



# **REPORT**

**FORUM FOR AFRICAN POLICY MAKERS AND  
REGULATORS ON INTERNET GOVERNANCE: A FOCUS ON  
COUNTRY CODE TOP LEVEL DOMAINS (ccTLD's) IN  
AFRICA**

***“A ccTLD for Every Country in Africa!”***

**Pailles, Mauritius**

**17<sup>th</sup> to 19<sup>th</sup> March 2009**

# **TABLE OF CONTENTS**

<b>1. INTRODUCTION</b>	<b>3</b>
A. PREAMBLE	3
B. ABOUT THE SPONSORS	3
• <i>Africa Telecommunications Union</i>	3
• <i>Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers</i>	3
• <i>Internet Society</i>	4
• <i>African Network Information Centre</i>	4
C. STRUCTURE OF THE FORUM	4
D. FORUM PARTICIPANTS	5
<b>2. FORUM PROCEEDINGS</b>	<b>6</b>
A. SESSION I: OPENING CEREMONY	6
B. SESSION II: INTERNET, POLICY AND CCTLDS	8
C. SESSION II: AN OVERVIEW OF CCTLDS IN AFRICA	10
D. SESSION IV: CCTLD OPERATIONAL MODELS	11
E. SESSION IV: CCTLD MULTI-STAKEHOLDER APPROACH	13
F. SESSION V: STRUCTURING A CCTLD POLICY DEVELOPMENT PROCESS	14
G. SESSION VI: OPEN SESSION TO DISCUSS THE ROLE OF A CCTLD IN A COMMUNITY	15
H. SESSION VII: OPEN SESSION ON HOW TO BUILD A CCTLD MULTI-STAKEHOLDER APPROACH	17
<b>3. WAY FORWARD</b>	<b>20</b>
<b>4. CLOSING SESSION</b>	<b>21</b>
<b>5. ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS</b>	<b>25</b>
<b>ANNEX 1: “THE PAILLES DECLARATION”</b>	<b>26</b>
<b>ANNEX 2: LIST OF PARTICIPANTS</b>	<b>30</b>

# 1. INTRODUCTION

## A. Preamble

The forum for African policy makers and regulators on Internet governance was organized by the African Telecommunications Union (ATU) in collaboration with Information and Communications Technology Authority (ICTA) of Mauritius and in conjunction with the Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers (ICANN), the Internet Society (ISOC), Organisation Internationale de la Francophonie, and the African Network Information Center (AfriNIC).

The three-day interactive forum for African Policy Makers and Heads of Regulatory bodies in the continent was meant to disseminate information and improve understanding on issues related to Internet Governance, and more specifically on issues relating country code Top Level Domains (ccTLDs). The theme of the forum was “*a ccTLD for Every Country in Africa!*”

The forum took place from the 17<sup>th</sup> to the 19<sup>th</sup> of March 2009, in Pailles, Mauritius, at the kind invitation of Information and Communications Technology Authority (ICTA) of Mauritius.

## B. About the Sponsors

The forum sponsors are organisations that are involved in Internet Governance in various leadership capacities at regional and international levels.

- **Africa Telecommunications Union**

The African Telecommunications Union (ATU) is the leading continental organization fostering the development of information and communications technologies infrastructure and services, with a current membership of 46 Member States and 17 Associate Members. For more information, please visit [www.atu-uat.org](http://www.atu-uat.org).

- **Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers**

The Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers (ICANN) is the organisation that is responsible for coordinating the management of the technical elements of the Internet to ensure universal resolvability so that all users of the Internet can find all valid addresses. It does this by overseeing the distribution of unique technical identifiers used in the Internet's operations, and delegation of Top- Level Domain names (such as

.com, .info, .ke, .uk, etc.). For more information, please visit [www.icann.org](http://www.icann.org).

- **Internet Society**

The Internet Society (ISOC) is a nonprofit organisation founded in 1992 to provide leadership in Internet related standards, education, and policy. It is dedicated to ensuring the open development, evolution and use of the Internet for the benefit of people throughout the world. For more information, please visit [www.isoc.org](http://www.isoc.org).

- **African Network Information Centre**

The African Network Information Centre (AfriNIC) is a non-governmental and not-for-profit membership based organization that is the Regional Internet Registry (RIR) for Africa. Its main role is to distribute and manage Internet Number resources for the African region. For more information, please visit [www.afrinic.net](http://www.afrinic.net).

## **C. Structure of the Forum**

The ATU forum brought together African Policy Makers and Heads of Regulatory bodies to discuss Internet governance issues, and more specifically to discuss issues surrounding country code Top Level Domains (ccTLDs). The forum was three-pronged: to appraise participants on various aspects of the Internet, to discuss key issues with regards to country code Top Level Domains (ccTLDs) that were common in the African region; and to urge members of the African community to rely on existing local, national, and regional organizations for leadership, guidance and direction, information, and support, such as ATU, AfriNIC, AfNOG, AfTLD, AU, AfriSPA, AfREN and the national regulators.

Some of the key issues discussed included, inter alia:

- country code Top Level Domain (ccTLD) Operational Models;
- Re-delegation of country code Top Level Domain (ccTLD);
- Legal Aspects of country code Top Level Domains (ccTLDs);
- Domain Name System Security (DNSSEC) and the depletion of Internet Protocol version 4 (IPv4) addresses;
- The role of country code Top Level Domains (ccTLDs) in a community; and
- The impact of the new generic Top Level Domains (gTLDs) on country code Top Level Domains (ccTLDs).

The forum was structured in four (4) main parts, with:

- an **introductory session**, participants were taken through a background of the Internet and country code Top Level Domains (ccTLDs);
- an **in-depth analysis session**, where participants were taken through detailed presentations of various aspects of the Internet and country code Top Level Domains (ccTLDs);
- a session on **case studies**, where participants were taken through real-life experiences in the African region; and
- an **open-mic session**, where participants discussed key focus areas.

#### **D. Forum Participants**

The event attracted over 120 regional participants. The participants were drawn from African African Union Commission (AUC), Government Information and Communications Technology Ministries, African Regulatory Authorities, African country code Top Level Domain Name (ccTLD) managers and Internet governance organisations including the African Network Information Centre (AfriNIC) and the Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers (ICANN), African Top Level Domains Association (AfTLD) and the Internet Society (ISOC).

