

**wwTLD Meeting Report**  
*Leila Bouchet*

*Executive Summary*

- *The opening section of the meeting shed light on the different stakeholder relation models that exist at the global level. The general conclusion drawn from this section is that different models adapt to the different environments in which ccTLD's operate around the world*
- *Dispute resolution models vary, and the presentations given at the meeting showed that the local legal framework may play an important role in the evolution of Dispute Resolution Models operating in different registries. It was also noted that information sharing between registries has enabled the development of this type of service in many registries.*
- *Two presentations were also given focusing on Domain Name Market trend by VeriSign and the Spanish registry.*

## **1. Introduction**

The wwTLD meeting was attended by over 56 participants from 36 registries and organisations.

Giovanni Seppia (CENTR) welcomed all attendees and thanked the agenda committee for their work. He also thanked SWITCH and VeriSign for their generous sponsorship of the meeting.

## **2. Questionnaire**

Questionnaire - The meeting started by the distribution of a questionnaire, the responses of which would be presented at a later part of the meeting. The focus of the questionnaire was corporate governance.

<http://www.wwtld.org/meetings/cctld/20050710.Luxembourg-Corporate-Governance-Survey-gg-NigelRoberts.ppt>

## **3. Stakeholder Relation Models and Best Practice**

*The Brazilian Internet Steering Committee, Hartmut Glaser, .br*

<http://www.wwtld.org/meetings/cctld/20050710.Luxembourg-Brazilian-Internet-Governance-Model-br-HartmutGlaser.ppt>

Hartmut Glaser (.br) began his presentation by giving a brief overview of the historical developments of the registry as well as some statistics. He then outlined the guiding principle of the steering committee, which are multilateral participation, democratic process and transparency. He then outlined the four stakeholder groups (government, private sector, third sector, academic and expert) which amount to 21 members in total. He explained the creation of an executive entity for .br that issues binding decisions on the registry. He then turned to the services provided by NIC.br, and what requirements they must be up-held by domain name holder. The conclusion examined the other services and activities of the registry, which include domain name and IP assignment in Brazil and a Brazilian Computer Emergency Response Team, to name but a few.

HT (.no) asked that when cleaning the data-base, by what criteria it was decided that names are not in use. HG (.br) answered that it was either because of lack of payment or if it was inactive. HT (.no) shared that it was the same for .no HG (.br) added that in the case of .br most removals were done because of non-payment.

MS (.ch) asked what .br's relationship was to government. HG (.br) replied that nine government representatives are part of their steering committee, but they do not have any direct power. He added that they were an independent self regulating entity. SD (.de) stated that in the past, the registry had more private sector representatives. She asked what had brought about the change. HG (.br) explained that her analysis was erroneous as there had always been the same proportion of government representatives in the steering committee. There were 4 out of nine and now 9 out of 21. It is a model that works well for us

*LACTLD Initial Findings for Best Practice Documents – Oscar Robles-Garay (.mx)*

Oscar Robles-Garay (.mx) explained that the findings were preliminary and that the process was still at an embryonic stage. The aim is to understand the current situation of registries in the regions. At the moment, few responses had been received, but some general findings on specific areas are available. He re-stated that the project was at an initial stage and that it should not be taken as a best practice document. The presentation then turned to the five areas that they had findings for. In terms of organisation, most registries are set-up as non-profit organisations. There is little evidence to indicate that this trend will change in the future. There are, however, some for profit and private organisations. Although the organisations are non-profit, financial stability remains a key goal for them. From the technical side, upgrade of DNS server and relations with other registries to share infrastructure of DNS are important. The registrar/registry model is not common. Most registries accept registrations from foreigners, and this is a small change from the past as we used to have nationality requirements. In general terms, registries are moving to adopt more open models of registration. Communication remains scarce and very informal between registries and their customers, and we think that there are some interesting issues to be explored in this area. GS (CENTR) asked what time-frame they had established for this project. OR (.mx) replied that they expect all answers to be in by the beginning of August. If this is the case, then a report should be published by the fall.

