
MARRAKECH – ccNSO: Members Meeting Day 2 (2 of 3)
Wednesday, June 26, 2019 – 10:30 to 12:00 WET
ICANN65 | Marrakech, Morocco

ABDALLA OMARI: Good morning. Welcome back from coffee break. Our current session is the IANA naming function session. We are happy we have the three presenters to lead us in the first 50-minute session. Lise from the Board PTI, Kim from PTI (ICANN), Byron dot-CA. Thank you. So, because we are already late by a few minutes, I'll request Lise to proceed with her presentation. I can see she has not disappointed. The pictures are there, as usual.

LISE FUHR: Yes. I didn't want to break that habit. Sorry. I hope to keep you a bit awake with that because we don't many questions during these sessions. I hope that's a sign that everything is working well, so I hope that when we have no questions, it's like when you have water or electricity, everything is fine. You don't really care or think about it.

Thank you for inviting the PTI Board. I'm here on behalf of the Board. I'm chairing it at the moment. My art today is actually Moroccan graffiti because I don't know a whole lot of Moroccan art but I think it's important to show a bit of the country we're in when we do these presentations.

Note: The following is the output resulting from transcribing an audio file into a word/text document. Although the transcription is largely accurate, in some cases may be incomplete or inaccurate due to inaudible passages and grammatical corrections. It is posted as an aid to the original audio file, but should not be treated as an authoritative record.

This is not because PTI is the elephant in the room. This is more because I like that picture and I think it was a fun way to do graffiti on stairs. So, without further ado, I'll just proceed on the agenda for today.

Actually, I just want to mention that Morocco is one of the few Arabian countries that actually has government support and [pave] those wall art or murals – they're called murals. I find it extremely fascinating. They're not all Moroccan artists but they're doing it in Morocco with the theme of Morocco, of course.

Apart from the art, what we will talk about today is the strategic plan for PTI. I'm just really quickly going to mention something about the budget because Kim is going to talk more about it.

Since we met in Kobe, we have not had a real Board meeting in PTI but we had a workshop and that workshop was actually to discuss the strategic and operational plan for PTI because in the first years we didn't really have our own strategy. We were looking at the requirements and ICANN strategic plan [served as] our interim strategic plan.

So, in late May, we had a one-and-a-half day workshop as PTI Board in Los Angeles and talked about the strategic process because you don't make a strategic plan in one-and-a-half days and we also need a whole lot of input. The PTI staff held their own workshop, so we saw their input and we built on that.

So, what's the timing of the strategy? Well, ICANN has a five-year strategic plan and we have a four-year strategic plan. That's not very convenient so we think we should look into if we can change this. We don't think it needs to be done now. We need to get on with the strategic plan. But it might require PTI to change some bylaws. It's not the same process as ICANN bylaw changes. I can assure you this is not difficult.

But our plan is the strategic plan will cover minimum FY21 until FY24. That leaves a year gap but we will see how we can actually have that FY25 covered and we will look into this in the next couple of months.

What we did to kick off was actually – I love this picture because it's kind of what we feel when we make a strategy. It is kind of a burden. It's never easy to make a strategy. And since we are multi-stakeholder – I love this, she's carrying the burdens of a whole city.

But we reviewed the ICANN strategic plan and we identified where we have IANA applicability. We actually had help to facilitate and capture our key priorities. We also found that we should have a vision to flesh out actually what we want to do with PTI. We have the old vision but we think we need to renew it because of the changes that have been done with PTI.

Our strategy will not follow the same structure as the ICANN strategy because we have other strategic objectives and we think it's better to create our own structure. But we will, of course, align with ICANN strategic goals.

So, when we show you these first ideas, it's very important to remember these are only initial themes and it's a preliminary discussion that we will continue to involve with all of you and also with the numbering protocol community.

We took first the offset, as I said, in the ICANN strategic plan where objective one is security. We found there was some overlapping and some things that needed to be done in our strategy to actually comply also with ICANN strategy. I'm not going to go through all of them. You can read them and you will have the slides because we only have 15 minutes and three presentations. But just to show you that we took great care into aligning with ICANN strategy and discussed it at the board at length. We also looked into governance and think there are some things we need to align with there.

Of course, objective three was very much targeted at IANA services, IANA functions, in the ICANN strategy, so there it felt that it was very natural that we took actually three of the goals. On the geo-politics, it's a bit more fluffy but we will look into how we can actually also align with that one.

We found when we look at finances, this is beyond our control, but we are of course able to reflect on the need to develop a long-term IANA operational plan and that will of course also align with finance.

The interesting thing is where didn't the strategic objectives in the ICANN strategic plan cover what we needed for PTI. So, it doesn't cover all the IANA communities, so the numbering and protocol communities were not covered as we saw it in the ICANN plan.

Also, of course, we have some very specific items for PTI like a reduction in reliance on manual processing that we would like to make a strategic objective. We would also like to have a reference to the SLAs.

We discussed a bit both on product quality and customer service experience and customer focus as such. That's not very apparent in the ICANN strategic plan but it's built in what they call operational excellency. We just want to be more explicit about this and I think we tried to build in these themes into the PTI strategy.

This is, by the way, called the Invisible Morocco. I think that's the Moroccans that are just around the street, the old original people that blend in. So, I just love them. It's a German artist. It's not a Moroccan that painted it but I just love this picture.

Then we looked at our vision and we have some key words because we are not ready to present you with a draft of a vision yet but we think it's important that it contains something about security, customer orientation, of course accountability, continuous improvement of our services. Also, continue to add value and usability to the Internet community including not only customers but also beneficiaries. That means the Internet at large, we would like to have a vision that covers all Internet users and not only what we see as customers, the DNS, the numbering and the protocols. We would also like to make a linkage to the ICANN contracts.