## **2. FORUM PROCEEDINGS**

### **Day 1: Tuesday, 17<sup>th</sup> March 2009:** **An Introduction to the Internet and Country Code Top** **Level Domains (ccTLDs)**

#### **A. Session I: Opening Ceremony**

The opening speech was made by the Chairman of the Mauritius Information and Communications Technology Authority (ICTA), Mr. Trilock Dwarka, acknowledged all speakers and welcomed all of the delegates to the opening ceremony. He stated that ICTA is delighted for hosting this event. He stated that it's common knowledge that the global medium for communication, education, important infrastructure, that dns is used every time you get an email instead of entering the numerical IP address you want to reach. He gave an overview of the forum's objective and stressed the importance of not only access to the Internet but also its governance. He noted that the Internet has become an indispensable component of our society and that domain names are important for the development of public communication.

In his welcome remarks, the ATU Secretary General, Mr. Akossi Akossi, thanked all of the sponsors and host for the event. He said that this is the first meeting organized by ATU with the private sector to address the theme of "A ccTLD in African Country." He stressed the need for mutual cooperation between government, operators and regulators. He also stressed that the main purpose of the forum was how to improve dialogue and discuss partnerships, especially due to the fact that lack of bandwidth is making Internet connectivity expensive in Africa. He also added that the private sector has a bigger role to play and that they bring better resources to help and implement ICT projects.

Mr. Esam Abulkhirat, Senior ICT Policy Officer in the AUC- Human Resources, Science and Technology (HRST) represented H. E. Jean Pierre Ezin, the Commissioner in charge of HRST, noted in his speech the need for global cooperation especially as the Internet has become a powerful tool for empowering people. He added that the state of African ccTLDs leaves a lot to be desired since Africa still lags behind with less than 1 million domain names under ccTLDs. He said that Internet users in Africa must insist on better opportunities and we must setup our own agenda.

**Opening Address: Hon. Mohammed Asraf Ally Dulull, Minister of Information and Communications Technology, Mauritius**

The honorable Minister announced that 2009 was the ICT year for the government of Mauritius and that the ATU forum was timely. He further noted that a ccTLD is seen as the identity of the country in Cyberspace and that the re-delegation of the dot MU ccTLD ranks as top priority for his government. He added that each country should be able to apply for the re-delegation of their ccTLD and that this would drive to increase the usage and development of the Internet in Africa.

**Dr. Paul Twomey:** In his speech, the President/CEO of ICANN, Dr. Paul Twomey, explained what ICANN is, the role of ICANN in country code Top Level Domains (ccTLDs) and the Internet protocol. Further more, he stressed on the need for people to work in consensus and that there are currently 54 ccTLDs in Africa and that multi-stakeholders played a key role in the stability of the Internet. He noted that ICANN is regionally structured with regional members to ensure regional participation and that the role of ICANN in ccTLDs is to ensure the distribution of country codes and establish a set of procedures for re-delegation to ensure the stability of the domain name system. He added that it is not ICANN's role to help set domestic policy of country codes, but that they are willing to work with people to share best practices about what works. Concerning the Internet protocol, Dr. Twomey said that ICANN had approved a global policy for the distribution of the unallocated (remaining) IPv4 address space. Dr. Twomey also stated that ICANN works closely with AfriNIC, la Francophonie, and ISOC.

**Mr. Frederick Donck,** the Director of Public Policy at the ISOC, started by saying we are to commit ourselves to the development of ICT and that the conference was of strategic importance and that ccTLD are an important national resource. He gave the example of .CN in China that has attracted more than 13 million domain registrations followed by Germany. He stated that the economic and financial crisis will have a link on the Internet as the Internet will bring more jobs, more industries, and vitality in Africa and that there are major challenges to live up to in Africa. He said that the stakeholders must talk to one another, talk more, talk better, and have more involvement for the sustainability and management of ccTLDs. He noted that ccTLD are under-utilised in the rest of Africa compared to South Africa. He also said that in Africa, we needed more technical capacity and political will.

**Alexander Ntoko,** The Head of the Corporate Strategy Division at the ITU, said that the ITU sees a tremendous growth of the Internet in Africa and that the continued growth, stability and reliability of the

Internet depended on connected efforts and responsibilities of the various stakeholders.

**Mr. Adiel Akplogan**, the CEO of AfriNIC, said that domain names were the most visible part of the Internet and that it was the virtual identity of each country on the Internet. He also noted that interoperability is important for the stability of the Internet. Furthermore, he said that resources should be dedicated for the development of the Internet in the continent. He also stressed that the Internet management system requires political support. He noted that 10 million IP addresses had been allocated from 1984 to 2004, and that from 2005 to 2008, the allocations had doubled. He also noted that the evolution of the Internet towards IPv6 opened opportunities. He finally noted that he hoped that this forum would identify key issues and determine the real obstacles and that participants would find solutions to these key issues.

## **B. Session II: Internet, Policy and ccTLDs**

This session was moderated by Mr. Esam M. Abulkhirat from African Union Commission.

**Hon. Samuel Poghiso**, Kenya's Minister for Information and Communications, in his speech read by Mr. Charles Njoroge, the Director General of the Communications Commission of Kenya (CCK), gave a background of the development of the Internet in Kenya from the 1990's where most connections were dialups and in Nairobi alone. As the number of ISP's increased, there became a need for regulations which led to the establishment of the telecommunications regulator. He noted some of the challenges at the time as inadequate bandwidth, lack of personal computers, lack of policies and lack of skills. He said that in 1999, the government of Kenya restructured the telecommunications sector that has seen the growth of Internet users from less than 500,000 in 2004 to currently over 3 million. He noted the governments' involvement in the submarine fibre project and said that the government of Kenya would partner with the private sector to assemble low cost computers to ensure increased penetration of the Internet in Kenya.

**Mr. Eric Akumiah**, the AfTLD Administrative Manager, gave an introduction to ccTLDs that included the basics of DNS, the history of ccTLDs and ccTLD basics. He also discussed the status of ccTLDs in Africa. In his conclusion, he noted that every African country has a working ccTLD and that the Internet has improved since 1999. He also noted that at least 4 ccTLDs are technically managed from

abroad and 50% of the ccTLDs in Africa had no registry URL at IANA. Further, he noted that 40% were single point registries. He stressed the need for governments as stakeholders to be more involved in the management of ccTLDs.

**Dr. Paulos Nyirenda** from AfTLD noted the importance of the local Internet community in the management of a ccTLD. He defined the role of ccTLD manager and talked about the delegation/re-delegation process. He noted that the best ccTLDs are community based and that we should ensure that the ccTLD is run for the benefit of the country and its citizen. He mentioned that in the case of dot MW, they have a 14-member Board that draws its membership from various sectors. He noted that it is important if a ccTLD is run from the country, including the Administrative and Technical contact as well as the ccTLD services. He concluded that sadly, some ccTLDs were run from abroad.

