where the policies and the rules for registering domain names are set through the ICANN processes. So that's something to keep in the back of your mind when you think about the difference between a ccTLD and a gTLD.

As I said, there is varying rules, and because they reflect the local circumstances of countries and territories, and what you see as well as a result is a great diversity in business and governance models, so you will have profits, not-for-profit, academia, and even government agencies acting as manager of the ccTLDs. And the governance models vary as well along these lines. In some cases, it's a foundation with an oversight board. In some cases, it's a limited liability board, etc. together with, say, membership structures, etc. which governs the ccTLD.

Again, administration, as I said the administration and how a ccTLD varies as well, again, as a result of local decisions and adherence to local laws, and as I said as well, the registration policies vary.

So from that perspective, going back – and just to summarize, a country code top-level domain, the country code is important, because it's an alternative for a generic top-level domain. A country code needs to be included in the ISO 3166 list to be eligible as a ccTLD, and only ccTLD managers, so the managing entity of the country code top-level domain, can be a member of the ccNSO. That's where you see the link. And this goes back to 1995, or even before 1995, but then it was codified in RFC 1591. Next slide, please.

As I said, I started off with the formal description of the ccNSO. If you would look from a ccTLD perspective or how ccTLDs look at the ccNSO, they look at it as a body platform where the ccTLDs can join and participate, because there are some functions performed for them and some activities which they feel are relevant, and some of them really have evolved over time. And this goes back to – yeah, go ahead, Abdelmonem. You have a question.

ABDELMONEM GALILA: Thank you, Bart. I am Abdelmonem Galila from Egypt. I am responsible for the IDN ccTLD or Egypt. Just I don't want to be somehow confused about a topic inside the presentation. You said in the previous slide you are talking about – it seems you're talking about ASCII ccTLDs, not the IDN ones. It is my first point that at the moment, I can't be registered as IGN ccTLD inside the ccNSO. Second point. Third point that if you are talking about only ASCII ccTLDs, [you are just] limited to two letters. At the same time, if you are enabling IDNs, it will be more than two, or up to [63] letters for IDN, I think. So could you elaborate more about that? Especially that you are talking here about emojis, and emoji is considered to be Unicode. Just to be part of IDNs, not for ASCII. Am I right? Thank you.

BART BOSWINKEL: You're right, and you're preempting some of the next slides. I was talking about the origin of the ccNSO and how it evolved, and how it's currently defined in the ICANN bylaws. If you bear with me for a moment, I'll make sure that your questions are answered.

So going back, taking up these points, on the evolved functions and other activities of the ccTLDs and how they are managed, and the relevancy of the ccNSO from a ccTLD perspective, it is with respect to the policy and policy-related work. As Abdelmonem already indicated, some of the work which has happened and is currently still undertaken relates to IDN ccTLDs, and one of the probably major milestones in the

existence of the ccNSO was the fast track process, and as a result, the creation of IDN ccTLDs.

As Abdelmonem said, IDN ccTLDs are not limited to ASCII. The only condition – and that’s why I say ISO 3166 is relevant also for IDN ccTLDs is that for an IDN ccTLD – that’s the reason why it’s a ccTLD, it is still related to a country or territory, or to a name of a country or territory. So as Abdelmonem said, say, the Egyptian IDN ccTLD, as far as I recall, it is related to the meaning of Egypt in Arabic. And that was one of the requirements, and the requirements was because Egypt as such was listed in the ISO 3166 list.

And other policy and policy-related work where the ccNSO has been very active in the past and still participates in discussions is the use of country and territory names as TLDs. Initially, they had a study group that evolved into a cross-community working group, which for various reasons had to conclude that it did not meet all the goals and hence was closed, and now they participate in the subsequent procedures work of the GNSO, again focusing on the use of country and territory names. I'll wait until the slides are back. There we go. Thank you.

And the third one, as Abdelmonem said, where the ccNSO is really currently involved, is in the emoji study group. Again, and he's right, this is broader than country and territory names, but again, related to IDNs. And one of the reasons why this study group has been started is at the request of the board, because some ccTLDs accept emojis, although there are some significant issues identified by for example SSAC with the use of emojis. But again, this is not about the substance of the work, but it shows you how the ccNSO with all the ccTLDs, including IDN

ccTLDs, have taken up the policy and policy-related work over time, and that this function has evolved and is broader than just the policy development process that was included on the first slide. So this is a ccTLD, ccNSO perspective on the ccNSO.