Our current mission is PTI is responsible for the operational aspects of coordinating the Internet's unique identifiers and maintaining the trust of the community to provide these services in an unbiased, responsible, and effective manner. For us, it's extremely important. We keep this but we just add a bit more to it. So, we will change the wording but what's in there will actually continue also to be there.

We have the current purpose in our bylaws. I'm not going to go through this. You will have the slides so you can read it yourself but this is what we need to reflect both in our vision and also in what we do with our strategy. When we have our mission, mission will ... Sorry, I was confusing the things but we will have the mission [studies] will do the vision in a broader sense. And then

we'll of course have the strategy that is a more detailed version of what we want to accomplish.

More importantly is actually the draft timeline. We will share the outcome here in Marrakech. That's been done. Then we will consult with all the specific customers. That's you and the protocol and the numbering. Then, we will try to see what we do if we hold a public session in March. Maybe we're ready to do it already in Montreal. We don't know yet. But we will make sure that you get a draft that you can give input to in a timely manner so it is able to be changed. So it's not a fully baked version you will get but a draft that we can work with. There will be a comment period from April to May and we review and finalize the plan May to June and adopt it by June 2020.

That was the strategic part. On the budget, Kim will walk you through the process of the budget. My only plea to all of you is if you have any wishes, if you have any thoughts on how IANA should improve on technical issues and wishes, we need to have it in our budget. So, please, give us feedback on the budget and your input is important.

This is an unknown artist. I don't know how you actually remain unknown making this big mural, but I love it. I think it's excellent of fantasy and a bit – what do you call it? Anyway, it's a nice piece.

That is all and thank you for listening. I'll open for questions, otherwise I'll hand it over to Kim if you have none. So, any questions?

ABDALLA OMARI:

Any questions to Lise? I'm sure she can also explain the pictures if you don't have questions on the strategic plan. Okay. Just one question maybe from me. Your strategic plan covers four years. ICANN is five years. Although you have said you are going to pick, when are you planning to harmonize? [inaudible] pick it.

LISE FUHR:

It depends on the community, to be honest, because if we are to harmonize, we need to do some changes in our bylaws and we need to have that done via a consultation with the community. I think the plan is if we can have it harmonized so we, after the four years, can align, the four years need to have an add-on to the fifth year and we don't know how to do that legally, so we're looking into how to either extend the strategic plan for one year so it becomes effectively a five-year plan. It's a matter of us wanting not to delay the strategic plan now but make sure that we work with changing the bylaws if it's agreed by the community.

ABDALLA OMARI:

Thank you. Any remark, participant question? No? Kim?

KIM DAVIES:

Thanks very much. Thanks, Lise. I'm going to start talking about some of the operational updates that we have and part of that will be to talk about the budget process. I'll also talk about some recent changes to SLAs that have been discussed in the community, a little bit about RDAP root zone management system development, KSK rollover, and customer satisfaction

So, budget. It might be a surprise to some that we need to start budgeting so far in advance but it is actually a bylaws requirement. Nine months prior to our fiscal year, we need to have the draft budget ready, so in order to get to that point, we need to actually start the discussions even earlier. The way we do this is to really start discussions over 12 months in advance, and that is what we're really kicking off today is the initial engagement that will lead into development of the draft budget for the IANA functions and for PTI.

Now, as part of that, another bylaws provision is that we shall consult with the SOs and ACs, as well as the Registry Stakeholder Group, IAB, and RIRs in developing the budget. We have an approach for this, too.

Our approach is twofold. One is that we do some sort of outreach and engagement at the very beginning of the process to find out what our priorities should be and then later in the process, when

we've actually developed the document, we share that for comment.

So, we're going to use this meeting to start this process but we are going to do it a little differently this time around from last year. Last year, I went on a speaking tour and went to different SOs and ACs and presented the budget and had a few people come to the microphone and give feedback. I went to RIR meetings in various locations and gave a similar presentation, and also went to the IETF meeting to present to our partners in that space. We [are going to do] some of those meetings, but what we're going to do differently this year is we're also going to hold a webinar. We recognized in scheduling this year there's too many communities we want to reach out to and not enough time, particularly at this abbreviated meeting that we have this week to try and accomplish that.

So, in addition to the engagements we are able to do, we will hold a webinar next month and we'll have an open invite to anyone that's interested to participate in that, hear a little more detailed presentation than what I'm about to give and then an opportunity for people to provide feedback either during the webinar or afterwards.

Now, I want to be clear. Feedback is welcome at anytime and it's welcome on anything. Any input you can give as a community

member on what our priorities should be, what we should work on, what we shouldn't work on is always welcome. If you want to see your ideas integrated into the first draft of the budget, over the next month or so would be the best time to get that to me. But there will be other opportunities to comment. We will have a draft document out for public comment later in the year and if you'd rather reserve judgment to review what we're proposing, then you're welcome to do that as well.

Not quite visible, I suspect, but this is how the timeline plays out just in brief. We start now. We do these preliminary priority discussions in June and July. The waterfall goes down to having a public comment period around September-October and then it goes through the various bits of ratification and approval with the idea that it will be approved early in the new year by all the parties that need to approve it. And then of course it doesn't actually kick in until July 1st. So, we're currently in fiscal year 19 and we're already talking about fiscal year 21, so that's kind of how it goes.

Some of the budget assumptions are more or less unchanged from last year. Our assumptions in going through the planning process are customers are generally happy with our service and they're not asking for any fundamental changes to how we do things, other than our ongoing efforts to improve our service. We don't have any big ticket new areas of functionality or new major policies to implement, that kind of thing, that would alter our

priorities in a significant way and we don't have any areas identified of extreme weakness that we need to correct for.