**Mr. Alexander Ntoko** from ITU noted that the ccTLD name space was fast-growing with a 22% increase in the past one year. He also noted that regulators and policy makers have an increasing role in security. He recognised various challenges ranging from intellectual property, the development of IDN ccTLDs and securing the domain name system. He raised issues such as who would be key signing authority, whether certification is enough, what the implementation and deployment costs are and the need for basic roles of the policy makers and regulators as important stakeholders in ccTLD related public issues. He also announced that the ITU would hold the World Telecommunications Policy forum where one of the issues to be discussed would be whether ICT is a solution to the financial crisis.

After the presentations, the session was open for participants to contribute. Mr. Esam Abulkhirat the moderator from the AUC said that without security we cannot achieve anything and as such confidentiality, privacy and security are important on the Internet. Mr. Akossi Akossi of the ATU said that we must be close to governments so that the management of the ccTLD is included in the reforms of the ICT sector.

Mr. Charles Njoroge from Kenya said that we don't need any foreign aid and that what we require are skills. However, it's not a complex issue, and that the main issue is that of Cybersecurity.

Dr. Paulos Nyirenda from Malawi said that there was no problem with soliciting foreign aid and added that the government is one aspect of the community and that the ccTLD is assigned to the country. He

gave the example of France who has put a legal framework so as to get closer to its ccTLD and have more say.

Mr. Eric Akumiah from AfTLD said that we should put in place a structure that would help the Internet. He noted that ccTLD's are critical resources and they will play a role in the economic development of countries.

Mr. Charles Njoroge from Kenya concluded by saying that it's a good thing for government to take an active role in facilitating ccTLDs.

### **C. Session II: An Overview of ccTLDs in Africa**

This session was moderated by Mr. DJEKOU Abraham of Agence des Télécommunications de Cote d'Ivoire (ATCI).

**Ms. Anne-Rachel Inné**, ICANN Regional Manager for Africa, gave an overview of ICANN, IANA, ccTLDs, re-delegation, the roles of various parties, and approach by ICANN staff to re-delegation. She noted there was a serious problem when re-delegating ccTLDs from legacy ccTLD managers. She gave examples of difficulties with re-delegations as local disagreements, fraud for different purposes, misunderstanding of procedures, technical problems, political problems, and legacy problems. She noted that re-delegation only happened when there was a change of either the Sponsoring Organisation or the Administrative and that a change of either the Technical contact or the name servers did not result in re-delegation. Moving forward, she noted that there was a need for the recognition of the complexity of legacy situations and that best practice and sharing of experiences between governments may be of use.

**Mr. Michuki Mwangi** of AfTLD/ISOC discussed the issues and challenges with African ccTLDs. He noted that from 1999 to 2008, government involvement increased from 5% to 20% and that there was a lack of understanding of ICANN's role in the re-delegation process. He raised several questions including: whether a ccTLD was representative of the local Internet community, whether the local Internet community is involved in the policy development process, how disputes are resolved, whether there's neutrality and autonomy and finally whether the ccTLD is in the right location. He noted that management and government structures should be seen as neutral and balanced.

**Mr. Eric Akumiah** of AfTLD talked about the ccTLD role as the backbone of African society. He defined the information society as one

in which the creation, distribution, diffusion, use, integration of information is a significant economic, political and cultural activity.

#### **D. Session IV: ccTLD Operational Models**

This session was moderated by Dr. Krishna Oolun of ICTA, Mauritius,

**Mr. Souleymane Oumtanaga** from Cote d'Ivoire talked about the management of .CI. He explained the setting up of the Network Information Centre (NIC) and noted that the NOC offers domain registration services, whois search services and consulting services and that the NIC had also initiated several projects including an Internet Exchange point to keep local traffic local as well as distance learning platform. He noted that CI NIC was expanding and that the total number of domain names was on the increase. He also noted that CI NIC was involved in creating IPv6 awareness.

**Mr. Michael Katundu** from CCK, Kenya, stressed the need for government involvement in public policy issues and discussed models of re-delegation, re-delegation options and the .KE re-delegation experience. He also discussed the Government Advisory Committee (GAC) principles and expounded on the two models of re-delegation noting that Kenya had adopted a 3-tier model. He listed the three re-delegations options, thus, administrative only re-delegation, technical only re-delegation or both administrative and technical. He also noted that the re-delegation can be either voluntary or forceful. In terms of the .KE re-delegation, Kenya joined GAC in 2001, and sent a formal application to ICANN in 2002. The application was based on the GAC principles, the 3-tier model with a sponsoring organisation with CCK giving the seed money for setting up the ccTLD. The re-delegation was forceful.

**Mr. Pierre Claver Secyugu** of the Rwanda ICT Association stressed the difficulty of going to ICANN for re-delegation. He mentioned that currently, a Belgian living in Switzerland was managing the dot RW ccTLD, and that after more than 2 years of correspondence, mainly due to delaying tactics by the current ccTLD manager (Mr. Gregoire), re-delegation has not been effected. He hoped that in 3 months time they would be able to complete the re-delegation process but stressed that it was a lengthy process and that he would have liked to helped.

**Mr. Vika Mpisane** of ZADNA, talked about the registry-registrar-registrant model and used .ZA as a case study. He mentioned the key players as the regulators, the registry operators, registrars, resellers

and registrants. He also mentioned that the model was recognised in the South African ECT Act (Law). He took participants through the evolution of the registry-registrar-registrant model and how ICANN had enhanced the model over time to foster competition.

After the presentations, the session was open for participants to contribute. Mr. Ciza said that the most important contact for a ccTLD was the technical contact and not the administrative contact and that having the technical contact out of the country was a fraud.

Anne-Rachel Inné of ICANN said that she has gone to Rwanda twice and noted that the problem in Rwanda, as those present could testify was lack of mobilization of the local Internet community and the lack of due diligence in getting the dot rw information.

Mr. Radhakisson of Mauritius said that since 2002-3, the MU ccTLD re-delegation process was like a horse that was whipped but not willing to move and said that one must understand the whole re-delegation procedure.

Finally, Mr. Kalu Ndukwe from Nigeria said that on the issue of re-delegation, there's a need to come to a consensus.

**Day 2: Wednesday, 18<sup>th</sup> March 2009:**  
**Structure and Models of Country Code Top Level Domains**

**E. Session IV: ccTLD Multi-stakeholder Approach**

This session was moderated by Dr. Katim Touray, Member of the ICANN Board of Directors.

