European ccTLD highlights from the month

.at
.at-report 01/2013: 25 years of .at
.at-zone celebrates it’s birthday! How it came that the ending .at was registered 25 years ago in Austria, what Jon Postel and the University of Vienna had to do with it, and what has happened in this quarter of a century, all of it can be read in the first .at-report of 2013.

.de
Redemption-Grace-Period for .de - a draft for discussion
Upon consultation with the Cooperative members, DENIC has decided to introduce a Redemption Grace Period. This procedure shall protect domain holders against unintentional loss of their domain by accidental deletion and give possibility to restore the original registration

.eu
.eu 2012 annual report available
EURid’s annual report outlines key achievements from 2012, showcases inspirational .eu websites and presents the .eu General Manager’s comments on the road ahead

.nl
SIDN presents 2012 Annual Report
Growth in the number of .nl domain names slowed considerably in 2012. A net increase of 6.6% was recorded, compared with 14.5% the year before. The slowdown was therefore 48%, the biggest in ten years. Although the number of new registrations was broadly unchanged at 1.1 million, far more domain names were cancelled in 2012 than in previous years.

.pt
DNS.PT Association is formally constituted
DNS.PT Association, which will assume the responsibility for the management and operation of ccTLD PT, has just been formally constituted, starting duties from the 1st of June 2013

DNS Explained Video Launched in Portuguese

"Can self-regulation still save the DNS?"
The growing number of large-scale attacks on the Domain Name System (DNS) and the trend to abuse over-provisioned authoritative systems in so called amplification reflection attacks were made the topic of a full plenary session and additional talks in the DNS WG at RIPE 66. The issue had also been discussed during the OARC meeting that preceded RIPE 66. Operators seem to beat a loss for how to turn the tide in the DNS, some even said regulation might be needed in order to close off some of the open doors in the DNS (including address spoofing, open resolvers). Meanwhile the DNS community dives into a debate about rate limiting on authoritative servers, which is seen as religious change.

The above is an extract from the Report on RIPE 66 (Dublin). Click on the image (right) for the full report

DomainWire Stat Report Available
CENTR has published its biannual statistics report on the state of the domain name industry (edition 2013/1).

.NASK publish Q1 2013 Report on Polish Domains
NASK, the Registry for the Polish Domain .pl have published their Q1 2013 report. The in-depth report covers domain registrations, IDNs, renewals, transfers, DNSSEC,.pl ranking in EU and many more metrics. Go to the report here

.Lawsuit against .SE – a fundamentally issue of law
.SE has made the headlines as a result of a blog entry by our CEO in which he explains why he believes it is the wrong path to take to issue a lawsuit against a top-level domain administer – in this case .SE – for the purpose of removing a service from the Internet. Read further

Latest data on .uk domain names
In our last issue (Domain Business) we looked at the strength of the UK internet economy and how we’re leading the way in the G20. This time we’re looking at the domain market and considering how it is changing as we approach the launch of new Top Level Domains.

CcTLD Conference for Central and Eastern Europe
The Coordination Center for TLD RU had hosted the International conference for ccTLD registries and registrars of CIS, Central and Eastern Europe since 2008. The Sixth Conference will take place in September 10th-13th in Greece, Creta.
The below is statistics on domain pricing taken from the CENTR Statistics Database. Data is based on direct input from the members of CENTR.

The chart (right) shows the average prices of a domain in each zone size category. The prices are 1 year wholesale (i.e. price for Registrar) in EUR.

In all categories, the prices have been slowly declining. The greatest decline between 2010 and 2012 was the category “1-2 Million domains” which saw an average price decrease of 21%

Only 21% of respondents offer Volume Discounts to their Registrars.

Sample size: 23 ccTLDs

### Wholesale Domain Prices (Box Plots)

The below chart shows 3 box plots of domain pricing for the past 3 years

Note: The ends of the whiskers are set at 1.5*IQR above the third quartile (Q3) and the lower whisker is the minimum value

### Observations

- The Median price has been consistent around 7.24 EUR
- The Inter quartile range (IQR) representing the range of the middle 50% of the data has contracted over the 3 years from 8.4 to 5.9. This suggests a reduced spread of prices among CENTR members.
- There is one outlier in each year (39 EUR)

### CENTR ccTLD Stats

In terms of number of domains added, .uk lead the months growth adding more than 73,000 domains while highest percentage growth was found in .ir with 2.73% net growth for the month
Is your Registry in any way involved in the new gTLD program, if so how?

We are not involved in the new gTLD program. Unfortunately, there were no applications from Estonia either.

How do you think the residents of your country will react to new gTLDs?

Considering the relatively low awareness of the new gTLD program and market size in Estonia, the response will probably be quite modest.

How much brand loyalty is there to the country code TLD?

Brand loyalty to our national TLD .ee is considerably high.

How do you feel ICANN has handled the new gTLD program?

The new gTLD program is somewhat a reflection of the multi-stakeholder model – getting many of the different interested parties to nod at the same time is a challenge ICANN has faced for this however the finish line is in sight.

To what extent does your Registry take an interest or active role in the ICANN process?

We are following the ICANN processes and hopefully can give our real contribution soon through ccNSO.

Visit the Estonian Internet Foundation website

Draft Opinions discussed at WTPF 2013

Draft Opinion 1: Promoting Internet Exchange Points (IXPs) as a long term solution to advance connectivity

Draft Opinion 2: Fostering an enabling environment for the greater growth and development of broadband connectivity

Draft Opinion 3: Supporting capacity building for the deployment of IPv6 and

Opinion 4: In support of IPv6 adoption and transition from IPv4

Draft Opinion 5: Supporting Multi-stakeholderism in Internet governance

Opinion 6: Supporting operationalizing the enhanced cooperation process

Looking back at the WTPF

Author: Martin Boyle (Nominet)

Nothing fails to make the headlines like a good-news story. After the publicity from WCIT in December, hardly anyone wrote about the outcome of the World Telecommunications Policy Forum. As ITU Secretary General Touré said in his final remarks,

“I can feel very proud that we are able to engage here in a very constructive dialogue... This was the most productive World Policy Forum I have ever seen and, of course, it was the most inclusive ever. Indeed, in building bridges and achieving consensus we have triumphed. The world was listening. The world was watching and the world was participating... We showed the world that we can discuss difficult issues with all stakeholders involved and emerge united. And we will continue to engage with all stakeholders, with ICANN, ISOC, IETF and all other stakeholders in a positive spirit of collaboration.”

Constructive dialogue? Productive? Inclusive? Positive spirit of collaboration? These are not words usually associated with international discussions on Internet governance.

The WTPF agreed six opinions by consensus. The cooperative approach led to agreement on the difficult issues of IPv4, IPv6, multi-stakeholder engagement and enhanced cooperation: a significant achievement.

Perhaps more important was a draft seventh opinion, on the role of government in the multi-stakeholder framework for Internet governance. This is an important issue for many governments and the proposal addressed it by supporting engagement and capacity building. This debate now moves into the ITU Council, but discussion is encouraged in the IGF and elsewhere.


The WTPF opinions will be used in these discussions. More importantly, will the “WTPF approach”, where ISOC sits next to Iran and speaks as an equal, be the model for future Internet governance discussions? And if so, are we ready to engage constructively, productively and with a positive spirit of collaboration in the ensuing dialogue?