*An Examination of the Registry/Registrar/Registrant Relationship in the .co.za Domain – Calvin Browne (.co.za)*

<http://www.wwtld.org/meetings/cctld/20050710.Luxembourg-Registry-Registrar-Registrant-co.za-CalvinBrowne.ppt>

An examination of the Registry/Registrar/Registrant Relationship in the CO.ZA domain, Calvin Browne, co.za

Presentation began with back-ground information on the registry. It was considered a medium sized registry, it has been a registry since 1995 and it has been set-up as a non-profit organisation. Many of the problems that have been encountered have been due mainly to the fact that it has operated in a policy vacuum. CB (.co.za) explained that it is a delegated sub-zone of .za, but there is no formal relationship between co.za. He then gave an out-line of how registry, registrar, registrant have operated in the past. He concluded by pointing out the mistakes that have been made in the past and provisions and guidelines for improvement in the future.

HT (.no) asked if a list of registrars was available, and if was it the case that anyone can act as an agent. CB (.co.za) replied that there was no official list and that anyone who has technical capability, can act as an agent.

SS (.ir) asked how their relationship with IANA was defined. For example, if there needs to be a change, who reports it? CB (.co.za) replied that they are a sub-zone of .za, so they do not need relationship with ICANN/IANA. YM (ccNSO) commented that they provide an important service to the community, and that it is dangerous that they operate without a legal structure. CB stated that if the local community was happy, then it should remain as it is.

HT (.no) asked that block registration of domain names can create problems, especially in the absence of any formal relationship. In light of this, is anew model being considered for the future? CB (.co.za) replied that they were reluctant to change things given the policy vacuum through which they are operating. He added that the legislation that is on course is taking a long time, and if they had known the process would be so complicated, then they would have used different methods such as work groups etc. Proper consultation is important, ORG (.mx) asked if they plan to open registrations on .za. VW (.za) stated that there is public consultation to see what the public wants.

*Stakeholder Relations in the Asia Pacific Region – Hiro Hotta (.jp)*

<http://www.wwtld.org/meetings/cctld/20050710.Luxembourg-Stakeholder-Relations-jp-HiroHotta.ppt>

Hiro Hotta (.jp) began his presentation by giving a historical time-line of the registry, highlighting that it has become a private commercial company since 2002. He explained the governance model of the registry, which operated through three main organs, namely government, JPNIC and JPRS (advisory committee). He outlined the method of communication with the community and ended by giving the composition of the advisory committee.

MS (.ch) stated that it was not clear how stock holders were involved. HH (.jp) answered that they are a private company. Their stocks are not available to all, as they are limited to very large companies. The view is that these companies participate in the stability and security of .jp. HT (.no) asked that if .jp had an advisory committee that gives advice, then who was responsible for policy development. HH (.jp) replied that PPRS was responsible for final decisions. HT (.no) reiterated the point that different ccTLD's work with different models, and it is paramount not to classify one model as being better than the other. In the case of .no, there is a close relationship with the government, but it is clear that close government relations may not be suitable for all registries.

#### **4. International Section**

*WGIG Update – Charles Shaban (WGIG)*

<http://www.wwtld.org/meetings/cctld/20050710.Luxembourg-Progress-Report-from-WGIG-AGIP-CharlesShaban.ppt>

Charles Shaban (WGIG) began by giving a summary of the WGIG process. He then listed the members of the working group, which come from the government, the private sector, civil society, and other sectors. The main parts of the presentation focused on the WG's definition of internet governance and the methods through which they would ensure that a; users needs will be taken into account. The conclusion out-lined the time-line for future steps.

LC (.uk) stated that they were keen to explain their local community involvement in policy. Will this issue be likely to be covered in the draft report? Are there likely to be options for the community to comment upon? CS (WGIG) replied that models will be presented. In relation to the report he explained that the aim was to it short and to the point, but that it will be supported by a background report that will be longer. All will be present within the two reports. PK (.ac) asked if there would be an opportunity to comment on report once it is published. CS (WGIG) stated that there would be a comment period, but the details of the process have not yet been finalised.