**Mr. Dawit Bekele, Manager, ISOC:** Mr. Bekele addressed the multi-stakeholder model. One of the challenges he mentioned was that different groups of stakeholders work differently and often are likely to compete with each other with the a risk of becoming endless talk shops. He stated that the roles of the stakeholders should be clearly defined and that issues should be relevant to all stakeholders. He stressed that for the multi-stakeholder approach to work, it requires champions and that there should also be a good evaluation plan.

**Mr. Vika Mpisane, .ZA (South Africa):** Mr. Mpisane presented on the success of the multi-stakeholder approach of .ZA. He stated that .ZA's success story was experienced-based and not theory. He said that the multi-stakeholder approach involves different stakeholders working to achieve a common objective. Moreover, according to him, what makes a successful multi-stakeholder approach is the understanding of decisions and actions that affect others beyond the stakeholder who is making the decisions. He added that compromise is also necessary between "must have it and nice to have." He also said that there should be commitment to work together. Finally, he said that in the case of S. Africa that there are two particularly important stakeholders; the youth because they were the first adopters of the Internet, and the women because they were previously excluded from the mainstream economy.

**Mr. Vincent Ngundi, .KE (Kenya):** Mr. Ngundi presented on the success of the multi-stakeholder approach of .KE. He explained that the government has an important role as a facilitator to protect public interest and to support and finance. In the case of Kenic, it obtains revenue from minimal domain name registration fees and its stakeholders provide free office space and complimentary Internet connectivity, but have enabled the sustainability of Kenic. Mr. Ngundi stressed the fact that seed money was received from the government. He stated that to setup a ccTLD successfully, a country needs to benchmark with established ccTLDs, have a neutral hosting location, startup finance, and adequate technical capacity. He concluded that a bottom-up approach has been used to drive the whole process a Kenic.

**Mr. Adiel A. Akplogan, CEO, AfriNIC:** Mr. Akplogan presented on “What is AfriNIC”, exhaustion of IPv4, and IPv6 transition. He explained that AfriNIC is the RIR for the African region, one of five in the world. He stated that AfriNIC values bottom-up approach. He stressed that as of 17 March 2009, it is projected that the central pool of IPv4 address space will run out around May 2011 and that the RIR pool will run out July 2012. He stated that the challenges lie on the fact that IPv6 adoption is an important challenge for more sustainable development of the Internet, however, fundamental transport is difficult to monetize, thus, there is a clear need for further assistance to deploy IPv6. He concluded that IPv6 is an opportunity and there should be the smooth management of IPv4 exhaustion and it will help IPv6 adoption.

**Mr. Ndukwe Kalu:** Mr. Kalu made a brief historic overview of Re-Delegation and forced re-delegation and talked about the .ng multi-stakeholder experience. He stated that in his country, there were 22 stakeholders for .ng. He stated that they ended with a non-governmental, not-for-profit, private sector led organization, called NIRA, the Nigeria Internet Registration Association. He said that everything was done by consensus. He also stated that among the issues was that of participation and decision making, however, the benefits reaped by the organization were high in terms of support and publicity from the various stakeholders especially through forums. He ended by saying the role of every stakeholder must be well defined and that the bottom-line is that for the multi-stakeholder model to work, we must all agree to move forward.

#### **F. Session V: Structuring a ccTLD Policy Development Process**

This session was moderated by Ashok B. Radhakisson of AfriNIC.

**Mr. Adam Mambi, TCRA:** Mr. Mambi, covered the legal aspects of structuring the ccTLD policy development process. He said that each domain name is registered on the principle of first-come, first-served basis and made the difference between domain names and trademarks. He talked about the misuse of domain names especially disputes between trademark and domain name holders, cyber-squatting, and the legal issues on dispute settlement. He ended by saying that we should address legal rights in domain names at national and international levels.

**Mr. Adiel A. Akplogan of AfriNIC** presented on DNSsec for a more secure Domain Name System on behalf of Alain Aina, CTO, AfriNIC. He stressed the importance of multilayered security and pointed out that there are vulnerabilities in the DNS structure and that the solution is the

DNSsec, now known as the critical component of DNS security. He stated that DNSsec provides message authentication and integrity verification through cryptographic signatures. He also talked about public key cryptography.

**Mr. Michuki Mwangi of AfTLD/ISOC** reported on the Impact of new gTLDs and how it affects the policy process of ccTLDs. He stated that the first generic top level domains were proposed by Jon Postel in a Request For Comments (RFC) 920. In 2000, there was an introduction of seven gTLDs and in 2008 ICANN opened discussions on two new gTLDs. He stated that nowadays, established brands and cities want to have their own gTLDs. Furthermore, Mr. Mwangi said that the average growth rate of registrations was 30% for ccTLDs and 18% for gTLDs during the last two years, but only 1% of (711,000) the total ccTLDs domains belong to Africa. He concluded by pointing out that marketing, outreach and awareness campaigns of ccTLDs are core to their success and that we should create attention to ccTLDs and that every new gTLD is an opportunity.

#### **G. Session VI: Open session to discuss The Role of a ccTLD in a Community**

This session was moderated by Michael Katundu, Assistant Director of Information Technology at the Communications Commission of Kenya (CCK).

During the open session there were five panelists each taking five minutes to set the phase for the items of discussion, which were:

- a. Should ccTLDs be recognized/protected under national ICT Policies?
- b. Should ccTLDs have a commercial or non-profit approach giving domains for free or at a cost?
- c. Should ccTLDs receive government subsidies (tax exemptions, etc.)?

**Panelists:** .MU (Mauritius) Mr. Joyadeep Beeharry, ICTA, .CI (Cote d'Ivoire) Mr. Souleymane Oumtanaga, .ZA (South Africa) Mr. Vika Mpisane, .GM (Gambia) Mr. Alhaji A. Cham, and .TZ (Tanzania) Mr. Beda Mutagahywa.

Mr. Joyadeep Beeharry stated that government intervention is of prime importance and in the multi-stakeholder approach why should government not be allowed to participate in the ccTLD especially due to the issues of child protection and public policy. He added that

government can act as an investor and that it would be beneficial for the community at large.

Mr. Souleymane Oumtanaga said that the state should help the ccTLDs to develop. He added that some ccTLDs are nonprofit making and others are for profit and that money should be re-injected for the development.

