



## ICANN MARRAKESH REPORT 24 – 30 June 2006

### 1. INTRODUCTION

Marrakesh is a fantastic place for discovering. Amongst fine wining and dining, albeit fewer cocktail functions, it turned out to be an excellent venue for the meeting. Coffee, Moroccan tea and pastries were flowing. All in all the Marrakesh was one of the most productive ICANN meetings so far. All the constituencies seemed to get on well with their tasks at hand. There were few contentious issues other than the ongoing who-is and new gTLD's (global top level domains) processes which were not dealt with to any conclusion at this meeting.

### 2. GENERAL AND TECHNICAL ISSUES

#### Internationalised Domain Names

IDNs are maturing; the Arab communities demonstrated that they have a working model being tested across all the Arab countries. There are mixed results with Saudi Arabia being the most popular. The ccNSO meeting of Monday, 26 June 2006 agreed that

- ccTLD managers should be responsible for IDN ccTLD including the IDN string/s.
- The IDN ccTLD issue should be made a PDP for public input.

There is no pressure on .za DNA to focus on IDN in the short to medium term, but it is important that we keep track of the ongoing discussions.

*Action A: Techcom*

#### DNSSec

DNSSec is also maturing although not yet to be seen as a serious issue for our consideration. We should keep an eye on it over the coming 12 months. It is anticipated that it will become more serious in 12-18 months. There were no real discussions on the UDRP.

### 3. INTERNATIONAL CCTLD GOVERNANCE AND POLICY

**The Country Code Name Supporting Organisation (ccNSO)** proved to be very stimulating in that it allowed us an opportunity to communicate with other ccTLD managers at both formal and informal level. Particular ideas were shared with ccTLDs such as .kr, .jp, and .ky.

#### Internet Assigned Number Authority (IANA)

IANA has not managed to reach all the milestones set since the Wellington meeting due to, inter alia, insufficient staff. However, it is working hard and seems to be improving a great deal under the helm of David Conrad. There was a significant presence of three staff and all were answering questions with the right answers.

IANA also reported on ongoing technical work including re-delegation of ccTLDs for countries such as Serbia & Montenegro. It will be announcing a re-delegation public comment on .ua (Ukraine) in a week's time, and will also be signing .arpa after a request by the Internet Architecture Board (IAB). Going forward,

IANA pledged to have better administration, reporting & business processes, to improve performance and to release new communication tools (e.g. IANA website).

### **ICANN Accountability Framework**

The fees apportionment group has failed and the ccNSO has fallen back on the old principle where ccTLDs are encouraged to contribute as much as they can. They also are making a bigger deal about this, and publishing each ccTLD contributions in 'bands'. (Alan: "Personally I would be ashamed to be at the highest band - i.e. Japan and Australia - who signed the first contracts with ICANN.")

Nonetheless there are a number of ccTLDs that are completing accountability frameworks. Basically they are simply exchanging letters. This is very 'light touch' but does at least allow each party to recognise each other. Germany, Namibia and England are some of the most recent notable ones.

(See: <http://www.icann.org/announcements/announcement-21jun06.htm> and <http://www.nominet.org.uk/news/latest/?contentId=3085>, and the email pasted below says a lot (*Appendix B*).

It is recommended that .za DNA should now consider the accountability framework more seriously.

*Action B: Board*

### **ccNSO institutional framework**

ccNSO's institutional framework, particularly its financial model, was also discussed. The desired funding model is to have ccTLDs undertaking to make contributions, say \$500 per annum. The current situation is that some ccTLDs (e.g. Deutschland, Netherlands & Canada) are making contributions, while the majority is not. It was agreed that draft guidelines on ccTLD financial contributions should be drafted & sent out for comments. These will simply be guidelines, not undertakings by ccTLDs to make contributions. We should discuss this once the guidelines are published.

*Action C: Board*

### **ICANN's 5 regions**

ccNSO also discussed the request to have the Asia/Pacific/Australia region split up as it is too vast, and makes it difficult, amongst other things, for the ccTLDs in the region to be properly represented at ICANN. It was agreed that ccNSO should address the proposed regional re-demarcation through a policy development process (PDP) & then forward a proposal to ICANN.

## **4. OTHER ICANN RELATED ISSUES**

### **Internet Governance Forum**

There was very little was mentioned about the IGF. All in all we were informed that the Prepcom meeting of May had been a success, and that the structure and format of the IGF launch in late October 2006 had been agreed. The agenda for the IGF has also been agreed, and it will focus on such issues as Internet access, governance, and security. In addition, there will be no presentations by governments at the launch. Rather, governments will be allowed to send short video messages of support.

### **African Top Level Domains (AFTLD)**

The African Top Level Domains (AFTLD) held their general meeting on Saturday, 24 June. The meeting was well attended with at least 24 African ccTLDs present. We could only join the afternoon session of the meeting as we landed in Marrakesh just after lunch. The earlier sessions had seen presentations by other ccTLDs such as .jp and .ke. The meeting agreed to extend the term of its current Executive Committee (Exco), and to co-opt certain individuals to be part of the extended Exco to help it make AFTLD function as an organization.