A second role or function of the ccNSO that has evolved over time – and again, this is the ccNSO, ccTLD perspective – is its platform function, so exchange of information, networking among its members, with other parts of the ICANN community, and sharing best practices or sharing practices and new developments.

And this is reflected in the ccNSO member's meeting days, which are two days during the meeting. Most of the upcoming meeting in Marrakech, it will be on the Tuesday and Wednesday, and probably in Montréal, it'll be also on the Tuesday and Wednesday, which are the normal days for ccNSO member days. And topics that will be discussed are presentations from members or ccTLDs in general about new developments within their ccTLDs, policy discussions, sometimes discussions around policy-related work like emojis or use of country and territory names. If you would look at the agenda, you'll see a varying number of topics.

A second important exchange of information point is [tech day,] which is normally on the opening day of ICANN events, so in the case of the Marrakech meeting, it will be on the Monday. Tech day is sometimes a full day, but definitely half a day, and again, it focuses on operational and technical aspects of running a top-level domain. So it's a little bit broader than just focusing on country code top-level domains. Especially since the new gTLDs have arrived, it has a broader scope and

it works very closely with SSAC and there is a liaison from SSAC on the tech day working groups which is structuring its agenda.

And a third important, and probably not well-known, activity under the umbrella of the ccNSO is the TLD operation security work, the TLD Ops group, which is basically running an e-mail list for people with a security role within their ccTLD. But it has broadened its activities now also organizing workshops and it's doing some tabletop exercises, for example around disaster recovery, etc.

So that's a broader activity of ccTLDs for ccTLDs. So again, taking another perspective what the ccNSO is doing and it's particular for the ccTLD. It represents the ccTLD community interests in the broader ICANN ecosystem. And again, you could see this and it is clearly linked to the description of the ccNSO in the ICANN bylaws, "ensure the interaction of the ccNSO and broader ccTLD community, in particular with the ICANN board and others SOs and ACs, including ALAC." It is focusing on the strategic and operational planning processes of ICANN itself, so its strategic and operational planning committee. I'll go into a little bit more details at the end of the presentation.

And it also looks at the ccTLD voluntary financial contribution to ICANN. The ccNSO has developed guidelines for individual ccTLDs to assist them in determining their voluntary financial contribution to ICANN. So this is in a nutshell the activities of the ccNSO as it currently undertakes and with some examples of it. Next slide, please.

So, how does it fit into the ICANN structure? Probably, you've seen this slide or alternatives of these slides. You will recognize the different SOs

and ACs. What is important, I'll allude to it a little bit later, is that the ccNSO appoints or nominates two members of the board of directors and in participating in the Nominating Committee as well with one member. I think this should look familiar to you even if this is the first time you are directly involved in the ccNSO. Next slide, please. I will not spend too much time on this one.

So I think the next two slides are probably relevant to you as well. Why is the ccNSO relevant? It's always good to have a structure, but it's always good to ask yourself, why is it relevant, and is it still relevant? That was one of the topics for example of the current ccNSO review.

Different ways of looking and answering this question. First of all, again from a ccTLD and maybe even from a broader perspective, it provides structure to the ccTLDs in the ICANN ecosystem, as I just alluded to. As I said, the 250 different country codes, every country has at least one country code, and these different country codes, they need a relation with ICANN and in particular with IANA. And the ccNSO does provide that link.

Again, this goes back to what Abdelmonem just raised. It's not just two-letter country codes, so the ASCII. There are also other ccTLDs, again because they're linked and associated with the countries, and management, etc. is within countries. There are 59 IDN ccTLDs for 41 countries and territories. As you see, in some cases, there are more than one IDN ccTLD per country, and I'll show you the list of IDN ccTLDs in a minute. So that's more the ccTLD perspective of its relevancy, so it provides a basis in the ICANN ecosystem. Next slide, please.

So again, there is another way of looking at it. I hope by now you've seen that the management of domain names and especially second-level domain names under TLDs is structured around ccTLDs and gTLDs.