Mr. Vika Mpisane said that the Internet is a powerful equalizer and that the state should be a fair, proactive promoter of the Internet and has to build consensus in public/private partnership. Furthermore, he stated, that a profit culture should be adopted in domain name registrations, but this should not hinder ccTLDs from giving free registrations for public interest domains such as school.za in the case of .za.

Mr. Alhaji A. Cham said that Gambia is one of the few countries to get back the ccTLD and that the efforts were supported by the government and this has enabled the growth of the Internet in Gambia.

Mr. Mutagahywa, stated that there are different models and that several questions should be asked such as, where does the ccTLD get its money? how much? and, When? He added that for a ccTLD, government funding is needed for the startup until it can run independently.

The moderator, Mr. Michael Katundu intervened by saying that various governments define local Internet community differently and that pricing should be kept as minimum as possible with government putting in sufficient resources.

**Questions/Comments from the participants:**

Mr. Kalu Ndukwe stated that the ccTLD should charge a fee and should receive grants to make it sustainable immediately because sustainability is the key to success. He also stated that the ccTLD should also be protected in terms of infrastructure.

The moderator, Mr. Michael Katundu intervened by saying that it will be different levels of involvement from country to country.

Mr. Beeharry added that governments should regulate and recognize ccTLDs because governments would be able to obtain revenue from licenses from stakeholders which would be plowed back for development of the whole sector.

Mr. Vika Mpisane said that tax payer must pay and that government must invest and make sure the best infrastructure is available in the interest of the public.

Mr. Michael Katundu expressed concern about cyber security and added that a number of roles is now being enacted.

Ms. Anne-Rachel Inné stated that concerning ccTLDS, government is the biggest content provider on the Internet and if governments use the ccTLD it would be a great deal. She expressed a wish that a ccTLD should be at the same price with the same technical reliability and stability as a generic TLD.

Mr. Michael Katundu stated that the issue of the role of government and the stakeholders need to be defined.

Ms. Anne-Rachel Inné said that the registration in generic top level domains leads to money going outside the country and that we should try to keep the money inside the country for investment through the ccTLDs.

#### **H. Session VII: Open Session on How to Build a ccTLD Multi-stakeholder Approach**

This session was moderated by Mr. Alhaji A. Cham, Permanent Secretary, DOSCIIT, The Gambia. Although this was an open session allowing opportunities for the participants to ask questions and share comments, there were three presentations.

**Mr. George Victor Salama, Egypt**, reported on why .cn is ranked #1 ccTLD? He stated that China used three strategies:

The Bicycle Strategy, that is know how to start to be the first.

Kill two birds with one stone, that is develop local content as it will help to enhance the ccTLD.

Shoot for opportunity (using the Olympic Games) to add an international flavor to .cn.

**Mr. Vika Mpisane of .ZA** presented on the multi-stakeholder approach. He said that in building multi-stakeholder approach each stakeholder should bring its base with it and that persuasion and consensus are very important.

**Mr. Jean Philemon Kissangou of Congo** presented on .cg inventory of fixtures. He said that Congo tld is managed neither in the country nor by the country, rather it is managed since 1998 by Switzerland. He stated that the administrative contact was Congolese but that the technical contact is from Switzerland. He also said that the annual cost for a domain name on .cg amounted to 245 euros although nobody knows where the servers are located or how many records are on the system. He

stated that since 19 Feb 2009, a commission as been setup to strategize to go forward and gain victory over the matter.

**Mr. Ashok B. Radhakisson of AfriNIC** presented on building multi-stakeholders approach to managing and developing ccTLDs from national and regional perspectives. He said that from a national perspective there is increasing awareness of the economic, cultural and social impact of ccTLDs. He said several issues have to be addressed locally, namely access to ccTLDs through computer penetration, affordability, and link between ccTLDs and territory. Furthermore he stated that from a regional perspective trans-border issues must be looked into, such as, cyber-security, cybercrime, jurisdiction and effective law enforcement. He concluded by stressing the need for regional cooperation through harmonization of ICT legislation and enhanced regional connectivity.

**Dr. Krishna Oolun of ICTA** analyzed the multi-stakeholder approach from a management perspective. He stated that the main problem was to get stakeholders to work together effectively, that is, relationship management. Furthermore, he said that there is need for the various stakeholders to unlearn the way they did things coming from a telecommunications background. He concluded that the role of each stakeholder should be described and that each stakeholder should be commitment.

**Mr. Vincent Ngundi of KENIC** stated in the multi-stakeholder approach, the different stakeholders should agree upon what they should do, there should be involvement, commitment, and the role should be defined. He also said that the ccTLD should be hosted in a neutral location.

#### **Questions/Comments:**

Representative of Burundi asked the audience if we should leave Congo alone on the issue of Re-delegation of ccTLD or after the forum with the support of ATU to try to obtain solutions in common to those problems. Ms. Anne-Rachel Inné, replied that in Tunis, all those present today at the forum signed an agreement that no country should enter in another country's ccTLD issues. She advised Congo to fix the problem at home first, adding that ICANN can help in pointing at what to do but cannot do it without the commitment of local community. She also said that a new template was signed each time a new minister came into power which just slowed everything down each time. She concluded that the local community needs to conduct due diligence before submitting delegation requests to ICANN.

The representative of Gabon said that the ccTLDs are resources of a state and suggested that Burundi could make a request for a new code as

Zaire did whereas the representative of Gambia, Mr. Cham said that we need to make things fast moving.

### **3. WAY FORWARD**

On the second day of the forum, the participants appointed a 9-member committee to develop a declaration of the forum and recommend ATU's role on the output of the forum. The following persons were appointed to the committee:

- Mr. Alhaji A. Cham, The Gambia
- Prof. Beda Mutagahywa, Tanzania
- Mr. Michael Katundu, Kenya
- Mr. Kalu Ndukwe, Nigeria
- Mr. George Victor Salama, Egypt
- Mr. Vika Mpisane, South Africa
- Mr. Niyonkuru Jean-Marie Vianney, Burundi
- Dr. Krishna Oolun, Mauritius
- Mr. Adam Mambi, Tanzania
- Mr. Vincent Ngundi, Rapporteur General, Kenya

The committee came up with a declaration document which was deliberated by the forum participants (see Annex 1).

## 4. CLOSING SESSION

This session was moderated by Dr. Krishna Oolun, Director General, ICTA, Mauritius.

Mr. Vincent Ngundi, the Rapporteur General, was invited to present the report of the ATU event and way forward. He also read the Declaration document (The Pailles Declaration).

