
MONTREAL – ccNSO: Members Meeting Day 2 (1 of 3)
Wednesday, November 6, 2019 – 09:00 to 10:15 EDT
ICANN66 | Montréal, Canada

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: Morning. Please settle down. We'll start in the next one minute, please.
Thank you.

Good morning once again. I hope you had a nice evening last night. I can see most of you survived. It must be [inaudible]. Our first session today is about the IANA naming function. We have the PTI Board and the management, Lisa and Kim, and the new Chair for the CSC is with us. Byron will allow him to take over as he slowly sneaks out. Lisa, if you're fine, you can start. Thank you.

LISA FUHR: Thank you. First and foremost, thanks for having us, and thank you to [Sierra] for a wonderful Canadian night last night. That was a good event. As you can see, my name is Lisa Fuhr. I'm the PTI Board Chair. I've just been reelected for a new period of three years – not reelected as chair but reelected as a member of the Board. Then we have to have a Board meeting settling down on the different positions. But for now I'm the PTI Board Chair today.

I'm using, as usual, a bit of art in my presentations. Today I'm going to show you two Canadian artists. One is Iheart. That's the picture you see now. He's doing a lot of street art and he's very inspired by Banksy, as

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.

you can see. His symbol is the eye and the heart, and he's based in Vancouver. So he's not from this part of Canada.

The other one I'll also tell you about before you see the picture. That's a guy called Rob Gonzalez. He's very inspired by [Dali and McGrid], so he's making surrealistic paintings. I think they're quite interesting. You have to take a bit of time to dig in to where the nuance is, and surrealism is on those pictures.

That being said, let's get onto it. We don't have all morning, even though I would love to show you art all morning. The agenda is I'd like to talk about the Board meeting and also about our strategic plan.

Let me see. Next one. Hmm. Why is it not working? ... Ah, it needs to be turned on. Logic. So we just had a Board meeting. As some of you might now, which is not on this slide, we had an observer, and that's a new Board member, Jia-Rong Low, who's the V.P. of Stakeholder Engagement and the Management Director of Asia-Pacific. He's actually going to replace Trang, who left ICANN. So she also left the PTI Board, as she was an ICANN-appointed director.

At our Board meetings, we usually have an operational update, a financial update. An IANA namings function review update is a new feature, and we will have that going forward because we'll now have the namings function review going on. Kim will just say a few words on that.

We talked about strategic planning. This is what I want to use most of my time on because this is making the plan of the next four years for PTI. Of course, we also discussed our future meetings.

If we are to look at the strategic planning, I've shown you much of this before but I think repetition is good and it's important because, from our side, what we want to is we have a rough draft and a rough framework that we would really like to start discussions with you on on an informal basis and get input from you. The formality is that the bylaws call for us to have our own strategic plan. The first year we had the transition proposal. That was our interim strategy. But we're also now, as I was saying, working on our four-year strategy, which is of course not aligned with the ICANN strategy because ICANN has a five-year period. So it's only the period that's not aligned. But they have a five-year term and we have four years. So we need to find a way to get synchronized on that. But we think it's important first and foremost to get the strategy done.

We also thought that we needed to clarify the vision statement because we are another organization now and it's good once in a while to take a step back and look into what we want to have as a vision statement. You will also be, of course, consulted on the vision statement. Sorry for this, Byron. This is to you guys. We will bring both plans into alignment on the content. Of course, we will have it start next summer. So we are in a bit of a hurry. So the timing of the strategy is important.

If we are to look at what we looked at and identified as key areas, there is a continued focus on consumer/customer needs, and we would like

to maintain, of course, operational excellence. We would like to maintain the very good reports we get from the CSC. Even more important these days is the trust and stability. So security and resilience are going to be key topics, too. So we will, of course, align, as I said, with ICANN processes and the annual budget.

I'm just going to very quickly rush through where we found that we had things in the ICANN strategic plan that we needed to take into our plan. One was then objective one on security. The second was on governance. Unique identifiers is also very directed to our strategic one. The geopolitics is what we need to look into, but it's also, again, an issue that we need to solve, both for ICANN and for all of IANA. So we need to make sure that the whole world has faith in us. The finances are not within our control, but we of course would like to reflect that we keep an eye on the spending and we want to be very low cost and not overspending anything here.

What we didn't find in the ICANN strategic plan is that there are other ICANN communities that we serve. That's the numbering and the protocol communities, and those need to be in our strategy, too. We think we would like to focus on a reduction in manual processing. Of course, it's important that, in our strategy, we adhere to SLAs. This is key for us.

[inaudible] product quality goes without saying, but, again, we didn't see a strong customer focus. This is one of the surrealistic pictures I was talking about. The colors are not very good on the slide but are when you see it on a computer.

Again, the timeline. We have a rough draft now that we're working with internally, but, as you saw, the areas we found were covered on the ICANN strategy that needs to go into our strategy. In March, we will engage in public sessions, both here with you and other communities like the Registrar Stakeholder Group, for example. Then there will be a public consultation. Depending on the response and the feedback we get, we hope to be able to adopt it by June 2020 and have it up and running in July.

So that's about it from the PTI Board.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE:

Thank you. I always miss the pictures. Any questions for Lisa? Remember, you can also do your remote questions here. You can send them remotely even if you're seated in the room so that they are read because I know some of us are not very good in standing in front of microphones. Do we have a question for Lisa, the Board?

Okay, Byron?

BYRON HOLLAND:

Thank you for the update on the strategic planning process. I'm curious as to how you expect to interact with the community in terms of developing the strategic plan and what kind of interface or comment period ... How do you see getting feedback from the community?