Now, if you just look at the numbers, currently – and this is from [inaudible] Verisign, there are around 248.7 million. That was at the end of Q4, or the fourth quarter of 2018. Probably a little bit more now. Roughly 250 million domain names.

If you would look at under management, that's a total number of domain names under management. If you would look at the number of gTLDs or domain names which are under management by gTLD operators and under management by ccTLD managers, you will see that approximately a little bit less than half of these of these 350 are managed by ccTLDs, so 44% of the total domain names.

So that's a significant number of all second-level domain names are managed by ccTLDs. So as I said, the ccTLDs, the way they interact in the ICANN ecosystem is through the ccNSO, so that's another reason why the ccNSO is relevant.

If you would look for example at the ten largest TLDs, again, by number of reported domain names, seven of them are ccTLDs. And as you can guess, the most important or the largest of all is dot-com with over 110 million domain names. But please don't quote me on that one. But definitely over 100 million domain names.

The second largest and the third largest are ccTLDs. It depends on your count or what you – but it could be Tokelau, so dot-TK, or dot-CN for

China, and in the top four, you'll see DENIC as well, or dot-DE for Germany.

So from that perspective, ccTLDs are relevant, and not just for the ccTLDs itself – or the ccNSO is relevant not just for the ccTLDs itself, but also for the broader ICANN ecosystem, because that's their link with these large TLDs. Next slide, please.

So after having talked about the ccNSO itself and the context, I'll now focus more on the ccNSO itself, its membership structure, and the council. And I'll go into, again, one of the points that Abdelmonem has just raised. So, who are currently the ccNSO members?

In principle – and this is defined in the ICANN bylaws – they're the ccTLD managers who agreed to be members. So in principles, it's a voluntary organization. So a ccTLD manager is only a member when it wants to be a member. So that's important. And the membership is currently limited to the ASCII ccTLDs, so the two-letter code ccTLDs, but it's open for all of them.

And if you would look at their roles, again, in the bylaws, they volunteer participate in activities, and you could see this if you go back and recall the first slide, the ccNSO can undertake activities mandated by its members. In principle, that means that ccTLDs or persons associated with ccTLD managers participate in the activities and subscribe to the activities. If there are no volunteers, there is no activity.

The members, so the managers, elect the councilors. That is defined, the process and everything is defined in the ICANN bylaws in article ten. Members nominate candidates for the board seat 11 and 12. Again, this

is in a way a voluntary arrangement. If you would look at the bylaws, the ccNSO council selects the board members, but over time, [or already very early when the ccNSO was created,] the membership and council agreed that in principle, the ccTLD managers, members, would nominate candidates for the board seat, and that the council would only appoint those candidates that were selected by the members. So that's what is meant with the voluntary arrangement. So the power of the council in principle has been subsumed by the membership.

It relates a little bit to the point – and that was probably the driving force – the membership, or the ccNSO members, have the final vote on a ccNSO PDP. Again, this is defined in the bylaws in Annex B. What it means – and this is, again, a major difference with the GNSO policy development process – the ultimate vote of a ccNSO policy development process is with the members, and it is a yes or no vote, or that's the way it has evolved, but in principle, the membership determined whether a policy will be recommended to the board or not. And in the GNSO, it's the GNSO council.

And then finally, again, this is a voluntary arrangement. If 10% of the members disagreed with a council decision, except for example something that is determined in the bylaws, then 10% of the members, which is currently 18 members, may call for a vote on the council decision. And in some cases, that means that no decision at all is taken, and this is one of the hardest rules to live up to, especially for example when you have very limited time for decision making, which is sometimes prescribed through the ICANN bylaws.

So to summarize, in principle, the membership of the ccNSO has the ultimate power within the ccNSO through the 10% call for council decisions and through the election of councilors, and the nominations of board members, and in determining the activities of the ccNSO. And ultimately, membership is voluntary, so this also means if a member disagrees – and fortunately this never happened – they can leave the ccNSO fairly easily. Next slide, please.

So looking at current membership – and apologies for the makeup of this slide – as I said, there are 250 plus two-letter code ccTLDs. 172 out of these 250 are currently members, and you can see the distribution across the ICANN regions.

Be aware that this number is a little bit biased. One of the reasons is that you will see that there are a few – a very limited number – ccTLDs which are managed by the same entity. I'll give you two examples. One of them is Norid, the ccTLD manager for Norway, so dot-no. It also manages dot-bv, Bouvet Island, and for Svalbard, so dot-sv. And Norid is only member for dot-no. So that's part of the 172.