Dr. Krishna Oolum then invited comments from the floor to ensure that most of the issues were captured in the last few days. It was also agreed that the draft report will be sent to participants for review and comments for a period of one week.

Several questions and comments were raised from the floor, including:

Gilbert from Seychelles: He stated that Seychelles runs a ccTLD and that he has another perspective on the ccTLDs. He stated that we have adopted one of the proceedings going towards a non-for-profit organization, but that he feels that the ccTLD authority should be based on the multi-stakeholder model to ensure all of the community could contribute. He said that the registry function of the ccTLD doesn't have to be a part of the multi-stakeholder process, rather it can be contracted out to a commercial organization because they tend to run more efficiently vs. a government run organization and that we all have such proof. He also said that there is nothing wrong with making a profit by running a registry as long as objectives are met and it operates in a way that it benefits the community with prices, stability, security, etc. He stated that some of the profits can be given back to the organizations to support ICT development in the country and that we cannot close the door by stating we are adopting a purely non-profit entity. He also added that Seychelles is working on a similar model to benefit the country.

Mr. Kalu Ndukwe, NIRA, reemphasized that the point raised about non-for-profit does not mean it will not make a profit, that there would be a surplus. He also stated that in terms of proceeding, the report and declaration sufficiently captures the discussions from the last two days and recommended that we formally adopt it and move to the way forward, to what was recommended for the implementation.

Ms. Anne-Rachel Inné commented that we are being prescriptive by saying "should" and therefore "could" is more reasonable as one model doesn't fit all. She added that any community can decide on what they want to do. There was agreement by Dr. Paulos Nyirenda who stated that this is highlighting a model that really doesn't fit all communities.

There were also comments to the contrary, that “should” should remain as what we are saying is that these are best practices and any country is allowed to deviate from them. This participant added that as Africans, we need to say what is right and that is not-for-profit. He also added that there are always two components; registration and services. He added that saying it be local and that we need to do what we need to get our resources in the African continent.

Another question was raised about the facilitative role of government, what is meant by that exactly?

Mr. Akossi Akossi of the ATU stated that “should” is appropriate as it is a recommendation. He also stated that in regards to the role of the government, we say “should” provide startup capital, training, inter alia, we can’t really issue orders, that governments are people like us with competencies and other obligations and that they will fully understand and that the way to proceed is keeping with what we usually do with declarations although the remarks are appreciated.

Dr. Krishna Oolum agreed that we are not prescribing to the governments by saying “should” so “B” will be relaxed, “C” is okay, and “D” will also be relaxed so it doesn’t appear that we are being too prescriptive. He also added that the declaration will be reformatted to ensure it takes the shape of a declaration so it is a document from all of the stakeholders of this meeting.

A comment was made from the floor to add governments and stakeholders instead of governments alone.

Mr. Michuki Mwangi commented that he would be skeptical with having recommendations go out that the governments should setup a local Internet Exchange as it is paramount that it is a collaborative effort instead of a government responsibility. It was later pointed out that this was a mistake and that it should read “multi-stakeholder” instead and will be corrected.

A request from Gabon was made to also provide the report in French and Dr. Oolum replied that it will be translated into French.

Dr. Paulos Nyirenda suggested adding the IANA part as a reference instead of listing in bullet format to improve the declaration. However, a member from the declaration committee responded that the committee thought it was best itemize and to put the issues in black and white because the issues are a lot of concern for most of the countries.

A suggestion was made to add the issues of Security and IPv6 to the declaration and that we should start moving in that direction. It was suggested that we add an item that there should be a commitment from the multi-stakeholder entity to ensure that DNS is secured and that maybe at the next meeting there will be a reference document on how to secure it. On the issue of IPv6, it was suggested to add an IPv6 policy for African countries because under IPv4 it was under first come basis.

There was a suggestion from Mali to specify who are the stakeholders mentioned in the declaration and to name who should be the person responsible for renaming the re-delegations.

A comment was made that IP address allocation policies were not discussed, rather to promote adoption, therefore if we want to bring in the allocation policies of IPv6 that we should have another workshop. Dr. Krishna Oolum agreed that we should talk about the need to have a policy and describe the policy as it was not discussed, but that it was a matter to be discussed. Mr. Michuki Mwangi stated that recommendations should be that ccTLDs should be on the forefront of driving the IPv6 technology and as such should be taking the leadership in their country to do so. Another comment was made that for ccTLDs it would be simpler to recommend that the server is IPv6 so that IPv6 can be used for the domain and that it would be simpler than talking about policies and processes.

Dr. Krishna Oolum asked what do we do, take the commitment to move towards the policy or to have IPv6 which can be configured on the servers?

Vincent Ngundi stated that we should have both policies and deployment.

Mr. Michuki Mwangi invited the participants to attend the AfTLD meeting in Arusha, Tanzania, 13-17 April 2009 and stated that the theme is "Securing Africa's Infrastructure." He also stated that the issue of how to secure ccTLDs will be a point of discussion and concern. He stated that there will be 3 days of training on Attack and Disaster Recovery for ccTLDs in particular, including hands-on simulations of how you are able to identify that your ccTLD and DNS servers are under attack.

### **Closing Remarks**

Mr. Alhaji A. Cham, Gambia read vote of thanks on behalf of the participants to the government of Mauritius, sponsors, translators, drivers, security, ATU, and all other organizers and participants.

**Mr. Akossi Akossi** in his closing remarks stated that we have to work at home and this is what we have to do, we will come back home and have constraints and national emergencies, but we need to have something to move forward. He stated that these ccTLDs are a strategic infrastructure, international quality infrastructure, and that we need to educate the population to have an environment that is adequate for investments. He stated that you see different people when you come to meetings but we need synergy among all and that at the meeting, we managed to have different sectors represented and that we want to continue this. He added that this is the future of Africa today and without efficiencies that we will not take the train to the Internet society. He stated that he hopes that we will not only promote the conclusions of this forum but that we will also have the hope of the population at heart. He concluded that the Internet is a tool for the population so he hopes we will all do something about this and wished all a happy return and stated that he hopes we will see each other again after we summarize this.

In his closing remarks, **Mr. Trilock Dwarka**, Chairman of the ICT Authority stated that we have come to the end of a realistic discussion, thanks to all for active participation in the forum and that it allows us to take a step forward for every ccTLD in Africa. He stated that he is satisfied on the basis of proceedings of this forum and that the pendulum is moving in the right direction. He said that ICTA will think more in terms of people rather than clients. He said that the issue of ccTLDs has been lingering for a few years but now is propelled forward as it carries a certain emergency and soon the matter will be dealt with. He said that we have seen a rising tide of consciousness regarding security and abuse and discussion on child protections, and that it underscores vital importance of enabling an environment to promote and expand Internet access. He concluded by thanking ATU, ICANN, ICTA, Mauritius Post, Mauritius Telecom ICANN, AfriNIC, ISOC, Organisation Internationale De La Francophonie, and all delegates from Mauritius and developing countries.