LISA FUHR:

Well, this is, for me, and interaction with the community on it. We've shown you some rough outlines of the strategic objectives. I think what we will do is show you the draft when we come to March and have a longer session than this to actually discuss it. Then of course there is the mandatory public comment period. I don't know if it's 40 days, but maybe we could see if we can make it longer. But, for me, as early engagement as possible is what we strive for. We talk to you. We talk to the other gTLDs. We need to find out a way to talk to the numbering and the protocol communities because we don't have the same interaction with them as we have in ICANN meetings. But of course the public consultation is open for anyone to respond to.

One last thing. We have the slides here. If you want to have an objective or you find that there is an objective missing, you should get back to Kim and me with suggestions because we're happy to include and process any requests that the community has already now.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE:

Thank you. From the audience? Is there an online question?

Okay. Just before we move to the management – [Jovan] said it better – it know it's a challenge when you're starting to do a strategy. With the whole thing at PTI, a lot of creativity has to come in.

I don't know. Do you have processes in place – they may not be firmly written down – to ensure that the PTI strategic plan synchronizes with the ICANN strategic plan as you try to have the [inaudible] and so on? I

know it's a challenge, but I'm sure it's in the Board's mind on how to ...
yes?

LISA FUHR:

I believe that the process of aligning on the ICANN strategic plan is that the Board is composed of three ICANN-appointed ... They need to ensure the alignment with ICANN. For me, it's a given that we're an affiliate of ICANN. Of course, we need to align with their strategy, especially when it's very clear that this is aimed at the IANA functions. So I would find that we're not doing our fiduciary responsibility if we're not taking that into account.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE:

Thank you. Congratulations for being reelected. Kim?

KIM DAVIES:

Thanks. Actually, just a comment on that last question. I think what we see as the benefit of the PTI strategic plan is coming out with a document with more specificity than the ICANN strategic plan. The ICANN strategic plan talks at a very high level about the IANA functions, that they need to be performed well, but we can drill down a little bit on exactly you want to see from the IANA function over the next four to five years and call that out.

So we're trying to make it a useful document. The easy path would just be to cut and paste the relevant parts of the ICANN strategic plan that

apply to IANA and call it a day, but we're trying to drill down a little bit and have a bit more focus in it.

With that said, hello, everyone. I'm Kim Davies. I head up the IANA team. I'm going to give you a brief update on a few topics that I think of are interest. Firstly, the IANA budget process that we're going through now. I want to talk about the KSK rollover. I'm sure that's exciting for everyone. Initial results from the IANA annual survey that we just received in then last few days. I'll show you some preliminary results. One impactful operational change that we're contemplating that I just wanted to walk you through a little bit take in mind – perhaps take back to your teams – because we're looking for some early feedback about whether it's a good idea or not.

Budget development. Some of you are aware, partly by bylaws and partly because it needs to be folded into the broader ICANN budget, that we actually start the PTI budgeting process very early. In fact, we already have our draft budget out for public comment. This is a budget that covers fiscal year '20/21. It's out for public comment. I encourage you to provide comments back on it if you feel it needs to be reprioritized or changed or indeed if you feel it is appropriate.

The headline is we've proposed a budget that's roughly comparable to the last fiscal year. So not a lot of surprises, not a lot of changes there. A very modest increase to account for increased costs. I think you'll find that it is roughly consistent with last year.

The public comment process runs up until roughly the end of November. In December, the PTI Board will be asked to approve the

budget. Then, in early 2020, the ICANN Board will be asked to review it and then to roll it into the broader ICANN budget under development.

The KSK rollover project. Just to brief folks on that, we've been using DNSSEC in the root zone since 2010. We implemented a project to replace the key for the very first time some years ago. That resulted in a rollover where the primary activity, actually changing the key in the root zone, happened on the 11th of October, 2018. It was widely seen as a success.

In terms of our process, we actually didn't finish the rollover until August of this year because even following that rollover we had a lot of administrative duties to do for the following nine months, predominantly destroying the key. We had to do some revocation acts to trigger software to forget about the old key. Then we had to the actual destruction of every copy that we had of the old key in our secure facilities over a number of months. So, as of August, it is completely gone.

And now we have a question, which is, what should we do next? There's definitely been a lot of interest in having a process that is well-understood moving forward. Doing KSK rollovers shouldn't be a unique act. It should be part of our normal operations. So we've developed a proposal on how to do exactly that. It's a proposal that we've just released this week. We put it out for public comment. It will actually be out for public comment all the way until the end of January. Based on the feedback that we receive on that proposal, we intend to put into operations next year.

What does this proposal entail? The headline here is we propose to change the key every three years. This for us strikes a balance between the operational complexity of the KSK which, end to end, takes several years versus the need to keep everyone well-practiced in making sure rollovers work and also obtaining the security benefits of actually having a key that is not completely static.

We've also increased our capability in the proposal to use a pre-generated key for an emergency rollover. So the way we've structured the order of events we think makes us more capable of responding to an adverse event. If for some reason the KSK is compromised, the way we propose to do it allows us to quickly roll to a new key.

Otherwise, we're trying to not change too much. Since the last rollover was quite successful, we want to repeat that and take what was good and keep that. So it's not significantly different from the last rollover.

This is just a high-level overview. I won't go into specifics and detail. There's a DNSSEC workshop later today. If you're interested in this topic, please come to that.

I mentioned our annual survey. We've been doing an annual survey every year since 2013, but we did change our approach significantly this year. At the start of this year, we started sending surveys to our customers after we completed a change request to see what you thought about performance. We know use that as our primary benchmark of customer satisfaction on how we do request processing. Now we're reformulated the annual focus to be focused on

engagement. Is the IANA team doing the right level of engagement with the community? Questions relating to that.

We will publish a detailed report in December, but we've got some initial figures to share with you now. We don't have comparables to last year because we have totally restructured the approach. So we don't have exact year-on-year comparables this year. We split it into six key categories, and these are rated from 1 to 5. Value of the IANA team's engagement was rated a 4, transparency of communications a 4, attentiveness of our team, 3.9, is the IANA team fair to customers, 3.9, is the IANA team responsive at communicating, 3.9, quality reporting by the IANA team, also rated 3.9. So pretty consistent across all the different groups.