Another example is AFNIC, which is the ccTLD manager for dot-fr and six other ccTLDs, and they are only a member for dot-fr, for France. So the number of 172 is a bit unclear whether this really links all these different members. And this is one of the reasons why some of the changes to the bylaws post-transition, so post 1 October 2016, do not work out well at this time. The best example is around the IANA functions review team where the ccNSO is expected or should appoint at least one non-ccTLD manager to the IANA function review team, but

unfortunately, that pool is first of all very limited, and nobody from that limited pool has volunteered to date.

So yeah, it is in a way a bit of an issue, having a smaller pool of non-ccNSO members. But you don't hear me complain about it, it just makes life a little bit more complicated. Next slide, please.

As I said earlier on – and again, going back to Abdelmonem – the country code top-level domains, the ccTLDs, are not limited to two-letter codes. Currently, through the fast track process, there are 59 IDN ccTLDs from in total 41 countries and territories. And as you can see from this slide, [the one country which you can easily see,] in some cases, there are more IDN ccTLD from one country than one. The best example is India, which has currently 11 IDN ccTLDs related to it.

Unfortunately, this is part of one of the policy development processes which is still underway. IDN ccTLDs are currently by definition – or by the ICANN bylaw definition – noneligible for the ccNSO. So that's one of the reasons why they're not included as such. Abdelmonem, I see your hand is up.

ABDELMONEM GALILA:

Thank you, Bart, for this clarification. [I'm so delighted for that.] I have a question here. You said that there is a document called ISO 3166. I think it is used by ICANN to verify that this word is essentially for this country. Am I right? That's the first question.

So if I am right, how could ICANN verify that this IDN word, this Unicode word is related to Egypt, this Unicode word is related to India? How can ICANN verify this? [You got my question?]

BART BOSWINKEL:

Yes, I do. And you go into the details of the policy itself and the fast track process. I don't mind answering it, but it's fairly simple. If you would look at the requirements of the fast track process and the overall policy, the first requirement is that a country or territory needs to be listed in that, on the ISO 3166, and that's verifiable.

If there is a ccTLD that in principle – if you meet the other criteria, you're eligible for an IDN ccTLD. Now, the second point – and this is about the Unicode points, etc., or other things, what you see here, the IDN ccTLD string should be a meaningful representation of the name of the country in the local or in an official language, and in a non-Latin script. That's the full requirement. And this should be stated or should be – in ICANN, the way it is verified is through self-selection or self-certification. There should be – either it's included in the UNGM list, which is a list from the United Nations geographic working group or work party, something like this, so please, again, don't quote me on that, or it should be done through a linguistic institute in the country or territory that request an IDN ccTLD string.

So ICANN itself does not determine whether this is a true or correct, meaningful representation of the name of the country or territory in, say, the official language and script. So there is a mechanism to it. I hope this clarifies and answers your questions.

So I'll go back to the slide. So what is expected in the hopefully near future is that the bylaw will change or the bylaws will change and that the IDN ccTLDs will become eligible to become member – again, voluntary – of the ccNSO. So if you would look at the current or the overall policy recommendations which are currently still in draft, in principle, the same rules apply for the ccTLDs and IDN ccTLDs, so membership is voluntary, and the only thing that needs to happen is a bylaw change. But that may take a little bit more time. Next slide, please.

So I just talked about one part of the ccNSO. That's the membership and their role. I'll now go into the ccNSO council and their role. So if you're not familiar with the ccNSO, effectively, the ccNSO has two layers to it, I will say, look at it from that perspective.

One is the foundational layer, which is the membership, so that's the ccTLD managers. And secondly is the ccNSO council. And again, the bylaw definition and description is that the ccNSO's council is responsible for managing the policy development process, but as you can see, its role has evolved together and in parallel with the evolution of the functions of the ccNSO itself. So it currently manages the ccNSO affairs.

What does it mean? It takes care of the administration, appoints members to the different working groups and working group chairs, it ensures that the community is informed about the latest [takes,] decides whether or not to participate in the work of other SOs and ACs, and manages the global volunteers, etc. So that is effectively what it means managing the ccNSO affairs.

