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Introduction

• Posted last week:
  – ccTLD Update, with background and explanation
  – Two model agreements: Agreement for Triangular Situations; MoU for Legacy Situations

• Reasons for posting –
  – Finalization of proposed agreement with auDA
  – Facilitate one-to-one negotiations with transparency to everyone
  – Provide texts for community discussions
ccTLD Update Postings

• Discussion paper overview
  – Based on past two years of face-to-face and ccTLD constituency meetings
  – Built on materials and drafts from community

• Background on the role and responsibilities of ccTLDs in the DNS
  • History of ccTLD delegations
  • RFC 1591; IANA News Memos; ICP-1
Need for Agreements

• Make ICANN-ccTLD relationships:
  – Formalized & defined
  – Transparent to all
  – Reliable

• ICANN’s MoU with US Government
  – Complete transition means ‘develop appropriate relationships with other entities involved in the Internet’s operation’
Key contributions from the community

• ccTLD Best Practice Guidelines for ccTLD Managers (version 4.1, June 2001)
  – Published by ccTLD Constituency
  – Reflects well established principles of trusteeship and responsibility to local Internet community

• GAC Principles
  – Emphasizes private sector leadership
  – Framework of accountability
Areas of Agreement

- As Internet increases in importance for everyone, good idea to make relationships more solid, formal, transparent, and reliable.
- Delegated ccTLD manager serves as a trustee in service of the local Internet community
“The designated manager is the trustee of the top-level domain for both the nation, in the case of a country code, and the global Internet community.”

— J. Postel, RFC 1591
Multiple Models Required

• No single agreement, or single structure, will work for every ccTLD
  – Enormous diversity of management structures
  – Organizational forms
  – Mechanisms of accountability
  – Relationships (or not) with governments
Two Basic Situations

- **Legacy situation**: The IANA monitors the trust locally and globally.
- **Triangular situation**: The national government, where interested, commits to responsible monitoring of the local interest; IANA monitors the global interest.
Documents for the Two Situations

• Legacy situation: Agreement between ICANN and ccTLD manager

• Triangular situation:
  • ccTLD manager & national government: agreement or equivalent addressing local interest (see .ca Umbrella Agreement)
  • National government & ICANN: letter or other communication
  • ccTLD manager & ICANN: agreement covering global interest

• Flexibility to accommodate other situations
Points to be covered

- Redelegation & and applicable principles
- Local and global policy responsibilities
  - ccTLD ==> local Internet community
  - ICANN ==> global Internet community
- ccTLD relationship with ICANN/IANA
  - Detailed definition of ICANN/IANA responsibilities & standards for performing them
- ICANN funding for DNS coordination functions, root server, etc.
Triangular Situation

• Applies where ccTLD and government reach their own arrangement

• Topics covered:
  – Recognize delegation; standards for redelegation
  – Local and global policy responsibilities
  – ccTLD–ICANN/IANA relationship
    • Technical specification
      – Stable and secure registry & nameserver operations
    • ICANN/IANA responsibilities to maintain:
      • Authoritative root server system
      • Authoritative and publicly available ccTLD database
      • Audit trail regarding changes & redelegations
    – ICANN funding – ‘in accordance with an equitable scale, based on ICANN’s total funding’
Legacy Situations

- Government not directly involved
- Model MoU for legacy situations
  - Light & minimalist
  - Memorializes existing intended commitments of ICANN and ccTLD manager
  - Balance: Government informed, but consent not required
    - Work this out in cooperation with ccTLD manager
Progress to Date

• Steady progress
  – (What a long, strange trip it’s been…)
• Each ccTLD is in a different situation regarding type of agreement and timing
  – E.g., Australia (.au)
• Strong need for face-to-face discussion & negotiation; also strong need for transparency & community discussion
  – Understand local situations; matrix into global framework
• Staff capacity: We’re able to do 5 a month
What’s next…

- A ‘non-legal’ explanation of the current models posted
- Triangular model where GAC principles have been implemented; Legacy model as baseline for all other situations
- Regional meetings provide great opportunities to go through models in gruesome detail
- Face to face meetings have been useful and will be focus in coming months
A Plea

• Read the model agreements WITH the ccTLD Update!
  – Lots of good explanation and context
  – Effort to avoid misinterpretation or misunderstanding
And Finally…

Special Announcement:

New ICANN Logo!