#### **5. Dispute Resolution Models and Best Practice**

*Dispute Resolution Service – Edward Phillips (.uk)*

<http://www.wwtld.org/meetings/cctld/20050710.Luxembourg-Dispute-resolution-in-uk-EdwardPhillips.ppt>

Edward Phillips (.uk) started his presentation by giving a back-ground and overview of the dispute resolution service. He continued by giving an example of what a successful mediation must show and an account of how the mediation actually happens. The ability to resolve disputes at an early stage, and the fact that resolutions are arrived at by the parties are some of the benefits of this service. He concluded by inviting participants to contact him if they would like more information on the service.

AB (.pl) asked if the numbers presented regarding number of cases, do the numbers relate to cases where the complainant paid the fee or is it the total number of requests. EP (.uk) replied that it was the full number. HT (.no) asked if the domain name holder had to participate in the mediation when someone brought a complaint. EP (.uk) replied that they do not have to be involved. HT (.no) stated that .no system is modelled on the .uk system. One of the things that they were trying to avoid was complainants who are just complaining to cause trouble and waste time of the registrant. We thought if they have to be involved, then it

may discourage them. EP (.uk) yes there are some cases, but it is difficult to weed them out without placing a judgment.

SD (.as) asked what resources were allocated to this service. EP (.uk) replied that the costs incurred were from some software development and 3 staff although it was difficult to assess the overlap between this and other activities. SD (.de) asked how many disputes were taken to court after this process. EP (.uk) replied that only 5-10 court cases per year. KVA (.ca) inquired why the service was not called arbitration. EP (.uk) replied that UK arbitration referred to a specific process and that the service provided by Nominet did not fall into that category.

#### *Updating the TLD Root Server data in the 21st Century – Paul Kane*

<http://www.wwtld.org/meetings/cctld/20050710.Luxembourg-the-TLD-Root-Server-shared-responsibility-ac-PaulKane.ppt>

Paul Kane (.ac) began his presentation by outlining the main goals of this project. The four main points are (1) the de-politization of the role of the root server system, (2) decentralization of Root Zone Data with information coming directly from registries, (3) to enhance the security, stability and efficiency of the DNS and (4) enabling equal access to all members of the registry community. He then gave the historical context that has led to the need for a project like this one to emerge. He highlighted that the registry community has shown that they would prefer the US to verify the process but not to authorise changes.

Focus on sharing the root server entries as outlined in the presentation. Many ccTLD's around the world have shown support for this

AV (.nl) stated that what we see is a number of conclusions based on a model, but that it is still not clear what the model is. The relationship with the DNS and this model is not clear.

PK (.ac) stated that the WGIG is likely to come up with a number of suggestions. How best to get authoritative information in the root zone file.

PK (.ac) asked the group if they were generally in favour of having the responsibility for changes to rest in registry or to leave it in the hands of the US Government. The group unanimously agreed that registry responsibility for changes was most favourable approach.

#### Joint Session with the GAC

#### The LDR Model in Chile – Margarita Valdéz (.cl)

<http://www.wwtld.org/meetings/cctld/20050710.Luxembourg-LDRP-CL-Experience-MargaritaValdes.ppt#15>

Margarita Valdéz (.cl) began her presentation by giving a historical background on registry activities. She then gave statistics regarding the use of the .cl domain in Chile, and on the use of the LDR model. She then outlined the two possible models for dispute which can occur during the first 30 days after a registration of a domain name. At this time the domain name is operational, but not permanent. A domain name can also be revoked after this 30 day period has ensued. Statistics show that in most cases, the outcome of the process favours the complainant rather than the defendant.

GS (CENTR) made reference to a part of the presentation regarding their 20 day stand-by policy. He asked if the name could be used immediately or if the applicant had to wait 30 days without being able to use the domain name. MV (.cl) replied that people who are susceptible of registering a domain name are well aware of the procedure and they are aware of the 30 day trial period. In any case, the name is active from the moment it is registered, but it only becomes permanent after the 30 day period, provided it has not been challenged.