The Chairman presented tokens of appreciation to some of the sponsoring organizations and again thanked all the sponsors and collaborators.

## **5. ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS**

The ATU would like to thank the following organisations for their support towards the forum:

1. The Ministry of Information and Communications Technology,  
Mauritius
2. Information and Communications Technology Authority (ICTA),  
Mauritius
3. Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers (ICANN)
4. Internet Society (ISOC)
5. Organisation Internationale de la Francophonie (OIF)
6. African Network Information Centre (AfriNIC)

## **ANNEX 1: “THE PAILLES DECLARATION”**

We, the participants at the Internet governance forum for African policy makers and regulators in Africa held in Pailles, Mauritius, from 17<sup>th</sup> to 19<sup>th</sup> of March 2009, organised by the ATU,

Expressing our sincere and deep gratitude to the Government of Mauritius, the Information and Communications Technology Authority (ICTA) of Mauritius, ICANN, Organisation Internationale De La Francophonie, AfriNIC and ISOC, for supporting this forum,

**Recalling** that a ccTLD:

- is the unique identity of a country in cyber space
- facilitates e-commerce
- facilitates e-governance
- enhances the management of cyber security
- enhances the development of technical human capacity in a country
- enhances the ability to create and avail local content online
- ensures affordability of domain names
- enhances the development of effective national policies and legal framework, among others

**Agreeing** that governments should facilitate the setup of the ccTLD in their country's in line with the following best practice principles:

- A ccTLD should be recognised and protected under national policies and laws
- ccTLD models should be self-sustaining. A ccTLD should have a not-for-profit status, unless otherwise agreed by the local Internet community.
- The facilitatory role of the government should include providing startup capital, building capacity, among others
- A ccTLD should be hosted locally where possible

**Agreeing** that those African countries whose ccTLDs are mismanaged or still managed outside of their countries without consent and support of the local stakeholders, should pursue re-delegation".

## **1. Re-delegation Process**

Having determined that a ccTLD is a critical national resource for every country in the information society, it was agreed that countries should apprise themselves with the process of re-delegation and that every country should:

- a) facilitate the identification of relevant stakeholders in their country in a transparent manner. Generally, stakeholders include the government/state, private sector, academia and civil society.
- b) agree on the structure of the entity to manage the ccTLD
- c) set up the entity that will manage the ccTLD

The above formed entity should meet the ICANN/IANA requirements for re-delegation as follows:

- provide information showing the change serves the local interest in the country;
- provide documentation demonstrating the technical and administrative capabilities of the organization receiving the re-delegation;
- provide a description of the legal status of the organization;
- provide the names of contacts in any in-country government agencies who have a say in the delegation/re-delegation;
- provide a detailed description of how existing ccTLD operations will be transferred to the proposed new operator, in the case of a re-delegation;
- provide documentation showing that the new operator will operate the domain in a fair and equitable manner; and,
- provide the approvals of the current contacts for the TLD, in the case of a re-delegation.
- apply for the re-delegation using the Change Request Template available on the IANA website ([www.iana.org](http://www.iana.org))

## **2. Capacity Building**

It was agreed that countries should:

- continuously share best practices at the regional and international level;
- actively participate at the local, regional and international Internet governance forums among them ICANN, GAC of ICANN, IGF, ITU, ATU, AfTLD, AfriNIC, ISOC among others; and,
- continuously development capacity.

### **3. Awareness**

As for awareness, it was agreed that:

- a ccTLD is a country's unique identity on Cyberspace;
- every government entity should have an online presence using the ccTLD name space;
- governments should strategize on making the ccTLD a national brand; and,
- all stakeholders should work together to develop a competition strategy that will include branding and marketing.

### **4. Content**

As for content, it was agreed that:

- government is the largest repository of relevant local content and as such every government should move towards the digitization of this content and avail it online in relevant local languages, using the ccTLD name space; and,
- relevant local content should be hosted locally.

### **5. Critical Internet Infrastructure**

ccTLD DNS servers and Internet Exchange Points (IXPs) were identified as Internet infrastructure that is critical for the operation of a ccTLD. Consequently, it was agreed that:

- every government should facilitate the setting up of a local Internet Exchange Point (IXP); and,
- the ccTLD database forms critical data and that the government should ensure that data escrow (database backup) is in place.

### **6. DNS Security and IPv6**

The forum agreed that ccTLDs should:

- Ensure the security of the ccTLD DNS servers;
- Participate in the development of policies for IPv6; and,
- Participate in the deployment of IPv6.

## **7. Way Forward**

### **i. The Role of ATU**

The role of the ATU on the way forward was indentified as follows:

- That the ATU should continuously apprise and sensitize policy makers on the importance of ccTLDs
- That the ATU should continuously partner with other Internet governance bodies in human capital development
- That the ATU should continuously participate at the national, regional and international Internet governance forums, including ICANN, GAC of ICANN, AfriNIC, AfTLD, among others
- That the ATU should continuously organize Internet governance forums at the regional level
- That the ATU should, in partnership with other Internet governance entities, including ICANN, ITU, ISOC, AfriNIC and AfTLD, develop common guidelines for the development and support of ccTLD's in Africa.
- That the ATU should hold follow-up forums on an annual basis to take stock of progression in the continent

### **ii. The Role of Governments**

It was agreed that governments should take the lead in creating the multi-stakeholder framework that will take the responsibility of undertaking the re-delegation of their ccTLD's.