We do have a breakdown based on customer segment. We break it down by ccTLD managers, gTLD managers, the ccNSO Council, the CSC, the trusted community representatives, IETF participants, etc. It's broadly consistent across all those different customer groups. Like I said, we will be publishing a little more detail.

We did have one anomaly though that I'll just share with you briefly which is that the GNSO Council rated us really low. We're not exactly sure why. We met with them yesterday and asked the question. The feeling in the room seemed to be that it's probably a statistical aberration. It's probably not rooted in any trend we should be concerned about. But nonetheless we'll be studying this a little more and having a little more dialogue with them before we go one way or another with our approach.

Last topic I wanted to bring to your attention was this operational change we're contemplating. As you probably know, we've presented here a few times. We're doing a massive undertaking for our small team in trying to rethink and redesign the authorization model for the root zone. Today we have admin and tech contacts that required to cross-authorize any change to the root zone. We wanted to create a much more flexible system that addresses a lot of the pain points that you see as customers, so we're taking our experience and your requests to design a model that is flexible and let's you have users with different positions and that you can grant them certain responsibilities and so forth.

So, at a high level, that's the new authorization model. But in implementing this in code, which we're a long way through doing now, we've identified an area of significant complexity that we wanted to address. Today our operational practice is, if you want to change a nameserver that is shared between multiple TLDs, we ask for the consent of every single TLD that's impacted. The idea here is no one should be surprised, have everyone opt into this change for it to go ahead. It's worked reasonably well. We don't get these kinds of changes very often, but when we do, we seem to make it work. There has been exceptions where requests have taken months and months and months just because there have been a few stragglers that didn't respond. But it seems to have worked.

With this new authorization model, it adds a lot more complexity because you can have any number of combinations of approval models for every single TLD. If you have a nameserver shared by, let's say, 100

TLDs, multiply that out by every individual authorization model for that TLD. We anticipate the customer service complexity would be huge just explaining what's going on.

So what we're proposing is to greatly simplify this process. We're proposing that, if we receive a change request for a shared nameserver, we obtain the authorization from the submitting party (the TLD that submitted the request). Any other impacted TLDs would be given an opt-out period. We notify them of the pending change. If they have concerns or objections, they can bring it to our attention and we will then pause the request and obviously work on those concerns. But absent an objection, we would then proceed after some kind of wait period with the request. So it does change the authorization model a little bit.

I will say that we pulled some numbers. Really, the structure of the industry has changed a lot. If you think back 20 years, every European ccTLD seemed to have ns.ripe.net as one of their secondaries. So, if we renumbered that host, that would be impactful. I think in Sweden you had one as well. Today when we have a shared situation, it's usually the same vendor, like it's a Neustar nameserver, it's a Donuts nameserver. Something like that. But the whole portfolio of TLDs is all controlled by the same entity anyway.

Hopefully this isn't materially much of change, but I did want to share it with so you could think about it a little bit, perhaps take it back to your operational teams. If you can think of scenarios where you think this would be an undesirable approach, please let us know so we can

take that into consideration. Ultimately, we'll put it as formally written procedure and have you review it, but for now we're just testing the waters to see if this would have some kind of adverse consequence that we're not thinking of.

With that, thank you very much. Happy to hear any feedback or questions.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE:

Thank you. Questions? I think I'll blame Byron for giving people so much partying last night. You should have put water in all those drinks. People seem to be recovering.

Online? Okay. What I'd like to ask Kim: the responses to the surveys over the years have been an issue. Is the new format becoming more beneficial? Are people know giving you answers to the survey, or are you yet to test it?

KIM DAVIES:

The overall response rate for the survey was 3%, which was way lower than previously. But that is deceptive because we actually surveyed thousands more people that we normally would with this new approach. For example, we sent the survey to the IETF mailing list, which has some thousands of people on it. We sent it to the root DNSSEC announce list, which has a few thousand people on it. So it actually skewed that percentage low.

If you look at the narrow groups of our customers, like council members and so forth, the response rate was, for most groups, somewhere like 10, 20, 25%, which I think is reasonable. Obviously, we can always try and improve response rate. I think every year we look at the results and see where the weaknesses are to try to get a better measure, but we also recognize that people hate filling out surveys. I know I get surveys all week long on every manner of things, and I'm judicious about which ones I respond to. So we need to be realistic as well. We can't force people to respond to surveys.

Hopefully, the way we do the survey is brief and meaningful. Then the community here will know it is a wise investment of their time to spend the five minutes responding because you know that we will actually take the results seriously and put into action. So the best thing we can do is monitor and try and tweak the approach but also show that we use these surveys in a serious way so, next year, when you get the invite and you're thinking, "Should I do it or should I hit Delete?" you'll take a moment to do it.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: Thank you. I think the new customer approach looks nice. We just need to work on the response rate and see why people are not responding.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: Hi. [inaudible] from .rs. I have a couple questions in regard to security and [inaudible] requests. You mentioned you're going to change the approach to how requests are confirmed. Right now, we do not have –

it's my opinion – a [inaudible] of confirmation of requests. Usually at ccTLDs or TLDs, all those people who are tech and admin contact use the same mail server. If it's compromised, what's going over there? Are you considering applying some PKI signatures to responder e-mails?

Another question. You mentioned a change to the way of authenticating and confirming requests. Does it mean that the new software that you've been talking about for a couple years is ready? Or you're going to change this application that we're using?

KIM DAVIES:

Thanks for the questions. The system we're building is the new replacement. I know we've talked personally about it as well. That will bring in this authorization model but a lot of other changes as well. I just focused on that auth model because it was pertinent to that question.