GS (CENTR) also inquired about the registries marketing strategies. MV (.cl) replied that they are trying to increase the association between the registry and the University, but that they were undertaking general strategies to increase registrations.

HT (.no) asked what the rate of dispute was since the revocation period had been put into place. MV (.cl) replied that only 43 cases since 2001 and in most cases the original domain name holder retained the name.

SS (.ir) asked why .cl was so popular for Chile. PP (.cl) replied that the name was very old as it had been in use locally in the university and some other businesses. Once the internet grew in popularity, people were already familiar with the code. Reasonable prices as well as un-bureaucratic procedures have also contributed to the popularity of the name.

*Dispute Resolution in DENIC – Stephan Welzel (.de)*

<http://www.wwtld.org/meetings/cctld/20050710.Luxembourg-Dispute-Enhancement-de-StephanWelzel.pdf>

Stephan Welzel (.de) gave a presentation regarding DENIC's dispute policy. He began his presentation by giving some background information on the registry. He then out-lined the different types of possible dispute, and highlighted that DENIC is seldom involved in the process. He then went through a summary of DENIC's policy where they argue that there is no need for a resolution service given the highly effective and relatively cheap court system in Germany. He then explained the service of the dispute entry which facilitates the speed of the process. HE then outlined the requirements for this.

SD (.as) asked about DENIC's responsibility in the case that someone registers a name like landrovermakesbadcars.de. SW (.de) replied that they could only be involved if it was the identical name, anything that varies even slightly would not concern them. PP (.cl) asked what system was in place to alert them if a famous name was registered. SW (.de) replied that they do not monitor this. If there is a problem, someone will bring it to their attention, so it is not necessary for DENIC to have such checks in place. PP (.cl) asked who decided if the matter should be looked into. SW (.de) replied that only if the name was identical. If the name was not obviously famous, it is up to DENIC to decide whether the name is famous or not. SS (.ir) asked if the court could ask DENIC to freeze a domain name until a judgment was issued. SW (.de) replied that it would only be possible if DENIC was a defendant. According to German law, third parties may not be involved or called into a dispute. DK (RIPE NCC) asked how many of these requests did DENIC get per year. SW (.de) replied that it varied from 3-4000 per year at the moment. He stated that the number may seem high, but it must be taken in context; DENIC grows at approximately 1 million per year. OR (.mx) asked if DENIC requires for German address to register a name. SW (.de) replied that the administrative contact had to be in Germany. OR (.mx) asked what method they used to enforce this. SW (.de) replied that they did not actively check for this. If it comes to our attention, we ask the domain name holder to rectify the situation. If s/he fails to comply, then the name is deleted. OR (.mx) asked how many people worked in that department. SW (.de) replied 5. RW (.at) asked what the procedure were in the case that there were two legitimate claims to a name. SW (.de) replied that it was resolved on a first-come-first-serve basis.

WIPO and ccTLD's – Christian Wichard (WIPO)

<http://www.wwtld.org/meetings/cctld/20050710.Luxembourg-WIPO-and-ccTLDs-JohannesChristianWichard.ppt>

Christian Wichard gave an overview of how the service can be used. He then gave an example of the possible conflicts and outlined the complexities of the international dimension of cases. He brought forth the problem of time and money and the jurisdiction in such cases. He explained the possibility of avoiding courts in a case of clear abusive registration of a domain name. He highlighted that the UDRP was only applicable to ccTLD's through explicit adoption on their part. He then went through the UDRP infrastructure, the statistics and the benefits that can be drawn from this process.

HT (.no) stated that it was her impression that there were very few UDRP decisions that had been appealed. She asked for an exact number. CW (WIPO) replied that he did not have the exact data, but approximately 1% of cases were taken to local courts. HT (.no) explained that that number could indicate how accurate UDRP decisions actually are. If many were turned to local courts, then that would indicate that most users of the service felt that the decisions were not satisfactory.

SS (.ir) made mention of the special relationship that organisations like WIPO have with local governments. It is his experience that if there is a conflict or tension with the government, then the relationship with such organisations is affected. He asked if there was an official policy regarding this. CW (WIPO) replied that they work according to what is on IANA, but that they have sometimes worked with organisations where they were not sure. As soon as a relationship is established with the ccTLD, nothing should come in between it, in theory.

