



## **ISOC in ICANN Meeting**

**Sunday 21<sup>st</sup> June 2009**

**Chair: Cheryl Langdon Orr (ISOC AU Chapter)**

### **Attendees**

(in person)

Cheryl Langdon Orr (ISOC Australia)  
Holly Raiche (ISOC Australia)  
Jonne Soininen (ISOC Finland)  
Tony Hill (ISOC Australia)  
Kevin Karp (ISOC Australia)  
Sivasubramanian Muthusamy (ISOC India, Chennai)  
Rudi Vansnick (ISOC Belgium)  
Chung Laung Liu (ISOC Taiwan)  
Allen Jong-Woei Whang (ISOC Taiwan)  
Ting-Yun Chi (ISOC Taiwan)  
Didier Kasole (ISOC Democratic Republic of Congo)  
Hawa Kiakite (ISOC Mali)  
Sebastien Bachollet (ISOC France)  
Frederic Guillemaut (ISOC France)  
Desiree Milsosевич (ISOC BoT, ISOC Serbia, Belgrade)  
Patrick Vande Walle (ISOC Luxembourg)  
Stefano Trumpy (ISOC Italy)  
Individual Members  
Glenn Ricart (PIR BoT)  
Barbara Fraser (PIR BoT)  
Jim Galvin (Affilias)

### **ISOC Staff**

Anne Lord  
Carmen D'Ellerba  
Drew Dvorshak  
Jean Marc Lilla  
Lynn St Amour (ISOC CEO & President)

Bill Graham  
Rajnish Singh  
Christine Runnegar  
**Sphere Project**  
Robin Loan

### **Apologies**

Alice Yu (ISOC TW)  
Olga Cavalli (ISOC AR)  
Vanda Scartezini

### **Draft Agenda**

#### **1. Welcome and introductions**

Cheryl opened the meeting and welcomed the attendees. There were introductions around the room.

#### **2. Post JPA discussion**

Bill Graham led by noting that there was a good response from Chapters to the JPA call for comments and thanked everyone. ISOC submitted an early response in the hope that it would influence other comments. Some Chapters also noted ISOC HQ response in their own responses to the enquiry.

According to information, around 80 responses made by various groups around the world to the Notice of Inquiry (NOI). Apparently two-thirds are in favour of continuing oversight. Some referred to a renewed JPA will limited conditions. In the US Government Anna Gomez is responsible for decision. It was noted that she is here is at this ICANN meeting and Lynn and Bill have an appointment on Tuesday afternoon with her.

Apparently there is no plan for a public meeting in Washington as per previous meetings. All comments and they will come to a decision and announce. House of Representatives hearing was fairly "brutal". Some big lobbying efforts going on in Washington to attempt to influence the outcome.

ISOC response identified areas where ICANN needs to continue evolving after the end of the JPA.

Bill noted he welcomed comments and feedback from the Chapters.

Holly Raiche: where were the submissions from and what did they envisage for "post JPA?"

Bill commented that the submissions were reasonably well distributed from all over the world but the majority from the US. Many from "brandholders" Intellectual Property (IP) holders concerned about new TLD process. There were also comments on accountability and some concerns about security and stability (which may have been misunderstood). Bill will summarise comments in a table and will to send that round to all those who were interested.

Sebastian Bachollet commented that the timeframe is very short. He felt a need to "go outside" the JPA as there is still work to be done with other stakeholders and constituencies.

Holly Raiche commented that she was not clear in what the problem is that is being solved. ICANN has activities etc that will not start or stop because of the JPA – she questioned what difference the JPA would make.

Sebastian feels that ISOC could have an important role to suggest a way forward. He observed a lack of consensus ie within the European community.

Lynn commented that rather than suggest an interim model, within ISOC (and in particular the Board) there was strong agreement to end the JPA. The second most important thing stressed by the Board was the collaborative management and collaborative model that should continue.

Holly commented that the submission from ISOC AU on the previous round was around the continuation of IANA regardless of the outcome. Holly commented that ICANN could operate well without the JPA. What has the US treaty relationship done to the way ICANN operates?

Desiree commented in regard to section 8.5. about JPA, says that EU is in agreement that this should be the last JPA.

[http://ec.europa.eu/information\\_society/policy/internet\\_gov/docs/communication/comm2009\\_277\\_fin\\_en.pdf](http://ec.europa.eu/information_society/policy/internet_gov/docs/communication/comm2009_277_fin_en.pdf)

<http://arstechnica.com/tech-policy/news/2009/06/eu-admits-icann-setup-has-worked-well-wants-change-anyway.ars>

"The indication by the US government in 2006 that the current agreement should be the last such agreement with ICANN was largely welcomed by the international community (including the EU)."

However the report itself contains some difficult ideas about intergovernmental co-operation.

Cheryl asked if it was a hard stop or is there a middle ground – it is not entirely clear. Cheryl reminded Chapters to have “hallway” conversations on this topic while at the meeting to reinforce the ISOC position and to help influence decisions.

There was a question as to whether there was a possibility for a followup Marratech meeting to discuss this further? Bill agreed to help find a time for a Marratech call with Chapters on this.

Lynn restated ISOC position. ie. JPA should end, support ICANN and support for the multi-stakeholder model should be restated and restated.

Cheryl commented that ISOC has a powerful global voice and we should make the most of it.

### **3. ICANN Plan on Security (examining chapter input/perspectives across different ICANN constituencies - comments are due 21 June)**

Patrick Vande Walle commented regarding the plan and gave an overview of the document. The document suggested that the work in several areas:

#### **a) DNS system**

\* DNS SEC - signing of root zone file – discussions with Verisign, DoC and ICANN for the process to sign the root. This will take a long time. Most people who want to use DNSSEC will reply on alternatives.