### **iii. The Role of Other Stakeholders**

The role of the other stakeholders, including private sector, academia and Civil society, on the way forward was indentified as follows:

- Liaise with government in the re-delegation process;
- Actively participate in the Internet policy development process;
- Actively participate in Internet governance forums at the national, regional and international levels;

## ANNEX 2: LIST OF PARTICIPANTS

#	COUNTRY	NAME	ORGANIZATION
1.	Burundi	Carine Kayengeyenge	Office National des Télécommunications du (ONATEL)
2.	Burundi	Jean-Marie Vianney Niyonkuru	Office National des Télécommunications du (ONATEL)
3.	Comoros	Abdallah Said Mlimi	Comoros Telecom
4.	Comoros	Charikane Bouchrane	Comores Telecom
5.	Cote d'Ivoire	Abraham Djekou	Agence des Télécommunications de Côte d'Ivoire (ATCI)
6.	Cote d'Ivoire	Souleymane Oumtanaga	Nic Cote d'Ivoire IINPHB
7.	Egypt	George Victor Salama,	National Telecommunications Regulatory Authority
8.	Equatorial Guinea	H.E. Carmelo M. Modu	Ministerio de Transporte, Tecnologia Correos y Telecomunicaciones
9.	Ethiopia	Abebe Mesfin	Ministry of Transport & Communications
10.	Ethiopia	Bedilu Bethlehem	Ethiopian Telecommunications Corporation
11.	Gabon	Yces Owangleley-Adiahenot	Primature
12.	Gabon	Emile Onanga-Anotho	Agence de Regulation des Telecommunications(ARTEL)
13.	Gambia	Cham Ahaji Abdoulie	Dept. of State for Communication & Information Technology (DOSCIIT)
14.	Ghana	Eric Akumiah	AfTLD
15.	ISOC	M. Donck Frederic	Internet Society (ISOC)

15.	ISOC	M. Donck Frederic	Internet Society (ISOC)
16.	ISOC	Dawit Bekele	Internet Society (ISOC)
17.	ITU	Alexander Ntoko	International Telecommunications Union
18.	Kenya	Akossi Akossi	African Telecommunications Union (ATU)
19.	Kenya	Alice Koech	African Telecommunications Union (ATU)
20.	Kenya	Vincent Ngundi	Kenya Network Information Centre (KENIC)
21.	Kenya	Charles Njoroge	Communications Commissions of Kenya (CCK)
22.	Kenya	Michael Katundu	Communication Commission of Kenya (CCK)
23.	Kenya	Paxton Musomba	Communication Commission of Kenya (CCK)
24.	Libya	Esam Abulkhirat	General Post and Telecommunication Company
25.	Madagascar	Hajanirina Ramboasalama	NIC-MG (Network Information Center Madagascar)
26.	Malawi	Dr. Paulos B. Nyirenda	Malawi SDNP
27.	Malawi	John Bande	Ministry of ICT
28.	Mali	Diakite Hawa	ISOC Mali
29.	Mauritius	Ashok Radhakisson	Internet Direct Ltd.
30.	Mauritius	Joydeep Beeharry	ICT Authority
31.	Mauritius	Mahen Soobron	CIB/MICT
32.	Mauritius	Awotar- Mauree Rosheen	Ministry of ICT
33.	Mauritius	Mauree Venkatesen	National
34.	Mauritius	Mr. Bundhun Narrotun	Internet Management Committee
35.	Mauritius	Mark Francois	Internet Management Committee
36.	Mauritius	Boodhun Ved	Ministry of ICT
37.	Mauritius	Mohamudaly Nawaz	University of Technology
38.	Mauritius	Rajesh Rai	Manager Telephone Mauritius Ltd

39.	Mauritius	Goolamally Ilrshaad	Internet Management Committee
40.	Mauritius	Mahen Govinda	Board of Investment
41.	Mauritius	Vyankoj Mulloo	Government Online Centre
42.	Mauritius	Awotar-Mauree Rosheen	Ministry of ICT
43.	Mauritius	Sunilduth Baichoo	University of Mauritius
44.	Mauritius	A. Naiken Maduray	Information Communications Technologies Authority (ICTA)
45.	Mauritius	Hanaa Esoof	Information Communications Technologies Authority (ICTA)
46.	Mauritius	Trilock Dwarka	Information Communications Technologies Authority (ICTA)
47.	Mauritius	R. Soobragrah	Information Communications Technologies Authority (ICTA)
48.	Mauritius	Krishna Oolun	Information Communications Technologies Authority (ICTA)
49.	Namibia	Henri J. Kassen	Ministry of Information & Comm Technology
50.	Namibia	David Imbilii	NCC Nambia
51.	Nigeria	Ndukwe Kalu	Nigeria Internet Registration Association
52.	Republic of Congo	Jean Philemon Kissangou	DGACPT
53.	Republic of Congo	David Kinsaka Ndvenga	DOTCD/OCPTONPT
54.	Rwanda	Edouard Mashyaringa	RICTA
55.	Rwanda	Kappusamy Vijay Kumar	Rwanda Utilities Regulatory Agency (RURA)
56.	Rwanda	Murara Brice	Rwanda Utilities Regulatory Agency (RURA)
57.	Rwanda	Pierre Claver Secyugu	Rwanda ICT Association (RICTA)
58.	Rwanda	Rwerekane Valentin	Rwanda Utilities Regulatory Agency (RURA)

59.	Seychelles	Ah-Thew George	Department of ICT
60.	Seychelles	Gilbert Lebon	VCS Pty Ltd
61.	South Africa	Jabu Radebe	Department of Communications
62.	South Africa	Vika Mpisane	South Africa Domain Name Authority (ZADNA)
63.	Sudan	Abdalla Rahmtalla Mohamed	National Telecommunication Corporation (NTC)
64.	Sudan	Abdelwahab Gamal Maha	National Telecommunication Corporation (NTC)
65.	Swaziland	Motsa Mandla	Ministry of I&C Technology
66.	Tanzania	Abibu R. Ntahigiye	Tanzania Network Information Centre (TZNIC)
67.	Tanzania	Beda Mutagahywa	Tanzania Network Information Centre (TZNIC)
68.	Tanzania	Adan Mambi	Tanzania Communications Regulatory Authority (TCRA)
69.	Tanzania	Richard Sunday	Tanzania Communications Regulatory Authority (TCRA)
70.	Togo	Naogbodji Ayikido Yawo	C.A.F,E INFORMATIQUE ET TELECOMMUNICATIONS
71.	Zambia	Choolwe Nalubamba	Communications Authority of Zambia(CAZ)
72.	Zambia	Garry Mukelebai	Communications Authority of Zambia(CAZ)
73.	Zambia	Milingo Lungu	Communications Authority of Zambia (CAZ)
74.	AfriNIC	Adiel Akplogan	AfriNIC
75.	AfriNIC	Lillian Sharpley	AfriNIC
76.	ISOC/ AfTLD	Michuki Mwangi	ISOC/ AfTLD
77.	ICANN	Theresa Swinehart	ICANN

78.	ICANN	Anne-Rachel Inne	ICANN
79.	ICANN	Dr. Paul Twomey	ICANN
80.	ICANN	Katim Touray	ICANN