Some of the changes we're making in terms of our security approach is not to try to put PKI in e-mail. We experimented with more fully using PGP signatures with e-mail-based root server exchanges quite some years ago and found that was a customer service problem. Most of our customers struggled with PGP. A lot of the people that interact with the IANA are not technical. They're lawyers, CEOs, etc., at a registry. So we found that difficult.

I think our focus is more towards actually removing any significance of the e-mail so that, if an e-mail address is compromised, you cannot achieve anything. Our primary approach is to promote user accounts

on the new system so that everyone has a username and password. We will have two-factor authentication so people can have a high levels of security. So put more faith in the ability of people to log in with a right amount of lockdown on their own accounts to manage that risk, not to invest in e-mail as being the right medium by which we receive that kind of authorization. We will send e-mails but the e-mails will just basically be notifications. “Hey, there’s a request pending. Please log into the system and go deal with it” kind of e-mails, not, if you respond to this e-mail, it will have some kind of special import in the business process.

[Denny]?

[DENNY]:

Hi. [Denny] from .se. What is the cost per TLD for your organization? If you take your total cost and divide it by the total TLDs. So what should we pay for your service?

KIM DAVIES:

You’re putting me on the spot, but I will say that, in our financials, we break down our costs by our three customer groups. I’m not going to tell you off the top of my head, but you can find in the budget how much we consider the domain names portion of IANA costs. That includes root zone management. That includes .[inaudible] and other periphery things, but it’s obviously predominantly root zone management costs. Then get a calculator and divide by 1,500 or so.

[DENNY]: It's an [older] question of course, but I saw the list yesterday of voluntary payments of the ccTLDs and a lot of zeros. I just wanted to hear what is the cost of having a ccTLD in your database.

KIM DAVIES: Don't quote me on this, but our overall budget is around \$10 million a year, and I think a little over half of that is for domain names. So obviously you can do the math.

LISA FUHR: Our accounts are online and you can read exactly what it costs for the naming functions and you can [inaudible]

[DENNY]: I can calculate it myself [inaudible].

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: Thank you. Any [report?]

All right. I'm sure the finance guy doesn't want to ask a question.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: [inaudible]

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: Thank you. Now we will invite Byron, the outgoing Chair and our host here. He gives a summary and he invites his successor. Byron?

BYRON HOLLAND:

Thank you. As the past Chair of the CSC, one of the things I will offer to the new version of the CSC is just some thoughts on why overall we consider the CSC a successful committee. I provided a much more detailed version to the CSC earlier in the week, but I did want to share a couple thoughts with this community because part of the success of the CSC depends on the Registry Stakeholder Group and the ccNSO in terms of putting candidates on to the CSC.

So I just wanted to take a few minutes before the new chair reports to you. For your consideration, first and foremost, the CSC had a very narrow mandate, a very specific mission. Many of you in this room have worked on a number of working groups or a number of committees. I would say that, as I am, not all of them are as successful. But a key reason for this is the very specific, well-defined and narrow remit that's articulated in the mission of the CSC. I won't read it to you, but when you go and take a look at it, is very clear, very precise, and a very limited scope. I think the work that the Charter Drafting Team did upfront to do that was absolutely critical in the ongoing success of the CSC.

One of the elements in the original charter drafting that I think was particularly important is it was a relatively small team. There were only four members: two from the g side, two from the cc side, and then six liaisons. Only the members were able to vote when we did actually have to take a vote, although the liaisons were always encouraged to participate in the discussion leading up to any material decision.

The other thing is, of course, the members were actually registry operators, both from our side and the g side. I think that's absolutely critical that the members actually be operators because we have skin in the game. That of course is reflected in our perspective in terms of how we interact with PTI and IANA.

Another element that I think was important and that was something that was self-generated in the CSC, because over the last three years we really bootstrapped up the policies and procedures of the CSC, is that quorum was 100%. All four members were required in order to make decisions. I think that was important for fairness and for the outcomes that we achieved, but there was another benefit, which is that participation and attendance was almost 100% through the whole three years that I was the chair. So somewhat of an unintended consequence is that it helped foster excellent participation and attendance, which all of us know can sometimes be a challenge in working groups and committees.

Team selection, of which this body has a critical role, I think was also extremely important. There was a very good mix between deep technical expertise, which is critical for the CSC, as well as an understanding of ICANN org and PTI. So having the relationships, the connective tissue, back into ICANN I think was also very important. That balance of talent, expertise, and relationships, both on the g side but certainly on the cc side, was really critical to making it work effectively and, in my mind, will be critical to make continue working effectively.

The liaisons provided a very valuable role, but their communities really put forward folks who also had expertise and didn't need to hear their own voices all the time but, when they spoke, brought significant value. So it's also important that we continue to maintain and build relationship with those communities to help ensure that they continue to put forward those kinds of folks.

It was a real working group. Every one of the members came ready to work and did work. Every single member did heavy lifting. Again, as we all know, that isn't necessarily the case in every working group that we have. So that was a really important element, too: that the g's selected all the liaisons, who all came ready to actually do heavy lifting. That's one of the reasons I think the first three years were particularly productive.

I'd be remiss if I didn't call out the support that we received. Obviously the members and the liaisons did a bunch of the work, but a lot of the background work happened through the support team, whether it was Naela on the PTI side and her team, and certainly our folks here. Bart and Ria and Kim were a very, very supportive team and did a lot of the legwork, particularly in the overhead of setting up the committee, not necessarily the work of the committee. But like I said, we bootstrapped all our own policies and procedures, and the support team was critical on that front.

I have the benefit of, as many of you know, of course, Alan, my colleague at CIRA. He played a very critical role in doing a lot of the background

work, too. So having not just the members but support around members I think was very, very helpful.