It also represents the ccNSO in the discussions and in the dialog with other supporting organizations and advisory committees, and in particular, as I said, with the board, at the GAC, the GNSO and ALAC, which normally, they meet at every ICANN meeting.

Based on the bylaw, it selects the ICANN board members, but as I alluded to with the role of the membership, but at the suggestion at the election of the members itself, and it appoints the ccNSO and elects the ccNSO chair and vice chairs. So this is more the administrative managing operational activities of the ccNSO. Next slide, please.

So looking at the ccNSO council, currently, there are 18 council members. 15 are appointed by ccNSO members, three from each of the ICANN geographic regions, and if you recall [one of the slides,] you could see the distribution across the different regions of the membership. Each of these regions elect three councilors, which has some strange side effects, for example the North American region only has five members, so there is a recurrence of membership from that region, whilst other regions have over 30, or sometimes even 40 members. So that makes it different.

There are also three NomCom-appointed members to the ccNSO council, and, say, from the start, the council elections and appointment by the NomCom is staggered, meaning that every three years, the term of a councilor is three years, and every year, there is a council election.

So if you would look at the current leadership, the ccNSO council leadership team, so the chair is – and I think this is for the fourth year – is Katrina Sasaki. She's the person on the right. She's from the European

region, from Latvia, and we have two vice chairs. One is from Canada, so that's Byron Holland, who has been in that position now also for a couple of years, and who used to be the council chair, and since March this year, we have a new vice chair from Guatemala, and that's Alejandra Reinoso. She's also the chair of the [ccNSO] programming committee, members program committee.

So this is a bit about the ccNSO council itself. Next slide, please.

So as I said at the start of this presentation, this webinar, I would go a little bit more into detail about decisions of PDP, and again, this is one of the major differences between the GNSO, the ccNSO, if you think about – and the ASO is – in a way the ccNSO is comparable to the ASO.

First of all, the scope of the ccNSO policies is very limited. As I said, out of scope are all policies relating to registration of ccTLD domain names, so second-level domain names. These are local ccTLD [managers]. So for example if you have an issue with your ccTLD manager, the ccNSO has no role whatsoever, nor does ICANN, because the policies for registration or around transfer of your local ccTLDs name are determined and developed through the ccTLD and not through the ICANN processes, including the ccNSO processes.

And this also applies to for example the WHOIS discussion, which is currently one of the major hot topics for the GNSO and other communities under the ICANN umbrella, WHOIS and everything, and the impact of the European regulation on data protection, so GDPR is local. So ccTLDs deal with it at the national level, especially in Europe, but also in other countries and territories. So that's one major

important difference between the ccNSO and the GNSO, or another major important difference.

And policies developed through the ccNSO policy development process apply to ccTLDs by virtue of membership. But there are major exceptions, but you can read them [inaudible].

So that's with respect to the scope of the policy development process. The process itself – it's another reason why it's so limited, – is very heavy handed. As I said, ultimately, there is a membership vote and there is a quorum rule to it, so 50% of the ccNSO members need to vote in a first round, and if they don't, the ccNSO has to wait for another month before they can take another vote, and currently with over 172 ccTLD managers, this is quite heavy handed.

And also, in the process, there is a structural engagement with the GAC, so a kind of – not early warning, they have to be formally informed that a PDP is underway, and they have a formal opportunity to provide input and feedback. If you look at the number of PDPs, [and for the very reasons it is very limited,] one PDP completed, that was in the early days, and that was only because that was an exercise in running a PDP and that was about a bylaw change. There is one underway, and you heard me talk about it, and we had some interaction on this. That's the IDN ccTLDs overall policy, which formally awaits board vote, but that's since 2013, and by mutual agreement, no decision has been taken because there is a parallel process, which is not formally a policy – the IDN fast track process – which is still evolving, and it was – in a way, it's the experimental basis for the overall policy. And by now – and I'll go

into a little bit more details later on – the IDN ccTLD overall policy needs to be reviewed.

Currently, there is one underway. That's a PDP, and underway meaning that the ccTLDs and others are working on it. It is PDP number three, which has two parts. One is on the retirement of ccTLDs, maybe going back to the slide about ccTLDs.