Some of the activities that we need to work on, the timing is highly dependent on other parties, so we're kind of in a wait and see mode, but things like the next round of gTLD applications, so-called SubPro and the TLD variance that will probably be somewhat linked to that.

Another assumption is that our team will generally remain the same size and that the funding that we get from ICANN will be roughly the same.

Some of the ongoing work that we have that we're likely continuing to FY21. We continue to update the root zone management system. I'll talk a little bit about that in a minute.

Protocol parameter management system. We're ongoing in developing a brand new tooling to support the IETF. This is an area of our operations that probably doesn't impact you but that area of our operations today is highly manual. We want to bring some of the benefits that you're seeing with RZMS to that community as well. So, we're building a system.

IANA website is getting a bit long in the tooth. We would like to improve it significantly, make it more usable and interactive and visually a bit more appealing so we're looking to doing that as

well. Variant TLDs, I mentioned. KSK rollover, I'll mention that later in my presentation as well.

So, that was it for the budget. I'll move on to the next topic which is changes to the SLAs. For those that are not familiar, we have a committee called Customer Standing Committee made up of representatives of CCs, Gs, and some of the other impacted parties involved in the naming functions.

We've gone through a long process of reviewing the SLAs we originally stipulated during the transition. As a consequence of that, recognizing there is a need to change the SLAs, and furthermore, that the process to change the SLAs will be very heavyweight the way it was originally constructed. So, the first step was to ability create a more lightweight and agile process to change the SLAs.

So, the CSC approved a new change process December of last year. Some related amendments to the IANA naming function contract were executed in April and this enables that process to be conducted.

Then, as a consequence of that, we basically have three streams of work on going to update the SLAs. The first one, technical check threshold changes. That is being implemented now, becoming effective July 1st. That's really the tail end of that change. I'll get to the details in a moment.

SLAs for label generation rule sets. You might know them as IDN tables. That is something we're working on as well. It's currently out for public comment, and depending on the nature of the comments, we anticipate it as being implemented later in the year.

Lastly, we're in the preliminary stages of evaluating changes to ccTLD transfer and delegation SLAs. What we found here is some of them need to be adjusted but it's still an early part of the discussion.

So, just to explain what those SLAs are all about. The first one, technical check thresholds. Again, these are the ones that come into force July 1st. This is about how long our automated system takes to check your name servers to make sure they're working correctly. Over two years of data now following the transition, we found that some of the averages that we used to set the original SLAs weren't really true averages over a longer period of time and the most obvious area that this was true was for these technical check changes.

So, we had a fairly aggressive SLA there. The CSC agreed that a more lenient SLA would be appropriate, given the averages. Staff discussed in detail with the CSC members about the causes of the delays and so forth and there was agreement that it would be appropriate.

Now, the actual numbers we're talking about here are very small. The original SLA was something like three minutes and it's been extended to ten minutes. So, we're still talking about a relatively timely implementation of your request. It's just for this particular measure, an adjustment was called for.

Label generation rule sets. There were actually no SLAs on this and this is really for one simple reason, that our work here was not an IANA function until the transition. So, given that it was added to our scope during the transition, the team that was evaluating SLAs didn't consider it for SLAs, because at that time, it wasn't an IANA function. This is more of a gap that was identified after the fact. We've had some discussions, implemented some measurement into our systems and that will start being measured [inaudible] the feedback we get from public comment.

The most complicated one we're dealing with – and that's why it's going to take longer – is ccTLD delegation and transfer. Currently, we have an SLA that essentially calls for these kinds of requests to involve no more than 60 days of staff processing time. Now, that might sound like a lot, but the nature of these requests is highly variable. Sometimes, they're done in weeks. Sometimes, they're done in months. But the requests are really rare, as some of you might know. ccTLDs don't change hands very often. So,

this is really a metric that targets one request every several months. It's not something that happens month in, month out.

The challenge here, at its heart, is that different transfer requests have very different levels of complexity. The issues are very different and the skill set of the customer is very different as well. Some requests are very well formed, fairly straightforward set of events, and the person applying is very familiar with ICANN, with policies, and what have you. Those kinds of requests go very quickly.

But on the other end of the spectrum, you sometimes have requests that are very complicated. There's a lot of parties involved. Maybe there's some conflict involved. Maybe there's a communication barrier in terms of the language they speak. Maybe they're not technical at all. They are trying to communicate concepts that they're not familiar with, acting as middlemen between other people.

As a consequence, what happens is our staff will go back and forth with this customer many, many times and this can go a period of months. That's where we see this time adding up and where we see this SLA not being representative. I think in our estimation, we're responding back to the customer in a reasonable amount of time, but the aggregate of all those times we consult with the

customer over many months, sometimes over a year, adds up to more than 60 days.

So, in recognition of this is the dynamic that we have with the customer and these kinds of requests, what we've been discussing with the CSC is instead of counting all that time together as one number, why don't we measure IANA's response rate after each individual reply?

So, a customer comes to us with some more information. How long does it take for staff to get back to them? If they come back a second time, we start a new clock and we count how long it takes to get back to them. So, we're actually measuring much more accurately I think what staff can control as opposed to the aggregate of all that time.

Other things that we would seek to measure is once all the requirements are satisfied, we do produce this report. It's reviewed by the ICANN Board of Directors. We would measure how long it takes for us to produce the report.

And also, just as a metric in terms of giving the community a sense of how involved some of these requests are, we would start counting the number of interactions we have, the number of times we go back and forth. It's a crude measure but it is something that might be helpful to identify which cases are simple and which cases are complex. And whilst there won't be

an SLA attached to that, by reporting it, it will give the CSC more data to use in subsequent discussions.