While initially we thought we were going to have an awful lot of reviews, which we did, we were very open to what the reviews said, both the charter review and the effectiveness review in particular. I think, going forward, the CSC has to embrace whatever the reviews says with open arms and participate in that process. They made some great suggestions and I would argue they were actually very helpful in terms of communicating and educating other components of the ICANN ecosystem to our needs and to what we need to do to evolve. So they are part of what made us effective over time, I believe.

Going forward, what would I suggest or what would I ask this body to consider? First, I would say, if it ain't broke, don't fix it. Right now, I believe the CSC is functioning very well. Cooperate fully with the reviews in the future. It's important for CSC members to really establish relationships with the other communities so that our CSC members establish good relationships with the Registry Stakeholder Groups, with the chair of that group because the CSC is operating very well right now and it's in a steady state business. Of course, the issue with the CSC is, if something goes awry and it really has to act, having those relationships in place already will be absolutely critical to the healthy high functioning of the CSC.

Most importantly for this group, we nominate 50% of the voting members. That is a serious responsibility. It is really important that this body, the council, take that very seriously and ensure that we get the

best people from a technical and from a relationship within the broader community perspective. So I encourage us as a community to take that responsibility seriously.

Now, over to the CSC chair. Thank you.

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN:

Thank you very much. My name is Lars-Johan Liman. I am now the current chair of the CSC. There was one important thing missing in your report, Byron, and that was actually Byron's own role in this community because I agree that this is an extremely well-run committee but it's also much down to you as the former chair to have created and fostered this. So thank you very much. I'm really scared to try to step into your shoes.

Who am I? I'm in the CSC as the liaison from the Root Server System Advisory Committee. In my day job, I have the technical and policy responsibility for operating one of the root name server systems in the public DNS. I was elected Interim Chair first as a result of the unfortunate situation that we lost both our chair and vice-chair, one planned and one unplanned. It was just an unfortunate combination of circumstances. So I stepped up as Interim Chair. As of this Monday of this week, I was elected Chair formally. So I am now the chair of the CSC.

I will give you a brief update on the CSC and its activities and what's going on. We'll see if the clicker here works. Yes it does. Was that the first slide already? Yes. So that ... [inaudible]. Did it ... there we go. So we had to amend our internal procedures a bit to deal with the situation

where we lost two voting members. One of the things we saw is that, since there is this requirement of 100% participation of voting members to reach quorum, we couldn't really continue our work until we had new members appointed. That's a process that takes at least a number of weeks if not months to complete. So we did a change to the procedures so that, if there are vacancies in the voting membership, we are allowed to continue to process the PTI reports that we receive every month and to issue our own reports based on the PTI reports. But that's the only thing that the committee is allowed to take decisions on.

We are now through that phase. We have received new members. We have, from the Registry Stakeholder Group, Gaurav VEDI, who is the incumbent, and also Dmitry Burkov, here at the front. We also have now two members from the ccTLD: Brett Carr, who is the incumbent, and Alejandra, also here at the front. So thank you very much for appointing new members.

We also have our four liaisons from the ALAC, from the GNSO non-registry part, from the GAC, and from RSSAC. There are also two open slots: one from the Addressing Supporting Organization and one from the Security and Stability Advisory Committee, who have both declined to appoint liaisons to this group. And of course, we have Naela from the PTI, who is the anchor of everything here.

So what do we do? We do a very boring job, actually. If you ever hear a report from me that isn't boring, you should be very worried. We receive reports monthly from the PTI. They are very detailed. They have lots of metrics in them. Every metric has a matching service-level agreement

that sits with it, and we receive a report on whether this was met or not. Based on the entire report, we give different statements in our own report after that on whether we see this as excellent, if everything was met, satisfactory, if a few things might now have been met but there are obvious and good explanations for why they were not, or, if we see a continuing problem with things that aren't being met, we'll make that as Needs Improvement.

If you see something like 98.4 met, that implies that 61 of the 62 SLAs were met. So almost every one of them. When you see numbers that aren't 100%, it's not necessarily a problem. It often has a very natural explanation and it's almost in all cases not the fault of the PTI, the IANA. But we do require explanations every time the SLAs aren't met.

Here you'll see the historic list. It lists all the reports that we've received through our years. You'll see that many of them actually go to 100% and a few of them are just, just below. I can report that the October report was at 98.4%. We received it after these slides were finished. To me, this is a statement of excellent stellar work. I don't see this anywhere else.

But there are things that we note. We do get reports for service levels not being met, and we have identified a few cases where we can see from the CSC side that these SLAs are not quite well-designed. If they cannot be met in regular work, then there's something wrong either with the work – we haven't identified that, so there's something wrong with the SLA.

There are a couple of things where there are timing issues where time is measured where the PTI is not responsible for the transaction. For

instance, in a technical test, if you send the DNS query to test the technical function of a nameserver and the server doesn't respond, you have a timeout. If that timeout exceeds the length in the SLA, you cannot really blame the PTI for not responding to that query. So we have shifted a few of these SLAs to take things like that into account.

But that turned out to be quite difficult, so we had to start at a different point, which is that the SLAs were part of the contract between the ccNSO, the Registry Stakeholder Group, and PTI on the other side. So we first had to create a process for changing that. In that work, we also realized that, in the future, we need a better process for modifying this process, a meta process. So there were a couple of steps we had to go through to be able to change the SLAs. That turned into changing bylaws and so on. So that took a good number of months just to create the process for them actually changing the SLAs.

But that's all now in place, so we are now in the process of changing SLAs and we have three of those on the table since the last report. One is simple technical checks, where we just needed to revise the metrics a little. That's already done and implemented. That's in place. There was an issue where we wanted to add new SLAs for label generation tables in the context of IDNs. That is a more complicated change, so that has a different change process. Also, in the case of a ccTLD delegation or transfer, the total time of the entire transaction going from first request to actually finished encompasses a lot of time and timing steps, again, where PTI is not responsible. So we wanted to change that as well.