Disputes are undergone through private parties and we should not be operating through the political side of their organisations. He then invited for questions to be brought to him off-line.

## 6. Technical Session

Presentation of Technical Best Practice Showcase – Kim Davies (CENTR)

<http://www.wwtld.org/meetings/cctld/20050710.Luxembourg-Registry-Showcase-CENTR-KimDavies.ppt>

Kim Davies (CENTR) started by offering the background to this initiative, which lies in the desire of members to have a best practice guide. It was deemed that the term 'best practice' could be politically problematic, so the term 'Show Case' was used instead. The aim of this endeavour is to document registries' experience in different projects and to enhance information sharing. He then gave a number of examples that were already available. He concluded by inviting registries to contribute to this project.

*DNSMON – Daniel Karrenberg (RIPE NCC)*

<http://www.wwtld.org/meetings/cctld/20050710.Luxembourg-dnsmon-RIPE-DanielKarrenberg.ppt>

Daniel Karrenberg (RIPE NCC) started by stating that the aim of the project would be to monitor DNS servers from many places. The advantage of this is that there are many erroneous measurements, and many people use them. It is important to have the correct information. Multiple monitoring positions will help to arrive at correct measurements. He then went through a detailed explanation of the process.

AB (.pl) stated that they use this service extensively and find it positive, what could be added is information on trace roots. Even if the problem is not close to our server, we would still like to know. He also asked when IPv6 support could be expected. DK (Ripe NCC) replied that if there is a need for trace routes, to send him a reminder e-mail. They are also planning to implement an alarm system. For IPv6, it's on the list, but he stated that he could give more information through e-mail exchange as he did not have the precise dates. CB (.co.za) asked what the costs for hosting a probe are, if the information was made public and how many queries could be handled. DK (Ripe NCC) replied that he would give detail of the costs off-line. The bandwidth for DNS measurements allow approximately 60 queries/hour/probe. The DNS measurements are all public. The only difference in subscribing or not to the service lies in time frame in which you obtain the information.

*Evolution of DNS Services in .mx – Francisco Arias (.mx)*

<http://www.wwtld.org/meetings/cctld/20050710.Luxembourg-Evolution-of-DNS-services-in-mx-FranciscoArias.pdf>

Francisco Arias (.mx) started by giving a background of the evolution of the DNS in .mx. He outlined the implementation of dynamic updates in January 2004, which allows for every update to go immediately to the DNS stealth master. He then gave a detailed account of the use of shared Unicast giving special emphasis to blocking and unblocking of attackers and traffic engineering. In the near future, they will offer IPv6 support to Registry applications and detailed statistics on DNS queries. The concluding remarks focused on the unlikelyness of the implementation of IDN's.

*Proposition to Team with IETF/IAB in the Internet Standard Process – JFC Morfin*

<http://www.wwtld.org/meetings/cctld/20050710.Luxembourg-Proposition-to-team-with-IAB-IETF-nicso.org-JefseyMorfin.ppt#1>

JFC Morfin (NICSO) began by giving a historical development of the organisation. The changing nature of the internet requires the appropriate channels of communication and action. Private funding seems to be the direction towards which the internet is moving. If this is the case, something needs to be done so that public and non-profit organisations reclaim their position in all processes relating to the internet. Routing, key management, network

management/monitoring/reporting, service quality and freely distributable prototypes were identified as areas to that needed immediate attention. He concluded by proposing a number of forums where these issues could be dealt with.

KD (CENTR) asked why it was necessary to create these extra organisations. If there is a solution that you need that does not exist, then creating working groups or other tools can help to resolve the problem. JFCM replied that the existing mechanisms can help the larger ccTLD's, but not the smaller ones. Some channels do exist, but they are not adequate for all the needs of the different ccTLD's.