Simultaneously, we're also looking to improve our documentation here, so we're using this exercise and talking this out in the CSC to identify areas that we can improve the documentation.

Moving on to RDAP. So, we implemented RDAP support in early 2016. For those that aren't familiar, RDAP automatically works out which RDAP server to contact to get a response whether it's for a domain name, IP address or so forth. How does it do that? Well, of course it talks to IANA. So, we built this service called the RDAP Bootstrap Registry based on IETF specification. And as part of that, we implemented features in our root zone management system that let you as TLD operators record your RDAP server, and if you do it [inaudible], automatically goes into the bootstrap registry to allow RDAP clients to automatically find your RDAP server.

So, we launched that in 2016. By the end of 2016, two TLDs were using it. 2017, four TLDs were using it. Four TLDs were added, I should say. So, six in total. Then, in 2018, a whole one additional TLD was added. So, you can see that adoption of RDAP initially has been quite slow. But that's all changing. There is a contractual mandate that gTLD registries implement RDAP by the

26th of August. That means that we're going to have a huge rush of these requests over the next couple of months. We've already had 83 TLDs added year to date, but obviously there's 1500 or so TLDs and they all need them by August, so our team is bracing for a busy summer.

One message I'll give out here, if there's any RSPs in the room, is that if you are a large registry service provider that has lots of TLDs and you need to make these changes, please do reach out to our staff first. They can make the process a lot simpler rather than you have to manually entering it in again and again and again through our web interface.

Briefly, our root zone management system. I just wanted to apprise you that work is still ongoing here. We've done some minor updates in the last year – GDPR-related updates. We've improved some security aspects of the system. We optimized the way technical checks are done which makes them go a little faster. So, that's something that's already been released and then we're actually working on a patch right now to improve the way we validate RDAP servers and some more security updates.

But what's most notable is the major work that's been ongoing. Internally, it feels like this project is consuming all of our time and I know outside our walls you don't really see any of it, so we're really looking forward to launching this. But effectively, we're

doing a ground-up rewrite of the whole system. Much more modular system with modern software. The system we're using now is over 15 years old, almost 20 years old, so it's kind of warranted.

Work completed so far is some of the architectural internal stuff, how we talk to Verisign and so forth. And we're now working on things like the user account system, authorization model, and the UI. So, I just wanted to give you an update. That work is still ongoing, targeted for release next year. It's a lot of work. Our team is working feverishly on it.

KSK rollover. In brief, as I'm sure you've all heard many times in different forums, KSK rollover happened late last year. It was considered successful by all accounts and we've published a document listing all our various observations on how it went.

But, importantly, my update for you today is we're now working on what happens next. What does the next rollover look like? So, the goal here is essentially to stop making rollovers be a one-off event but make them a normal part of our routine operations. They just happen on a regular schedule moving forward.

We're currently accepting new input on a mailing list that we set up and we are developing a proposal that we'll publish in the next six months and my expectation will be before Montreal. So, we're looking forward to community input on how we do that.

So, customer satisfaction is my last topic. One thing we implemented late last year was immediately polling our customers after they submitted a request to us to find out if they thought the request went well or not. And we're starting to get results that we can rely upon. The way it works is basically you're asked, "Are you happy with the request, yes or no?" And also there's a comment field if you wanted to provide any extra commentary.

Our team reviews every single one of these responses and every single comment, and also tasks staff specifically to do follow-up. So, we're trying to do a high level of follow-up to these comments that we receive.

Here are some numbers since Kobe. I wish I could tell you what they are but I can't see them. Generally speaking, satisfaction is relatively high, 90% or so. We're still wrestling with some challenges in how to report these numbers. The truth is that part of our job is telling people no. People apply for something that they're not eligible for under the policy and we say no to them, close the ticket. They get the survey, they say they're not happy with their experience with us because they wanted that domain or they wanted that IP address blocked they just asked for and they're not eligible under the policy. So, we're trying to find a way to best discern when people aren't happy with the way we did our job versus just being unhappy with the policy.

So, as a consequence of our surveying this way, in the past you've received annual surveys from us that asked how we do our job and we really want to reformulate them to only ask strategic questions about where we should be going. Now we have a tool that tells us how we do our job pretty well because we have these surveys that come right after a request.

So, we're developing a survey technique that we will use later this year to be more focused on engagement in these strategic questions. But it poses a big question and I don't know the answer here and I'm really keen to hear thoughts on what you think about who should we be asking for feedback on strategic questions?

Some of the ideas we've had is maybe it's the CSC on behalf of the naming community. It's a small group but they have high awareness of all the facets of how we do our job. Maybe it's all the TLD managers that are out there as a larger group, but as a whole, TLD managers have less awareness of their day-to-day stuff that we run into. Maybe it's both. Maybe we poll the CSC and all the TLD managers separately and then we compare results. If the CSC has quite a different view of where we should be focusing versus the rest of the community, maybe that's useful information to know.

Then, of course, we could go even broader and open the survey up to all and let people respond to the survey, self-select what

group they're in. So, this is something we're wrestling with and if you have any thoughts on where we should focus this, it would be very valuable input to us.

So, with that, thank you. Happy to answer any questions.

ABDALLA OMARI:

Thank you. Can I put a request Byron to present, then we ask the questions as a whole? Byron, you have about seven minutes. Even the online questions. Just let Byron present. Thank you.

BYRON HOLLAND:

Okay. I will do my best to try to get us back on track timewise. I'll try to compress my 20 minutes into two or three minutes.

The good news is Kim has shared with you in significant detail I think some of the major work that the CSC has been involved with as well. As I think everybody here will recognize, the CSC was created to provide to the oversight mechanism for the performance of PTI and the IANA functions.