Of these, the first one is already completed. The SLA thing is on the table of the GNSO this morning, I believe. I believe that it might have been processed here in the ccNSO already. According to the process for that type of change, we need to seek approval for both the ccNSO and the GNSO. That's where this sits right now. So we hope that, after this week, we will actually be able to implement this and go forward.

The last one, the ccTLD creation transfer, is right now in public comment, according to normal ICANN procedures. So please comment on that and state your support if you think this is a good thing.

If the cc's should determine that there is a systematic problem that needs to be fixed, the first thing is to ask the PTI to come up with the remedial action plan. This process for remediation was also developed in the first time of the CSC – once it's approved by the CSC to implement that plan. There are escalation steps for this going to the PTI Board, the ICANN CEO, and eventually the ICANN Board, should that be needed.

At the final end, if the remedial action plan is implemented and it still doesn't solve the problem, then the CSC can turn to the ccNSO and GNSO and ask for a special IANA functions review.

Now, we have never, ever been near to think the thought of evoking anything of this because, as far as I know, everything just works. We have undergone a number of reviews, as Byron mentioned. First there was a charter review that was part of the initial plan for the CSC when it was first created. We've had an effectiveness review. Both of those are completed and recommendations have been implemented. Then we have the periodic IANA functions review, where the CSC will be only a

part of what's being under review. That, I believe, is starting and will have a first informal meeting this week. Don't take my word on that, though.

In short summary, the PTI performance is extremely good. There are some minor metrics missed. We all understand why these happen, and we are working on changing processes in one or two cases and SLA levels and metrics in a few other cases. These are minor issues. These are just to polish the numbers. It's not a systematic problem anyway.

The process in then committee works very well. When we do identify problems, we actually work on them. We have now a very good relationship with the PTI. I think it was a bit of hesitance in the beginning. We didn't know each other and now we do and I think it works very well.

As mentioned here, one challenge step we have is that we would like to maintain to have the community's interest. It's a bit difficult when all you do is report boring reports. But again, boring means good.

So I think that was the end of the presentation. I don't get any further here in [some metrics]. So I say thank you very much. I'm happy to take comments or questions.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE:

Thank you. Let's give a round of applause for the incoming chair. I know we are used to Byron, but I see the energy. I can see you have twice the energy of Byron.

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN: Not quite.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: It's a tough job. That's good.

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN: With humble respect, I would like to step out because there's an ongoing RSSAC meeting which I have a scheduling conflict with here. So if there are no questions or comments, I would like to step out. And please stop me in the corridors if you have comments or questions. I always like to be approachable. So don't hesitate.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: Okay. I'm sure Kim will collect [inaudible] online, and he will be happy to pass them to you.

Jordan is not happy with me. I've eaten into his time. The next chair is Jordan for the Board session.

JORDAN: Good morning, everyone. Sorry we're running late. I hope you're all awake. We have our two appointed ICANN Directors, Chris and Nigel, and our three ccTLD-friendly ICANN Directors: Lito, Danko, and Becky. So five out of 16 ain't bad, huh? This is your opportunity for a Q&A with these directors. So we have two friendly microphones waiting for you at the front of the room, and we will need to have some questions from

the audience. But of course I have a few to kick us off because it's early in the morning and it may be that you're intimidated by those microphones standing by themselves.

If we do a quick round around the table – we'll start at the far end – what's changed for you since last time we met? That's the first question. What's new in the ICANN world? What has changed in the dialogue or the community or something? Let's start with. If we could start right down the end with Danko.

DANKO JEVTOVIC:

Thank you for the question. Well, looking at this meeting, I think the most important thing that has come [inaudible] the discussion on abuse. Maybe this subject is not something that is seen as critical in the ccNSO environment because it's the cc registries themselves that deal with that problem. But this is something that I see as then next big thing after the GDPR discussion that still hasn't concluded. But we're coming to that. So I think, right after this session, we will have a cross-community high-interest topic on abuse, and I think cc's should contribute to that because this is a common problem for us serving the global Internet users.

JORDAN:

Thanks, Danko. Lito?

LITO IBARRA:

Thank you. I was also going to mention DNS abuse, but since Danko did that, I will go to another topic which I think is relevant. It's advancing [inaudible]. I'm referring to the root server system governance model that was, as you know, proposed or brought to our attention by RSSAC037 and 038. I think we've had some advances in that field, too. I think it's very concerning to all TLD managers and organizations that handle the top-level domains, both gTLDs and ccTLDs. And it's the first time I've seen this being discussed. So I will mention that not new thing but it is firmly advancing.

JORDAN:

Thank you. Nigel?

NIGEL ROBERTS:

Thank you very much. Both very good topics. I want to focus a little more on internal stuff on the Board. What's changed for me? Well, this Thursday it'll be one year since I've taken my Board seat. It seems to have gone extremely quickly. What's changing is that we're going to welcoming two new Board members, Mandala and Ihab. They've been working with us for several months already, the way I was onboarded myself early on. This is proving to be quite a very fine way of doing it. I've been privileged to take part in that. I've been doing the onboarding in relation to the responsibility for teaching them about the ccNSO, which is exactly what Chris did for me exactly one year ago today.

One thing that has come out of that that's quite interesting is that we have a short amount of time to teach the Board members who come

from the NomCom completely outside the community what the ccNSO is, then the GNSO, and so on. In putting these things together for them, I started to think we're going to reinvent the wheel each year, so maybe it'd be a good idea to put this all down in writing and provide a kind of input. A natural place to turn to for some input for that is: don't reinvent the wheel. So, please, anybody who wants to help me produce a pack for onboarding for future Board members and to teach them about the ccTLD world from the very beginning, as well as the ccNSO itself, I'd ask you to get in touch with me.

Jordan?

