

INFORME  
REUNIÓN  
ICANN 48

November 2013

Buenos Aires



[www.lactld.org](http://www.lactld.org)

## Internet Governance: high on the list

The ICANN 48 meeting in Buenos Aires was heavily influenced by the recent developments in the Internet Governance landscape of the past months and ICANN's changing role in the Internet Governance ecosystem.

ICANN's President, Fadi Chehadé has a new vision about the role that ICANN has to play in the IG landscape, which had been traditionally one of relative silence with respect to these issues. The two letters sent by [Fadi Chehadé](#) and [Steve Crocker](#) on 14 November, just before the ICANN meeting, were a sign that the Board was explicitly supporting the President's active stance in leading the Internet Governance debate of the previous months and those to come. Nevertheless, following the explicit comments repeatedly stated by Fadi and Steve Crocker at the opening session, this does not mean that ICANN will be involved in the future of all IG arrangements but is kick-starting initiatives in the hope that other stakeholders will take the lead.

Some of the recent events that have triggered ICANN's new engagement strategies are the following:

- Snowden's declarations of massive global surveillance, mainly by the US government.
- Fadi Chehadé's announcement of a Strategy Panel on the Future of Global Internet Governance led by Vint Cerf. This had already been announced at ICANN 47 in Durban and Cerf reappeared at an ICANN meeting for the first time since 2007.
- The [Montevideo Declaration](#) on the Future of Internet Cooperation on 7 October with the I\* organizations.
- The initiation of the discussion between ICANN and the government of Brazil after Dilma Rousseff's address at the UN General Assembly. We now know that the meeting will be called "Global Multistakeholder Meeting on the Future of Internet Governance" and that it will be held in Sao Paulo, on 23-24- April 2014.
- The [1-Net initiative](#) was initiated by ICANN during the IGF 2013 in Bali (22-25 October) to promote an agenda that is forward-looking and multi-stakeholder to engage not only with the Brazil meeting next April, but other relevant issues, including the globalization of IANA functions which had already been expressed in the Declaration of Montevideo.
- ICANN's compromise with the IGF model was expressed repeatedly, including the fact that the Brazil meeting will not be a substitute for the IGF but a complementary initiative to discuss currently orphan issues within the current institutional landscape. The following three IGF meetings were announced by Fadi Chehadé in his opening speech: IGF 2014 in Istanbul, IGF 2015 (10<sup>th</sup> edition) in Brazil and IGF 2016 in Mexico.
- The 4 Regional Organisations (AFTLD, APTLD, CENTR & LACTLD) agreed the following strategic positions:
  - The Regional Organisations request involvement in all future I\* meetings.
  - The Regional Organisations support LACTLDs General Manager Carolina Aguerre to represent them in the Brazil meeting.

## Highlights from different sessions

The meeting was well attended with 1,800 participants and a nurtured participation of regional representatives. In this meeting ICANN also celebrated its 15<sup>th</sup> anniversary.

The ccNSO finalised the discussion on Financial Contributions: the Council adopted the guidelines on voluntary contributions. While underlining the voluntary nature of the contributions, the ccNSO

encourages ccTLDs seeking guidance to use these guidelines to define the fair amount that they can contribute to ICANN.

Once again, the [GAC failed to come to an agreement](#) with respect to the .wine/.vin issue. This is not just about claiming rights to alcoholic beverages. It even is not just about the safeguards for geographical indicators. But this discussion touches the fundamentals of the GAC processes, which is currently under heavy criticism by European and Latin American countries. Where does GAC advice end and where does geopolitical and commercial treaty drafting start?

The ICANN Latin American and Caribbean strategy dwelled on the advances in the five pilot projects and there was a Latin American and Caribbean space organized within the session with presentations from .co and .mx. There is definitely scope for improvement in the organization of this session, since there was no time for questions, nor engagement with the audience to develop the projects that were being discussed.