As you can see by what Kim has shared with you over the last number of minutes, it's been a very busy time. The CSC really focuses on the work that IANA was doing around the SLA changes and that's what we've really focused on over the last several months because while Kim and Naela and the team really do all

the heavy lifting and the work, it is the CSC's responsibility to have an oversight function around that work to make sure that we're getting what we need. Also, I think we've generated or created a very positive and constructive, iterative relationship going back and forth around these issues and others.

So, we have been very involved all along the way for all of those SLA changes. Like I say, they do the work but we provide feedback and input along the way.

One of the things that I want to remind everybody of – you heard it here, but Kim has delivered a lot of information – just a reminder that the public comment period on the IDN SLA is open right now and closes on August 9th. So, I would recommend that all of you who have interest in that subject in particular please take the opportunity to participate in the public comment. Again, closes August 9th. So, you have a bit of time but not a lot of time.

The other thing is around the ccTLD delegation transfer issue, of course there is little more near and dear to our hearts in this room than that issue and IANA's performance around that issue. There will be a public comment period on that. It's not open yet. There will be. But please put that in your calendar, because like I say, the IANA functions are probably the single-most important issue that we ever have to deal with as a community. Make sure to participate in that.

In terms of the other work that CSC has been involved in since we last spoke or since the Kobe meeting, a lot of what we have done has been in response to the effectiveness review recommendations. As I think everybody here will recall, there have been a number of reviews around the CSC. One was around our charter. The other was going to be around the IANA functions review which has yet to start. But in there, also, was the effectiveness review which I'm happy to report I think was quite effective, particularly in light of the fact they didn't really tread on any ground already covered by the charter review or will likely to be covered in the IFR.

The effectiveness review made a number of recommendations, in particular about how we onboard new members. The CSC right now was something that was started from scratch, so a lot of what we've been doing over the last couple of years was actually building up the processes by which we will operate and govern ourselves and one of the recommendations that the effectiveness review team made was how do we onboard people, now that we have history, now that we have processes, now that we have a culture and a way of doing businesses, how do we ramp new members up quickly? We took that on board as a good recommendation.

Also, how do we map experience and skills? What is the skills matrix by which we should try to attract the right new members?

And to that end, how do we communicate that and work with all of the organizations represented in the CSC, both the members as well as the liaisons?

So, those were all recommendations that the effectiveness review team made. In addition, they also talked about how we deal with complaints. So, one of the things that we've noticed has happened is that individual actors have come to us with a complaint, come to the CSC with a complaint. But by charter, by mandate, we don't deal with individual complaints. We deal with systemic issues.

So, if we notice that there were several or more complaints about an issue, we would become interested and potentially involved. But we're not here to resolve individual complaints.

However, that's not necessarily clear, so what is the process by which we could deal with that? By circumstance, we end up receiving individual ones so what do we do with that and how can we have that normalized in terms of a process?

So, all of those things were recommended to be addressed by the CSC and I'm happy to report that we agree with all of them and have taken steps to move forward to address each and every one of the recommendations from the effectiveness review team.

You can see some of that work already in terms of the onboarding of new members and if you go to the CSC website, you'll see a tab called "Onboarding" and that's our first attempt at providing the necessary background and required information for new members to help get acclimatized to our processes, procedures, cultures, etc.

To that end, I would also highlight the fact that we will be going through the process of getting new members. The call has gone out to all of the respective communities, so that actually will be very, very useful as we take on new members and go through the election process, etc.

I did have a few other things but I think Kim gave a very detailed overview of the various SLA changes, so I won't touch on those again. Happy to take any questions now. Back over to you.

ABDALLA OMARI:

Thank you. Yeah. Kim gave a very detailed presentation. I think we can take the questions from the community members here. There was someone to ask a question. I think Byron must have answered the question. Online question?

UNIDENTIFIED MALE:

I don't have a specific question, but a very quick comment and I would just like to thank Byron for the work. I think there is no

questions because it's working well and the involvement of the CCs and the CSC is very useful. So, thank you very much.

PETER: I have three questions for Kim, but in the interest of time, I will follow the other Peter's example and send them to the list instead, if that's okay.

ABDALLA OMARI: You have about two minutes. That's too squeezed? Okay. Let's give a round of applause to the team which have made their [inaudible]. Thank you. I'll invite myself to chair the next session. You can see a very strong team here.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: [I made] one of them come down. The rest are just following willingly.

ABDALLA OMARI: I'm chairing the [inaudible] from chairing a Board meeting here. Wow.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Yeah. You got it.

ABDALLA OMARI: Okay. [inaudible] ICANN specification review session. We'll start with a status update and community consultation [inaudible] accountability and transparency. You can hear me?

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Now we can. You were speaking away from the mic. You need to speak into the mic.

ABDALLA OMARI: Okay. We'll start with the status report of the ATRT-3. Now, because you have a big team, they'll tell me who will present.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Well, always defer to me first.

ABDALLA OMARI: Okay. The floor is yours.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: That's alright. There's a few people in this room who are used to me. My name is Cheryl Langdon-Orr. I'm one of the two co-chairs of the Accountability and Transparency Review Team, third iteration. Having said that, now can I just call it ATRT-3, please? Good. We have people who say, "Can't you use the full

terminology?” Well, I’ve used the full terminology. Now we’ll go shorthand.

And you will see, from one end of the table to the other, the members of the community but the one you need to be most interested in is the valued person that you sent us – Demi. It’s alright. Trust me, I don’t need two microphones. I can probably get away without any.