JORDAN: Thanks, Nigel. An opportunity for volunteers. Talk to Nigel later. Chris?

CHRIS DISSPAIN: Thanks, Jordan. I think everyone has covered what I would consider to be new things or things that were there bubbling in the background but have risen to the top, but of course the everchanging festival that is GDPR and the EPDP is on the top of my list because I'm now, with Becky, the liaison to that. Although you might now think that has changed, it does change. It moves at a glacial pace. But we can new information all the time and things happen and new inputs arrive. So, for me, since we last met, which actually doesn't seem to be that long ago, I have spent most of time concentrating on that and trying to figure out how we fix that because, in my view – I'm slowly coming to a conclusion on this – this is a major test. If we can't fix this – when I say “we,” I don't mean

the cc community; I mean ICANN – WHOIS or whatever we’re calling it this week, that’s a real issue for us because it’s a major part of the history of what we’ve done and there’s different views about what WHOIS is about and what it’s for. But if we can’t come to consensus and actually fix it, I think that’s a real indictment of our model and we need to be cognizant of that.

I said the other day in a session that, whilst I acknowledge and accept that it is critical that the EPDP group works extremely hard to find a way of creating access to WHOIS that is acceptable under GDPR, that is not going to fix the problem. All that does is it makes WHOIS legal under GDPR. There are other jurisdictions that are coming up with their own privacy rules. Some of them already exist and it is almost guaranteed that at least one, if not a number of those, jurisdictions will have rules that clash with the rules in GDPR. And it is not impossible that you could have a jurisdiction that said, “The data of all citizens of our country, no matter where they are in the world, must be open and available to everybody.” What would we do then?

So my current thinking on this is that this community as a whole – I include the cc’s in this because pretty much, I think, every single one of us has our own WHOIS and our own sovereign territory and therefore presumably have our own rules, some of which we’ll be in Europe, obviously, and subject to GDPR – has to get together and has to figure out what is the purpose of WHOIS and why we have it. We have to reach consensus on why we have it. We need to figure out what data elements we believe, because of the reasons we have it, should be made available and to whom. Once we’ve done that, we should go the governments

and say, “This is important. It’s for the security and stability of the Internet. You need to go away and legislate WHOIS into your registration. If you don’t, we will not be able to provide access to law enforcement or anybody because, until such time as legislation permits it, we’ll be breaking the law if we don’t.” So, for me, that’s what’s changed in my head.

JORDAN: Thank you. A tour of Chris’ head. Becky?

BECKY BURR: It’s a terrifying tour of Chris’ head. I have a couple of observations. Since the last time we met, I think the abuse issue has taken off and has captured the hearts and minds of everybody talking about this space. Although ICANN obviously does not regulate what cc’s do in this space, it is a driving a realization, an important realization, which is we could think about gTLDs as the ones we have to worry about, but suddenly understand that an awful large percent of the domain name registrations are actually in ccTLDs. So I think it’s inevitable that the conversation sweeps in ccTLDs.

I’m going to say to you guys what I’ve said to the gTLDs. This is a space where we don’t want this issue to get legs because there’s weird stories about it that don’t make a lot of sense. It’s really important for the people who are doing the work on the ground to understand what’s going on to and to be in control of this narrative. The fact is that TLD managers, cc’s and g’s, are working hard to address some of these

things, and we need to do a better job of explaining what we do as registry managers – in particular sharing ideas about what can be done, what works, tools that are available – because I think that we need to get away from “The sky is falling. We need to panic” and be more about sharing tools, ideas, and those kinds of things.

So I really do think it’s important for the cc’s to pay attention to this issue. You guys have the opportunity to really guide the discussion in a productive way. I hope you will do that.

The other thing is that – nobody else mentioned this – I have the feeling that the amount of work and the amount of items on our plates have really exploded. I had this experience the other day, a week ago Thursday, where I was literally on ICANN calls from 10 A.M. to 6 P.M. Now, two hours of that were EPDP, but that’s a fairly unsustainable pace for most anybody. Now, part of it is driven, oddly and perversely, by the realization that everybody is stretched too thin. There’s too much work on everybody’s plate. There’s volunteer burnout and we have to figure out ways to do things better, more efficiently, and to prioritize. So there’s an awful lot of work going into focusing on how we use our resources more efficiently, how we prioritize, how we align with the strategic plan, and how we say, “This is an interesting question that we’re going to address, but we’re not going to address it right now.”

But I would just say that, for the foreseeable as we hopefully get our arms around this problem, I’m pretty overwhelmed by the amount of work on our plates here, I have to say.

JORDAN: So when ICANN directors are telling you there's too much work, we know we've got a real problem. But thank you, Becky, for that. We've had GDPR, DNS abuse, root zone governance, onboarding of directors, and too much work. There must be something here that's going to generate a question from the audience, but the microphones are empty. No one is standing up.

Oh, thank God, Danny. Phew!

DANNY: I don't know how much it costs [inaudible]

JORDAN: Please introduce yourselves. It was \$4.7 million [inaudible]. Be clear if your question is for one person or a set or the lot.

[DANNY ADS]: [Danny Ads], .se. Maybe I'm not a regular participant on the ICANN meetings and maybe I've missed something, but I'm a bit surprised by the next hot thing called DNS abuse. When did it become the next hot thing, and what happened between Marrakech and now that it bubbled up from where it was? Was there a trigger or something somebody advanced with "Now we have to run and panic because of this abuse." So, please, what happened?

BECKY BARR: It's a really, really good question and a very fair question.

JORDAN: Great question.

BECKY BARR: Part of this is driven by the Competition and Consumer Trust report, which came out in, I don't know, February or March but really didn't make its way – well no. It came out actually before that. The Board responded to it in February, I believe. It has bubbled up through the community because the discussion has been very bizarre. People are focused on the fight about whether there's a definition of DNS abuse, how broad it is. The question really is, what's in ICANN's remit to do? That's one of the questions that ICANN can be focusing on.