\* Ensured stability where the DNS to work 24x7 all year round. This implies processes for security and stability in place – what are they? Emphatically they also need to be at the top level and again at the lower level. ICANN is a strong influencer of technical requirements for TLDs.

\* Security is also at the registrar level. A registrar was subject to a hack in NZ with access to customer accounts. Security is about the running of registrar systems.

#### **b) Other suggestions**

\* Plan also contains suggestions on how to go forward on other issues where ICANN cannot be the leader: eg. Virus and malware spreading using the DNS System. Not specifically an ICANN task but registries and registrars can help.

\* Operations of the A Root server by ICANN and measures to be taken

Patrick encouraged everyone to read the report. Comments close today and midnight UTC so you can make your comments today, missing dinner . Cheryl also mentioned that comments could also come in via the ALAC.

### **c) Working Group on Security issues held by At Large summit in Mexico**

Suggestions received very well received by the technical community. This helped demonstrate that ALAC is a credible partner in the ICANN community. People who were members of that group were also ISOC Chapters so there is an interesting nexus.

Cheryl asked how we could as ISOC Chapters, how as a group we could make stronger statements on this topic. She also commented that the Chapters might have a remit on outreach in their local countries.

Shiva also felt that the connection between At-large and ISOC could make some people nervous. Cheryl clarified that this is not necessarily the case.

Holly – commented that she felt that there were things missing like timelines. Patrick commented that indeed there were no hard deadlines at this point.

Jim Galvin pointed to a discussion in ICANN at 9am on Wednesday.

Patrick commented that the Chapter role could be to encourage ccTLD's to sign their zone.

Jim commented that with respect to registration security: Chapters could do work in educating registrars what to expect. There is a lot of help from the security and advisory committee, but it is useful to encourage registrars. There is a lot of good documentation now on the ISOC Website. There is an 8am presentation on [?] protecting registration services and people were invited to those meetings.

Lynn commented that ISOC did submit a response in October to the Notice of Inquiry (NOI) which is on the ISOC website. Also the IETF in Stockholm in July, ISOC is preparing a DNS Sec media briefing (.se was one of the first ccTLD's signed and PIR was the first gTLD to sign).

Rudi suggested that each Chapter should contact their ccTLD and to registrars try to encourage them towards steps for DNSSEC and that this is an important issue.

Holly mentioned in ICANN accreditation agreement there are now some very strong obligations on resellers.

Shiva commented that this does not fully solve Internet Security for the user.

Barbara Fraser commented that she does not challenge the fact that there is more than user security problem. She felt that we would do ourselves a disservice if we allow that situation and observation from moving us forward. Not all the DNS security issues are solved with this, but it is an important piece of the puzzle and an important step forward.

Jim felt that it was important for registrars to "raise the bar" in terms of standards.

Cheryl commented that in the user community the ALAC is working hard to "lift the bar" in terms of the experience for the user community.

## **4. New gTLDs from the user perspective (including IDN's)**

Professor Lui commented that language brings in many issues. With Chinese for example, there is simplified and complex characters so it is not easy. ISOC TW will express their opinion in working with Chinese language committees.

Cheryl asked if Professor Lui had any comment on the 3 versus 2 versus 1 character sets debate? He felt he thought it was rather an emotional issue rather than a technical issue. She also commented that she would like to see some solidarity behind others who have "script" requirements and is important for the "next billion online".

Rudi gave examples of the complexity and issues to be solved with China where 56 million people may have to change their name because one character is not allowed in the second level domain.

Cheryl commented that the in the Indian sub-continent has a great need and invited Shiva to comment.

Shiva (IDN liaison role for the ALAC) commented that he was simply observing needs and discussions at this point. He asked if there was a "second level reference table" for certain names.

Lynn asked whether there was a position developing within the ALAC to new TLDs? Cheryl answered "yes" – it was one of the working groups out of the summit. The "cost" of entry and maintenance to gTLDs, ALAC been very active in looking at Intellectual Property (IP), examining consumer risk (is more choice more risk), and does everyone need a gTLD? gTLD's are not at the consumer interest end of things. ALAC does not want commercially exploitable model to have high barriers of entry.

Cheryl noted that the ALAC is having a meeting with GAC to discuss the "lists" of 3 letter codes (and asked 'where did they come from?').

Stefano Trumpy (part of GAC representing Italy) commented that the new gTLD process is one of the new major challenges facing ICANN which will go on for a long time. We see many efforts (guidebooks etc) but there is no strategic plan from ICANN. ie. What is the present situation and demand for domain names? US Government commented that they would like to see more studies and analysis. Also questions like – how many contracts and applications to process them all and the impact of that?

Jim invited attendees with an interest in this topic to Meeting tomorrow at 4pm about what happens when the root grows.

Lynn commented that part of the registry review is to examine collapsing the registry/registrar process. From ISOC's perspective, it is important to revert back to the original principles which looked at competition and support the principles in place. PIR has established a site call [registryregistrarsseparation.org](http://registryregistrarsseparation.org). Lynn asked for Chapters to sign it but it would be good to sign up from different organisations rather than ISOC. Cheryl said she would convey this to the ALAC.

Patrick commented that there had been suggestions not to split the registry and registrar business up to a certain number. Particularly in the case where you are targeting a very small operation you may not find registrars willing to carry the domain. The limit (50-80,000 domains) is under discussion. He commented that this also extended to 'backend' providers.

Cheryl closed the meeting and thanked everyone for attending.