This is pretty much, with the except of Pat who is my co-chair, who are the community members that have been charged under this iteration of ICANN’s Accountability and Transparency Review to look at some mandated and some optional under our own auspices issues of transparency and accountability.

Obviously, we are going to look at things like Board-GAC interaction and those things that are required of us under the bylaws of ICANN but we are also very, very interested in the thoughts of the component parts of ICANN. In other words, the community feel. This is a temperature-taking exercise. I mean, if you’ve got data, give us data. But if you don’t have data and you’ve just got a bit of a funny thing that you think might not be transparent enough, this is the opportunity to talk to us and tell us about it.

It’s not the only opportunity, however. We have many, many questions we would have liked to asked you but we’ve narrowed

it down to the three you can see on the screen and we will be looking forward to hearing your individual views. We know you are talking with one voice that, as ccTLD operators, you have many different views on many different things, undoubtedly. We're interested in your view.

We also will be sending out follow-up survey and we will be open to any input coming to our email address that you can find on our Wiki and that I will make sure our fabulous staff send to ccNSO staff so that it can be recorded in this part of your minutes for today. Any follow-up, sometimes you want to raise something that you might want to raise somewhat more quietly or privately. We are open to that as well.

We may or may not in the time left to us, noting that we started late and we don't want to push you back for the rest of the day, we may or may not get to the third question. So, we would very much appreciate any input at all, freeform or point form, databased or not on that last one. So, if there is there anything you'd like to share from the perspective of accountability and transparency, we're open for business. Please do let us know.

Status update. We've only just begun. To that extent, we won't be handing in our homework until March next year. Our first significant meeting, or meeting of substance, is held in February – in the end of February – and it is from then that the clock starts

running. And just shortly before our coming to the Marrakech meeting and holding another one-day face-to-face, we presented the Organizational Effectiveness Committee and the ICANN Board Terms of Reference and our work plan and they now have that on their table. Hopefully, they won't be putting too many red marks through it. We will find out when they get back to us.

So, with that, I'm going to ask Vanda to briefly articulate the first question. Why am I asking Vanda? That's because we're actually broken up into four work parties. There's a work party interested in board issues, a work party interested in GAC issues. Vanda and Liu are the two leads on that. A work party interested in community matters, and we've got Erika and Michael who are the primaries on that at the table. And we also have the work party involved in reviews. We are a review that reviews reviews. I think that's the right number of reviews. And I believe Daniel is somewhere up the back hiding. That man in the corner is guilty of not being here early enough. So, Daniel is one of the leads at the reviews. KC, his co-lead was unavailable. So, that's what we're asking Vanda to articulate. I've given her time to think about it. Over to you.

VANDA SCARTEZINI:

Okay. Thank you. Good morning to everyone. While related to the GAC what we would like to see is, first, if you remember the

individual, you are in groups are satisfied with interaction you would rather have with the GAC. And if you see some kind of improvements that can be done to improve this relationship until now. So, I would like to have your thoughts, any points open for all for anyone. So, up to you.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Come on, ladies and gentlemen. You must have some opinion, some opinion about interactions with the GAC. Stephen, bless you.

STEPHEN DEERHAKE: About the GAC. The answer is no. And I say this as the chair of the PDP Retirement Working Group because every ICANN meeting I present to the GAC on the progress. Every ICANN meeting I ask the GAC to provide one or more members to the working group because I don't want to get – which they did with the Framework of Interpretation and it was very useful to have Frank there. I asked I'm because I don't want them to act surprised as we near our work and they have a big freak out. So, they sit there and stare back at the dais. We do get a few questions but nobody to step forward. I've asked this repeatedly. I've interacted with the chair about it. I don't know what to do about it at this point. So, the answer is no.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Thank you. We will have noted that [inaudible].

PIERRE BONIS: Hello. Pierre Bonus, .FR. One, I fully understand what Stephen said about the working group that we have with the GAC. I just want to point out that for a lot of us the relationship with the GAC is mostly with our GAC counterparts because we are country codes and they are countries, so the relationship is special compared to the relationship between the other kinds of constituencies in ICANN. That was my first point.

My second point would be that out of this individual basis which is very important in our relationship, that's true that I don't see too much discussion at the constituency level between the GAC and the ccNSO. One example is, for instance, that I think we didn't have the time to meet the GAC during Marrakech. So, I think it's unfortunate. Thank you.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Thank you very much for that. I am very pleased to hear that the recognition of the unique aspects of the relationship between government and ccTLD operators is recognized. Of course, it's not a [inaudible] across ccTLD operators either. Now, who are you? Can you introduce yourself?

KATRINA SATAKI:

Yes, absolutely. My name is Katrina Sataki. I'm from ccTLD .LV. I'd say that we have seen several improvements in our interaction with the GAC, probably because we came up with some new methods of working. For example, now we have a representative from the ccNSO Council and they have appointed their representative from GAC leadership. These people work together to set up agenda of interests to both groups, for GAC and for ccNSO. So, I think that ...

Of course, I also wanted to mention what Stephen mentioned, that yes, we would like to see representatives from GAC in our working groups where we clearly see the need for GAC representatives.

Another good example of collaboration that we've had recently is with one of the groups that deal with underserved regions where we together worked on an FAQ document about ccTLDs, about transfers and delegations and things like that. So, we have seen very positive collaboration. We have seen improvement in this collaboration, but yes, sometimes we really would have liked to see something, a more deeper involvement in our policy work. Thank you.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Thank you, Katrina. And thanks for recognizing how much work is actually being done with the component parts trying to work with each other. That's greatly appreciated. Let's move to the next question, then. Oh, hello! Do I know you? You come from Canada, perhaps? Hello, Byron.