But I believe it's been in issue. By the way, in 2013 it was a big issue for law enforcement at the time. I think it's partly driven by the fact that the Subsequent Procedures policy development process for another round is moving forward, so it's associated with that. It's partly driven by the Competition and Consumer Trust Review Team report that had a lot of focus on it. It's also very much driven problems with accessing WHOIS data and the fact that the cybersecurity research community is very frustrated about the availability of registration data and that it's a convenient addition to the narrative of others who are involved in it. But I think it's just a confluence of a bunch of things.

You are, of course, right. It is actually not anything new under the sun, and it's not at all clear to me whether it's worse. It is certainly a problem, and the worst thing that we could do is just say it's not a problem.

We all know it is a problem. There's lots of bad behavior out there. The question is, what can registry operators and registrars do about it? What is within ICANN's remit? We've let the narrative overtake what ought to be the question.

JORDAN: Thanks, Becky. Nigel, then Danko.

NIGEL ROBERTS: Just a quick word on that because Byron has it right when he said words matter. One of the parts of the discussions that's going to need to be is when we have a common understanding of what we're talking about because, if you undertake a technical look at the words "DNS abuse," it means abuse of the DNS. But clearly the conversation is around something that is wider than that. It's always been the case of people from outside law enforcement (politicians and so on), saying, "There is a bad thing happening on the Internet, and somebody must do something about it." Every now and then, people say ICANN is the person or the organization that should be doing something. Sometimes that's true, and sometimes perhaps it isn't. We need to be quite clear about the words. Thanks.

JORDAN: Thanks, Nigel. A quick one from Danko?

DANKO JEVTOVIC: To tackle that, I was trying to [vent] in your term, like security challenges, but no one took it up on that. But I would say that one of the things why abuse is so important now is that also it seems that we are surviving the storm of transition and the storm of GDPR. So we were trying to collectively take a breath but now the abuse is here, so we don't.

JORDAN: Great. I realize it's a quarter past and that's our scheduled finish, but I'll take the two questions up here. I'd urge your questions to be brief, and I'll urge your answers to be brief, too.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: Coffee break.

JORDAN: We did start late, but people love coffee. We'll carry on for at least five minutes. Calvin, you go first.

CALVIN BROWNE: As a member of the CCT review team, when it came to the abuse questions, one of the things that we struggled with was empirical data. That leads to bad things and bad assumptions and so forth. So it's not a question but it's just a statement saying that, if we can get empirical data and work towards getting empirical data, it will be very useful in diffusing that tension.

JORDAN: People agreed here, for those who are online. Thanks, Calvin. Steven?

STEPHEN DEERHAKE: Changing topics quickly, we know there's been publicized Board leadership changes. Less publicized are probable changed to either Board committees and certainly assignments of personnel to said committees. We're just wondering if there's stuff we should know about. Thanks.

CHRIS DISSPAIN: I'll take this.

JORDAN: Things to know. Chris?

CHRIS DISSPAIN: No. I mean, it is publicized. It just isn't yet. If you can be bothered – I use that not about you but just generally; anybody can be bothered to come to the Board meeting tomorrow morning – at the functional meeting of the new Board, which takes place after the end of the old Board's Board meeting, the committee slates are resolved. So therefore they become public. So all of the people who belong on the committee – that is what you were asking, wasn't it? Yeah. So all the people who are on the various committees, etc., is open and will be resolved in the results. So it's not a secret and there's nothing that I think you need to know about.

JORDAN: So we need to know nothing. I'll take one last question from Peter.

PETER VAN ROSTE: Thanks, Jordan. This is Peter Van Roste from CENTR. A question to Becky. You mentioned that people start realizing that ccTLDs are quite a big chunk of the second-level domain registrations globally and that that might lead to regulation creeping into the ccTLD space. Can you clarify which type of regulation you were talking about?

BECKY BARR: ICANN is not going to regulate the ccTLD space, but there is going to be an increasing narrative – I'm just saying – from the g's saying, "Your pointing at us. Bye the way, half of the world is cc's. Let's have a broader conversation." That's all I mean. But ICANN is not going to regulate cc's.

CHRIS DISSPAIN: If I could annotate that, Becky's right. Of course, it works both ways. You may know this already, but apparently in the GAC two days ago there was a discussion under the heading of DNS abuse at which the possibility of [registrant authentication] was discussed. The response to that would have to be, if you were a gTLD, to a government, "Well, go home and figure out how to do that in .home ccTLD before you come to ICANN and suggest we should be trying to do that in the gTLD." So it's about that. It's about those two things. The cc's are half the registrations and the g's are going to be saying, "Well, why should we?"

It's completely pointless to fix abuse at one end of the continuum if you don't at the other." So there has to be a community-wide conversation about this. Otherwise, it's going to look really, really daft. I think the cc's need to make sure that they're involved in that from a fairly early stage to make sure that what is defined by ICANN eventually or by the ICANN community as DNS abuse has significant and real input from the ccTLD community, which – let's face it – are the people who actually manage the cc's, whereas the GNSO is not just the people who manage gTLDs. It's a bunch of other people as well. So we need to make sure our voices are loud and proud and heard.

JORDAN: Thanks, Chris and Becky. I'm seeing empty mics. I'm seeing an appetite for coffee, so we're going to draw this to a close. Thank you very much, the five of you, for joining us this morning. Thank you to all of you for being here. Let's have a coffee break and be back, I believe, at 10:30. Thank you.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: At 10:30, the DNS Abuse Forum will take place in the main hall. So we will reconvene here in this room after the lunch break.

[JORDAN]: Actually, for those of you wondering, the next scheduled session on our agenda is the DNS Abuse Plenary. So that's at 10:30 in 517-D.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]