Among the co-opted individuals, the .za DNA GM (Vika Mpisane) was endorsed by the general meeting to serve as AFTLD's general secretary and treasurer. The mandate of the extended of Exco runs until June 2007, and its main responsibilities include planning the 2007 AGM, raising funds, increasing and liaising with membership, and organizing training programs for African ccTLDs.

#### **ICANN contract**

The ICANN President's focus was to encourage people and organisations to respond to the US government's call for submissions with regard to the ICANN contract renewal. Some ccTLDs (mainly within GAC) still felt that the issue was a US government issue, and that other countries could not be required by the US government to comment on its internal matters.

The ICANN President suggested considering the 'big picture' and the alternatives to ICANN (personal e.g. a prescribed fee given out by another UN type organisation). There is a need for .za DNA to seriously consider a response. The original call for submissions is here:

[http://www.ntia.doc.gov/ntiahome/frnotices/2006/NOI\\_DNS\\_Transition\\_0506.htm](http://www.ntia.doc.gov/ntiahome/frnotices/2006/NOI_DNS_Transition_0506.htm).

*Action D: Board*

#### **At-Large Advisory Council (ALAC) RALOs**

Whilst we found out that there still were no RALOs, along with ISOC- Morocco and ISOC-Sudan, ISOC-ZA (all ALS's) agreed to establish the African RALO. This will probably be the first, and the African RALO requested an official response from ICANN to establish some formal agreement. The other regions are now more seriously preparing their RALOs and the (interim) ALAC committee members have recognized that they need to either make sure this happens quickly or some other mechanism must replace them.

#### **ICANN Nominating Committee**

The Nominating Committee reported that it is currently filling in 3 ICANN Board vacancies.

### **5. CONCLUSION**

The meeting was useful and important for the global standing of the .za DNA. Of particular inspiration were the presentations by ccTLDs such as .nl, .tw, .cz, and .jp. This should encourage .za DNA to use all its strength and resources to finalise its policy and business model, and fully perform its functions as a ccTLD Manager. The .nl ccTLD were generous enough to give memory sticks for free at the ccNSO meeting, and one day, we hope, .za DNA will return the favour.

Issues that require .za DNA's attention have been identified as "action" points above. It is important that the Techcom takes a leading role in giving direction on regarding technical issues. The Board will do well to apply its mind to other (non-technical) issues.

*Prepared by:  
Alan Levin (Board member); and  
Vika Mpisane (General Manager)  
Friday, 9 July 2006*

## Appendix A:

### CONTACTS

The GM and Alan Levin managed to make many new contacts. Alan was particularly instrumental in introducing the GM to key people within ICANN, including the ICANN CEO (Paul Twomey). Some of the contacts made include the following:

Paul Levins - ICANN communications  
Kim Davies - IANA ccTLDs  
Aziz Hilali - ISOC Morocco  
Mohamed El Bashir - ISOC Sudan and .sd  
Eung-Hwi Chun - .kr  
Roland LaPlante – Affilias (sponsors)  
Ms. Sean H. Park – Researcher, .kr (NIDA)  
Ms. Min-Jung Park - .kr  
Keonho Lee - .kr  
Ms. Jiyeon Kim - .kr  
David Archbold - .ky  
Ms. Hamida Benlemlih - .ma  
Ms. Yumi Ohashi - .jp  
Adam Peake – International University of Japan  
Ms. Connie Francis - .tz  
Mohamed Elfatih Altigani Ali – Sudatel (Sudan)

## Appendix B:

### Email re ICANN Accountability Framework

> Elisabeth Porteneuve <Elisabeth.Porteneuve@cetp.ipsl.fr> wrote on  
> 01/07/2006 12:36:40:  
>  
>> Your letters with ICANN will be available only on Monday, while I  
>> have an immediate question with regards to funding of ICANN. Did you  
>> set up in your AF with ICANN an annual amount of money, similarly to  
>> DENIC and subsequent?  
>>  
>  
> We have said that we will contribute, on a purely voluntary basis, to  
> the costs that are directly relevant to ccTLDs and provide \$85,000  
> for  
> the first year only. We will then review voluntary contributions in  
> future years.  
>  
> It is worth noting that both letters clearly state that they are not  
> a  
> contract.  
>  
>  
>> How does it concile with the duty of membership fees in ICANN Bylaws  
>> <http://www.icann.org/general/bylaws.htm#IX.4.2> ?  
>>  
>  
> I see ccNSO membership fees as being separate from any contributions  
> to ICANN. It is my understanding that ccNSO fees would relate to  
> specific ccNSO expenses - such as a separate ccNSO secretariat for  
> example.  
>  
>  
>> May I conclude that the ccNSO Council will decide for voluntary  
>> contributions of ccNSO members - which seems to be the only workable  
>> and respected solution the to eternal funding problem  
>>  
> [.....]  
>  
> The proposed way forward this week was for a contribution table, that  
> would have a range of financial bands. ccTLDs would then voluntarily  
> self select (if they wish to do so) which band they wish to be in.  
> This seemed to me to be a very sensible and pragmatic way forward.