Countries come and go, and the RFC 1591 has defined processes and procedures when a country is included or a territory is included in the ISO 3166 list. It does not include any processes or procedures – effectively no policy – when a country ceases to exist, and there have been some recent examples when a country ceases to exist. And it could happen for various – or is removed from the ISO 3166 list.

For example, a significant name change could lead to a change in the two-letter code. Some countries cease to exist by itself, for example the Netherlands Antilles which was dissolved as a change of the statute of the Netherlands. And for geopolitical reasons, some countries cease to exist. One example is the Soviet Union.

So retirement of ccTLDs, there needs to be a policy in place. It doesn't happen very often, but it is important to have one. And related is – and this is, again, a result from the IANA transition discussions and outcome – currently, decisions related to delegation, revocation, transfer and retirement of ccTLDs are excluded from the IRP.

The ccNSO and ccTLD community required and demanded an independent review mechanism, which still needs to be developed. So

that's what is happening in the current ccNSO policy development space. Next slide, please.

Some references. Have a look at your leisure. Next slide, please. So as I said, a little bit on key topics and what is happening right now in the ccNSO. And I've alluded to it already early on. Now, the easy part is probably the PDP number three on retirement of ccTLDs, the review mechanism of decisions. I'll not go into details anymore.

As other SOs and some of the ACs, the ccNSO is one of the decisional participants, so that's a result of the introduction of the empowered community. As such, the ccNSO is developing all kinds of internal guidelines how to deal with its new role, so a lot of volunteered time goes into making this happen. They are intending to focus on the implementation of the SO/AC accountability as proposed through Work Stream 2 from the accountability working group. It's been put a little bit on hold, awaiting the outcome of the broader discussions. I think I've alluded a little bit on the IDN ccTLD policy. It will be reviewed shortly because of the evolution of the fast track process, and the evolution of the way the confusing similarity review, and that's what is meant with [DPSRP]

And another reason for reviewing and updating the IDN overall policy has to do with variant management. The GNSO and ccNSO have been asked to look into this, and this is a reason for decisions or to review its current draft policy.

I've alluded a little bit to the ccNSO organizational review which is currently underway, so I'll not go into details. The only thing is the

review work party is looking at the first draft recommendations, and there will be a broader discussion, so with the community in Marrakech around the results [of the] proposals of the independent reviewers.

And then again, looking at the activities in a broader perspective, the ccNSO or country code top-level domain related people participate in Work Track 5 of the PDP subsequent procedures, and in the cross-community on auction proceeds, and in some of the specific reviews. So that's [inaudible].

And finally, as I alluded to, the ccNSO or a working group/committee has been very active in providing comments on ICANN strategic and operational planning. Probably, it was the first group that did it on a structural basis and started or since 2009. So there is a lot of experience within the ccNSO on dealing with the ICANN and strategic and operational planning processes. Next slide, please.

If you want to learn more, you can look at it again at your leisure, and then I believe the next slide is the ccNSO secretariat. I'm the guy on top. If you see me walking, you'll point me out fairly easy because I'm reasonably tall, probably the tallest person within the ICANN environment. And the three ladies are the secretariat of the ccNSO. Next slide, please.

So if you have any questions, do not hesitate to send an e-mail to the ccNSO secretariat, and thank you. I see a lot of new messages. Joanna, should I hand it back to you? A question, maybe first go back to Olivier because he has a question. Olivier?

JOANNA KULESZA:

Hello. Thank you, Bart. That was interesting. That's wonderful. Thank you very much for doing that. I believe we had a few questions in the chat box. We have Olivier's hands up. Please, Olivier, kindly post your question. [I have had a few questions noted down] from the chat room as well, and we have a few minutes, I think we might be able to take those if Bart agrees. Olivier, the floor is yours. Please ask your question. Olivier, we can't hear you. Olivier, can you hear us?

I have a question from Oksana who reported she has issues with the mic, so I'd be happy to report the question in the meantime before Olivier attends to the technical challenge that seems to be coming up with his mic.

So Oksana wanted to know what is the case when the manager responsible for the basic ASCII and the IDN name is not the same institution or the same individual? And who has the vote if those two responsibilities rest with different parties? [If that question is clear, carry on, Bart.]