BYRON HOLLAND: I'm fading into the background. Byron Holland, .CA. Thanks for coming to visit with us and thanks for asking us these questions. I've got a couple of comments. Certainly, on the GAC, while I recognize Katrina's comments about some improvements, it's certainly been my observation over the years of interacting with the GAC that it often tends to be a very one-way relationship. We go to the GAC and we present and often it's met with silence but it feels like we present a bunch of information that may or may not land on any receptive ears and that can be a challenge because it just feels like ongoing one-way relationship when of course what happens in the GAC is both important and may, from time to time, be very directly relevant to us.

So, I think my observation would be I'm not sure how to solve this problem but is there a way for that relationship to be actually more interactive because the issues they're discussing and how they think about them is certainly very important to this group. So, how can we stimulate them to provide that more iterative,

interactive relationship? I think that would be something worth considering.

The other thing is I recognize that, for many GAC members, this is only one file in their day-to-day existence. They're dealing with really GAC-centric issues. So, it's difficult to get their attention on working groups that are important to us and how do we make that accessible for them and easier for them to participate with us? That's another challenge that I think we have. Can we find a better path for that? Part of that is how do we make it easier for them?

On the third question you have here, I think there's quite a bit of transparency. The challenge is really with accountability and it's the complexity of accountability. It's not that there isn't accountability. It's that we almost have to have a deep, deep, deep subject matter expert. Unfortunately, we have Stephen, for example. But he becomes that kind of single point of understanding of accountability as an entire holistic process. And how do we make that also more accessible for everybody?

Over the last number of years, we built all of these mechanisms, these checks and balances which are of value but there's a level of complexity that makes it inaccessible to many people, especially unless you want to wade into the deep end of the pool.

So, again, how do we do that and make accountability relevant to the average person here who's not going to spend the majority of their time focusing on this? Thank you.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Thanks, Byron. In fact, what I might do now is just ask for anybody who would like to, to queue specifically regarding the questions on the perception of transparency within the policy development process and that can include the EPDP. If there's any depth and color, would Erika or Michael like to give any depth and color to that while they're trying to align themselves up in a nice order here?

MICHAEL KARANICOLAS: Sure. And don't all rush to the front. We need an orderly line. We do want to expand that out a little bit to include transparency questions, as well as any issues related to accountability as well. So, if there are areas where policy development processes are either difficult to understand or difficult to track or go in areas that are tough to monitor or coming back with resolutions that are inaccessible or unpredictable or anything like that. Any commentary on accountability or transparency aspects connected to PDPs, including but not limited to the EPDP, would be appreciated. I see we already have a queue starting.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Eberhard, thank you.

EBERHARD LISSE: I'm Eberhard Lisse from .NA. I vice chaired the PDP Working Group of [inaudible] Retirement where the input from government would be very helpful – from governments would be very helpful. So, we have asked the GAC twice and we have been unable to secure a member to work with us.

Just a quick aside to the EPDP. Nobody at the ccNSO really cares about the EPDP because we all have [inaudible] issues. We are not bound by whatever the ICANN were to decide.

My main question is, as part of your ATRT team, how many members of GAC are part of your team?

VANDA SCARTEZINI: One. Uno.

EBERHARD LISSE: Okay.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: There he is down the end. Liu from China.

NICK WENBAN-SMITH: This is Nick Wenban-Smith, Nominet UK, .UK. I don't want to have an argument with my honorable friend from Namibia, but from the European ccTLDs, what ICANN is doing with EPDP and particularly the private bilateral communications that they're having with the European Data Protection Board is of concern to me.

I know that some of the recommendations from the first phase of the EPDP were rejected on the basis apparently of private discussions which had been had and that didn't seem to be the best example of transparency I've ever seen, if I can put it politely.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: You most certainly can put it that way, Nick. We heard that clearly.

LEONID TODOROV: Leonid Todorov, APTLD. My experience is sort of indirect because I deal with APTLD members, and interestingly many ccTLDs in the region are technical arms of local ministries, [inaudible] ministries, and understandably some ccTLD representatives – quite many of them, actually – sit on GAC. So, I would say that we are very pleased with the level of interaction with GAC in that regard.

Also, these GAC representatives – this is pretty much guesswork – they report back to their colleagues in office and I think that they’re fully accountable and transparent.

On top of that, I must say that attending recent GAC sessions, I was really thrilled at seeing such an increased level of participation of many GAC members, from Asia-Pacific in particular, in addition to Kavouss. There are some others and many, like India, Indonesia, China and Oman, for example, recently have been quite vocal in expressing certain concerns in participation in whatever discussions on those certain issues of, I would say, cross-community interest. Thank you.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Thank you, Leonid. We note all that. With time ticking away, wanting to get you back on schedule as best as possible, first of all we – and do look at these faces because these faces are approachable. And of course you’ve got the [conduit] to and fro. So, we would like to offer our thanks for your valuable time and just remind you all that we are in listening mode until about the end of July. Then we’re in data crunch mode. So, please, if you’re inspired to send us something – and obviously you’ll all want to respond to our survey – please do so and we will do our very best to make at least an incremental improvement in some of the things we’ve heard today. Thank you very much.

ABDALLA OMARI: Any online? Nothing? Okay. A round of applause for Cheryl's team.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: I told you I'd get you back, Vanda.

VANDA SCARTEZINI: Thank you.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: And if we haven't [inaudible].

ABDALLA OMARI: Okay. Our next presentation is an update by the SSR-2. Zarko, the CTO of RNIDS will lead us in the presentation.

ZARKO KECIC: Hello, everybody. My name is Žarko Kecić. I'm coming from .RS TLD. I'm happy that [inaudible] myself part of ATRT team for the last half-an-hour. Actually, I am [inaudible]. I will do an update on what we are doing at SSR-2 Review Team.