The five [strategy panels](#) which had been announced in Durban, and developed in the subsequent months, held their first open sessions at this meeting. These will be under Theresa Swinehart's new position in ICANN as Senior Advisor to the President. These panels comprise: Identifier Technology Innovation (Chair: Paul Mockapetris); ICANN Multistakeholder Innovation (Chair: Beth Simone Noveck); Public Responsibility Framework (Chair: Nii Quaynor); ICANN's role in the Internet Governance Ecosystem (Chair: Vint Cerf); Role of ICANN in the Future of Internet Governance is currently under focus for definition. These panels will not be a substitute for ICANN's five-year strategic plan, but are inputs that will feed and inform the organization and its strategic development.

## ccNSO meeting: 19-20 November

For a full view of the final agenda and the power point presentations available:  
<http://ccnso.icann.org/meetings/buenos-aires/agenda.htm>

Two working groups deserve particular attention:

**Finance Working Group.** The [Finance Working Group has established recommendations](#) for contributions based on numbers of names. The ccNSO has developed a “banded model” for voluntary contributions to ICANN. However, the level of contribution that any ccTLD registry makes to ICANN should continue to be determined between ICANN and the individual ccTLD manager.

- Although this initiative had been proposed in Beijing, refined in Durban, and further elaborated for Buenos Aires, there was still resistance encountered by two main arguments: (a) the banded model vs. a linear progression model; (b) the idea that ICANN needs to have clearer intentions in cost reductions. The 7-tier banded model proposed is based on a value-exchange model.
- ICANN and the ccNSO acknowledge the value exchange model with “specific”, “shared” and “global” value categories, which has been developed cooperatively as the basis to allocate expenditures.
- The ccNSO recognized that ICANN undertakes expenditures that are of direct and specific benefit to the ccNSO community and recommends that ICANN be reasonably compensated for these costs.
- Where a ccTLD agrees to initiate payment of contributions or to an increase in contributions, either as a result of the adoption of this guideline or in time, after reaching a higher band, these amounts could be phased in annually or over a period of over 3-5 years.

Where a Registry is responsible for managing more than one ccTLD, it will have the option of determining its ICANN contribution on the basis of either:

- The total domains under management
- The sum of the contributions of the individual ccTLDs

It is worth noting that this recommendation obtained unanimous full support during the ccNSO council on Wednesday 20.

- **The Framework for Interpretation Working Group.** The [FOIWG](#) has been reviewing a history of delegations, transfers and revocations and in this opportunity has made a significant finding: re-delegation never existed in any policy process or document. The exact terms for the processes are: delegation, transfer or revocation.

Revocation is the last resort option for the IANA Operator. Revocation refers explicitly to a change in organization and player. RFC 1591: limit revocation to cases where the IANA Operator reasonably demonstrates there are persistent problems with the operation of a domain. If the manager does not consent to a proposed transfer, this is the only mechanism available to the IANA Operator to deal with ultimately intractable problems.

### Other ccNSO sessions:

The round table discussion: **“Internet Governance in the light of the Montevideo Statement”** highlighted the role of I\*organizations in the process, as well as the need for ccTLDs to be part of these meetings with other organizations from the Internet technical community, particularly since IANA functions are beginning to get discussed under this institutional context.

The roundtable discussion on **“Capacity Building”** focused mainly on Security and Stability as it relates to ccTLDs, including:

- Identifying the potential effect on all ccTLDs when one ccTLD has a failure
- The value of prior proper planning as covered in some training courses that ccTLD Regional Organizations, including LACTLD, initiated in conjunction with ICANN, Delta Risk and ISOC in the past years.
- Capacity building was also underscored as part of the agenda of LACTLD by Eduardo Santoyo (.co), where the large registries have a compromise with the smaller ones and for that reason they support financially more generous contributions to capacity building activities within the scope of LACTLD.

The panel session on **“Stability & Security from the Perspective of Global Companies”** included the presentation of .cr’s attack and the lessons learned for all registries, including gTLD which have also experienced similar kind of attacks. MarkMonitor provided interesting statistics: they are currently offering registry lock to 24 registries and they also stated that there is no pattern for vulnerabilities: registries in developing countries, registries in developed countries and in all parts of the world face the same issues without a clearly identifiable trend.