BART BOSWINKEL:

I think the way I interpret these – and please correct me if I'm wrong, please add it to the chat – is assuming both could be members of the ccNSO, and you have a manager who runs the IDN and you have a manager who runs the two-letter codes, and they're different entities, the way it's foreseen right now in the – that is proposed, is that the two managers need to appoint one person who will vote on their behalf, and they need to sort out among themselves how they want to do this.

Until that time, the manager who is member first takes the vote, and there is some mechanism proposed as well in case there is a real issue between the two. But that's how it works out, and it is probably the two fundamental issues here which are very relevant for the ccNSO.

First of all, it's one country, one vote, and the people who designed the mechanism did not want to tinker with that. When you start tinkering with it, as soon as you allow – say, in some cases, some countries will not ever have an IDN ccTLD. I'm from one of those countries, The Netherlands. In a way it's good, and in a way it's bad. But there is only one ccTLD.

On the other hand, as I said, you have, say, India, which now if you would count them all will have 12 ccTLDs, and so that would mean depending on the mechanism you choose, it could be 12 votes.

So to avoid this, the basic principles, what everybody agreed upon, at least when it was developed – that needs to be confirmed – is one vote per country. So that's one principle.

The second principle is – and that's related – people should sort out their issues internally. The ccNSO nor ICANN should have any role to decide what is happening internal in a country. So if two ccTLDs, the IDN and the ASCII ccTLDs are not able to sort it out, you have a serious issue, but that's an internal issue. The ccNSO could mediate, provide some mechanism, but will not make a selection. So I hope that answers the question.

JOANNA KULESZA: I think that was most informative, Bart. Thank you very much. We still have Olivier [with] his hand up. If I understand correctly, in the chat box, he was asking about ccTLDs that have mirrors. You mentioned mirrors and there's a question from him asking about countries that actually do have mirrors. Would you be willing and able to give us some examples?

BART BOSWINKEL: Mirrors? I don't understand the concept of mirrors.

JOANNA KULESZA: My understanding was that you mentioned that some ccTLDs use mirroring providers, and that was Olivier's question. But if that's not clear, I'm happy to wait for –

BART BOSWINKEL: Maybe the way – how a ccTLD is structured is – and maybe this will answer the question – is locally determined, and how it works is again locally determined. In some cases – and I know them, you'll have ccTLDs which are run as not-for-profits, but what they do, the manager is a not-for-profit, but you could have an operator, somebody who really does the day-to-day work, which could be a gTLD provider, so a backend provider. That's one way of organizing.

Another way of organizing is that a not-for-profit is both the [manager or manages] the ccTLD but also does the day-to-day business. And it also could be a for profit in some cases. So that's very much locally determined in how it runs. So I hope this answers the questions.

JOANNA KULESZA: That is my hope as well. We're happy to hear from Olivier when he attends to those technical issues. I have Abdelmonem's hand up and Vanda's hand up, and I would like to take those two questions or comments in that order. So Abdelmonem, if you have audio, the floor is yours.

ABDELMONEM GALILA: Yes. Thank you very much. I would like to follow up about Bart's answer about two managers, one from ASCII and other one from IDN. What I want to say is that [how come ASCII should still be manager] to vote for IDN policies? I don't like the idea about that, to only have one of these two votes.

Second item, I would like to follow that, I think that our colleague that's talking about data mirroring, I think he is talking about data escrow, escrow of data. I think big ccTLDs that have a large number of domain names like this idea of data escrow, and of course, it's a lot of money to save your data away from your country in case [of a disaster, you will] roll back to the original backup of this data [inaudible]. Thank you.

BART BOSWINKEL: Thank you, Abdelmonem, for your questions. First of all, let me first go back to your second point about data escrow. Again, data escrow is something that is determined locally. If a ccTLD wants to have data escrow, wants to have it in place, either because of a local arrangement with its interested parties or with its government or other entities,

that's a local matter. It's not a matter of the ccNSO, and I know some ccTLDs do it and I know some don't. They have other provisions to ensure they have continuity. So that's one point. Again, so the ccNSO has no role there, and that's important to understand.

Going back to your second point, I do not want to imply – and if I did, I apologize – that an ASCII ccTLD determines policy for the IDN ccTLD or vice versa. From that perspective, they are different entities, and the ccNSO has no role. The only thing where it becomes important is if both the IDN ccTLD and the ASCII ccTLD are members of the ccNSO, and this is what is currently foreseen. In such a case, this IDN ccTLD and the ASCII ccTLD need to agree on a person who will vote on their behalf. So it's a matter of both.