IDN Development in Taiwan – Ai-Chin Lu – (TWNIC)

<http://www.wwtld.org/meetings/cctld/20050710.Luxembourg-IDN-development-in-Taiwan-tw-Ai-Chin.Lu.ppt>

Ai-Chin Lu explained that the launch of the IDN was done in May 2000, and it entailed that for every English DN registered, one free corresponding Specific Chinese DN would be issued. She then explained the IDN standards for TWNIC. The current .tw IDN registration policy is done on a first-come-first-serve basis. The structure restrictions impose a 2 Chinese character as minimum, a maximum length of 63 bytes per puny code and that interleaving between simplified characters into traditional characters is not allowed. The presentation then turned to registration and resolution of IDN's and the registry/registrar framework. The concluding remarks focused on the proposal to ICANN for Internationalised ccTLD's.

## **7. Corporate Governance**

*Presentation on Questionnaire Findings – Nigel Roberts*

<http://www.wwtld.org/meetings/cctld/20050710.Luxembourg-Corporate-Governance-Survey-gg-NigelRoberts.ppt>

Nigel Roberts read out the answers of the survey and concluded that information-sharing is beneficial.

## **8. Domain Name Market Trends**

*De-regulation in Spain – Alberto Pérez-Gómez*

<http://www.wwtld.org/meetings/cctld/20050710.Luxembourg-Domain-names-under-es-AlbertoPerez.ppt>

Alberto Perez stated that lightweight rules, open to all, taking the risk of potential cyber squatting, fast registration and low prices were the main aims of the liberalisation of .es. The change was made through consultation of managers, stakeholders and public authorities. He then explained that the .es is controlled by public authorities because they believe it is the best way to ensure the security and stability of its use. He then offered an in-depth account of the legal background that permitted the changes for the liberalisation. He concluded by contrasting the old rules to the new, more liberal ones.

RW (.at) asked who was responsible for the setting the end-user price. AP (.es) replied that according to the orders approved by government, we must accept direct registrations, both have been imposed on to us, we have discussed with the ministry. For registrars there is a wholesale price. We know there will be some competition and the price will vary depending on the registrar. AB (.pl) asked if this liberalisation was due to the arrival of .eu, and he also asked what was meant by special domain names. AP (.es) replied that the liberalisation was not prompted by .eu. The most direct factor was the change of government. The opposition, which came into power in March 2004, had been criticizing the current government's policies on domain names. The 'special' domain names are not really relevant with the new policies anymore.

*Domain Name Trends – Sarah Langstone (VeriSign)*

<http://www.wwtld.org/meetings/cctld/20050710.Luxembourg-Market-Trends-VeriSign-SarahLangstone.ppt>

Sarah Langstone began by giving general statistics of the domain name industry, showing that .com and other ccTLD's (excluding .de and .uk as they were in a category of their own) had the biggest growth over the years. The next graph gave an overview of ccTLD growth over the past 4 years. She continued with statistical analysis of ht renewal growth of .com and .net registrations. The final part of the presentation focused on the impact of the PPC (Pay-Per-Click) on the industry. The findings show that end-users are satisfied as renewals have increased. She then gave a brief overview of trend in registrar behaviour in the areas of PPC, hosting services, blogging and international expansion into upcoming areas by sellers.

CB (.co.za) pointed out that the presentation did not contain any data from Africa. SL (VeriSign) answered that it was probably due to the fact that there was not much activity related to .net or .com. LC (.uk) asked if they viewed PPC as a revenue opportunity. SL (VeriSign) that it was an opportunity to see that renewal rates are increased. She explained that it has turned into a market of its own. Although it brings some operational problems, end users are finding it useful, which is what really matters. SS (.ir) asked if they get their data from ccTLD's directly. SL (VeriSign) explained that they get their data from ZOUKNET. She added that if their data does not seem right, then it should be brought to her attention. CB (.co.za) in reference to his previous comment added that they have 200 000 zones, so it would make a significant shift if it were included in the statistics. SL (VeriSign) stated that the data for Africa was probably grouped in with that of the Middle East. SB (.as) asked what percentage of ccTLD's was represented in the statistics. SL (VeriSign) replied that they are all represented but some will be more accurate than others.