I am not pleased that I have to present such an interesting topic because I would prefer to have something less interesting to the

community, but since two other members of ccNSO community representatives in SSR-2 teams are now present, I'll have to do that. I'm not [inaudible] with presentation and I did this presentation based on what we had in Kobe. I changed [inaudible] but I would rather like to hear your questions and suggestions if you have, and I will just give a short update where we are and what we are doing right now.

We are established under ICANN bylaws and our scope is defined by bylaws. Our task is to review ICANN's implementation of SSR-1 Review Team recommendations from 2012 and to do key security, stability, and resilience activities, process, policies and systems, both internal and external of ICANN.

Where we are today. We completed our assessment of ICANN's implementation of SSR-1 recommendations. But we will go again through the same process and review our findings again. Also, since we didn't get clear objective and scope at the beginning of when team was formed, we're a little bit struggling in defining our scope of work and scope items. Also, we are collecting information from the community and from ICANN Org in regard of SSR topics.

So, at this ICANN we had two-day face-to-face meeting and we just continue drafting key findings and also started consolidating recommendations because at the moment we have more than 50

recommendations and would like to see fewer, let's say 15, more just less than 20, we'll see. We have to do that as a team.

In this face-to-face meeting, I regret to say that there are only one-third of the team so we did this work not having full consensus or majority of the team. And we're conducting further information getting as necessary.

What are the topics that we are doing, apart that implementation of SSR-1 recommendations? It is ICANN Org systems and procedures, security, stability, and resilience. We did some research on ICANN systems and procedures and we are looking at that. We'll have probably a few recommendations on that part.

There are a lot of discussions about that. We are not going to do assessment. We are doing review. Sometimes we ask some deep questions just to get understanding, not to assess how ICANN Org is performing.

Second or third, [if we get] SSR-1 Implementation Review [inaudible] work team, we have activities that impact domain name system. So, that means we are looking at root zone management, root server system security, stability, and resilience, and similar topics that may impact domain name systems that ICANN overlooked.

Last topic is future challenges that we recognize and that DNS in regard of IoT devices. Also, we are looking at [DOT] and DAAR implementations and what can be done within ICANN's limited remit.

Our current timeline, it should be updated. I believe that we will discuss on next conference call we will have after our meeting in Marrakech and agree that this timeline is not feasible anymore because ... I'll tell you later on. Let me jump over here first and I'll come back.

So, we are doing ongoing [drafting] activities and we have a face-to-face meeting in Brussels mid-May, but what also happened in the meantime is that we got a technical writer in mid-May. Actually, at Brussels meeting. And two weeks later, we lost our technical writer. So, it is now in the process to get a new technical writer and status is pending. I am not sure where negotiations are at the moment.

So, this current timeline should be updated and we had a talk during a face-to-face meeting in Marrakech on Saturday and Sunday and we all agree – meaning, members that were present, [inaudible] of us – that the feasible timeline should be that we cannot finish draft report before next ICANN meeting in Montreal and we'll have that here to the end of year and most probably will

have draft report done for ICANN meeting in March next year and final report after public comments in June meeting 2020.

I would really appreciate your request, your questions, your suggestions that you can ask today, and also you can send that to those email addresses which are provided here and you can follow our work at ICANN Wiki page, actually SSR-2 Wiki page, so you can get [inaudible] where we are and how we are progressing.

So, that's it. If you have any questions, I would like to answer.

STEPHEN DEERHAKE:

Thank you for that. I usually don't bring my laptop up. I need to set some context. So, I've listened to several but not all the available recordings about the SSR-2 leadership and SSR-2 team meetings from the April timeframe forward until about mid-June. And I think you'll agree with me that the SSR-2 group has not been a happy one. There were a couple of calls that were frankly very depressing to listen to.

So, it does appear to me that there's been an almost complete breakdown in trust between the SSR-2 group and MSSSI. So, I have a few questions.

First, to the fullest extent that you can, might you share with us the events that have led to this breakdown in trust? Second, can you discuss the details of your trust issues with MSSSI? And third,

can you provide us with an assessment of the damage done to the SSR-2 group by the breakdown in trust with MSSl including any delay to the drafting process and work product deliverables. You alluded to a delay in your previous slide. So, to the extent you can comment on those, that would be appreciated.

ZARKO KECIC:

Sorry, but I am not the one who can answer that question because most of the correspondence between MSSl and review team is done by our leadership and I am not part of team leadership, so I don't have exact facts. For example, there is huge question what happened to our technical writer and we lost him. I don't have enough facts to share with you in that regard. So, I'll really appreciate if you just send that question to the group, to the team, so team will answer on that.

ABDALLA OMARI:

Any other questions?

ZARKO KECIC:

May I add something that I forgot during the presentation? I imagine a couple of times, but we're traveling also from the beginning because we didn't get clear objective and clear scope of work. When such a team consists of 15 or 18 or 21, whatever number of people, who never work together, without clear scope

of work and objective, it is very hard to get going and organize work. We are still struggling with some parts of our review because some members have a feeling that we can go very broad and request from ICANN some actions that are not feasible and under ICANN's remit.

So, I would really appreciate if ccNSO has similar opinion as I have. But to work with other SOs and ACs [inaudible] that such review teams should have clear scope and objective before a group is formed. I believe, in that case, we'll have much faster review done and much better manner.

ABDALLA OMARI:

Thank you. Any other questions? Online? Okay, let's give Zarko a round of applause. Thank you. The next session is lunch, so after lunch, we'll have the ccNSO Review Session chaired by Barbara of .SI, so let's be back at half past 1:00 PM. Enjoy your lunch. Bon appetit.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]