But at the same time, what you can see is in some cases, the IDN or the ASCII ccTLD is already a member of the ccNSO, and up and until the time that they've agreed on such a person, that person of the ccTLD or the ASCII ccTLD may vote on ccNSO matters and ccNSO matters only, so that's for example the election of the council members or the election of board members, or other areas, say, where there is no vote, the IDN ccTLD and ASCII ccTLD are considered and should be considered the same and they – for example asking for a vote on a council decision. I hope this clarifies the point.

JOANNA KULESZA:

Thank you very much, Bart. I believe Vanda has stepped down from the queue. I saw a hand from Olivier Crépin-Leblond. Is that hand still up? If Olivier wishes to speak, the floor is his. [inaudible].

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you, Joanna. My question was also answered, and it also had to do with Olivier Kouami's question. So thank you.

JOANNA KULESZA: Thank you. And I believe Olivier Kouami's question has been attended to by Vanda, and [inaudible] offered to send more information via e-mail. Olivier seems to be having pertaining issues with his microphone. I hope that question was answered by the chat responses and Bart's response as well.

Yes, if there are any more questions, Bart has kindly agreed to [inaudible] still unclear. Are there any more questions from our participants? We still have a few more minutes of Bart's time. I don't see any hands up. If that is not the case, I would be happy to thank Bart. That was most informative. I think everyone that has been involved with ccTLDs has learned a few new things, and those of us who are new to the issue have learned a lot.

I see a quick comment from Vanda. If you want to make a quick comment, Vanda, I see your hand up. Please, you have the floor. We have four more minutes. Go ahead.

VANDA SCARTEZINI: Okay. Thank you. Thank you, Bart, it was great. What I'd like to know is nowadays, what is the percentage of ccTLDs that contribute financially to ICANN? DO we have this percentage, the statistics? Thank you.

BART BOSWINKEL:

Yes, and I think currently, the latest figure for fiscal year 19 is \$1.9 millions, so that's the voluntary financial contribution, and I believe it's around 55 ccTLDs. And what you have to bear in mind, some ccTLDs pay a far larger amount depending on the domain names under management than others. But you also see some smaller ccTLDs, and definitely some smaller ccTLDs who also financially contribute, and some larger ones don't.

But again – and this is something to bear in mind. Financial contribution to the ccNSO is not a requirement for ccNSO members. Effectively, if you would look at the distribution, you will see that non-ccNSO members or ccTLDs who [were] non-ccNSO members financially contribute to ICANN, and they do it for their own reasons, and probably, it is to express their support for ICANN's work with respect to the IANA naming function.

So it's another way of looking at, say, ccTLDs, which I have not included in this presentation. I'd say a third way of looking at them – and you didn't ask, but maybe some people are interested – you have some ccTLD managers who've entered into an accountability framework or exchange of letters with ICANN. And again, that is not required for ccNSO members, nor – so again, it's a voluntary arrangement, and you will see members and nonmembers who've entered in such an arrangement with ICANN.

So that's another way of looking at the relationship between ccTLDs and ICANN. Today, I was just focusing on the ccNSO and the relation

between ICANN and the ccTLD community and ICANN through the lens of the ccNSO. Thank you.

VANDA SCARTEZINI: Thank you, Bart.

JOANNA KULESZA: Thank you very much, Bart. That was most informative and helpful. Thank you for the information we see here on the slide, and [inaudible] information on the monthly ccNSO newsletter. I believe that one is open to all, should we wish to subscribe.

Our time is up, so I will be slowly closing the webinar. Thanks, everyone, for attending. Bart has kindly agreed to join us again tomorrow. I believe it is 12:00 UTC that [inaudible] correct me, Claudia, if that might be in incorrect.

We will be discussing the same issues, [inaudible] then you might want to join us again. Thank you so much, Bart. That was most informative. Thank you, everyone, for joining us. Thank you to the staff and thank you to our interpreters. It is 12:00 noon UTC tomorrow.

BART BOSWINKEL: [inaudible] and talk to you tomorrow. Bye.

JOANNA KULESZA: [inaudible]. Bye.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]