ICANN78 | AGM – ccNSO Welcome and PTI Update
Tuesday, October 24, 2023 – 8:30 to 9:30 HAM

CLAUDIA RUIZ: Hello, and welcome to the ccNSO Welcome and PTI Update Session. My name is Claudia Ruiz, and I am joined with my colleagues, Kimberly Carlson, and Bart Boswinkel. And we are the remote participation managers for this session. Please note that this session is being recorded and is governed by the ICANN Expected Standards of Behavior.

During this session, questions or comments submitted in chat will only be read aloud if put in the proper form as I've noted in the chat. I will read questions and comments aloud during the time set by the chair or moderator of this session. Interpretation for this session will include English, French, Spanish, and Arabic. Click on the interpretation icon in zoom and select the language you will listen to during this session.

If you wish to speak, please raise your hand in Zoom. And once the session facilitator calls upon your name, kindly unmute your microphone, and take the floor. Before speaking, ensure you have selected the language you will speak from the interpretation menu. Please state your name for the record and the language you will speak if speaking a language other than English. When speaking, be sure to mute all other devices and notifications. Please speak clearly and at a reasonable pace to allow for accurate interpretation. This session includes automated real-time transcription. Please note this session is

not official or authoritative. To view the real-time transcription, click on the closed caption button in the Zoom toolbar.

To ensure transparency of participation in ICANN's multistakeholder model, we ask that you sign into the Zoom sessions using your full name, for example, a first name and last name or surname. You may be removed from the session if you do not sign in using your full name. Thank you. And with that, I will hand the floor over to Alejandra Reynoso, chair of the ccNSO. Thank you.

ALEJANDRO REYNOSO: Thank you, Claudia. This is Alejandra Reynoso, and I will be speaking in Spanish. [Participant speaking in different language].

EVERTON RODRIGUES: Thank you, Alejandra. Good morning, guten morgen or min/moin as we heard yesterday. Hi, all. Thanks for joining us here today. Thanks for being here in person and for those who are joining us remotely now or in the future. I'm Everett Rodriguez from Brazil, from .BR. And I'll make this really brief presentation today about our members meeting. But before I go into the shadow itself, I would like to present you to the current meeting program committee, which I have the pleasure to share.

This group coordinates and manages the high-level shadow of the ccNSO related sessions, including the members meeting agenda at public ICANN meetings. Some of us are here in the room already, so if there is something that you would like to talk about our members

meeting, we are so glad to receive those inputs from you. In a few days or during the meeting, actually, we will have the survey about the meeting taking place. So, please give us your feedback. It's so important to make this a better meeting at each ICANN meeting.

So, usually, we have some newcomers coming to our ICANN meeting. So, do we have newcomers or first timers today here in the room? Do we? Who are you? Okay. 1, 2, who else? 3. Okay. So, welcome. Well, ICANN meetings may be heavy for newcomers, but remember that we have a lot of contents to both at the ccNSO Wiki and at ICANN Learn, so don't forget to check them. And we also have the daily emails sent by our excellent secretariat who is also very helpful for those who want to know more about what's been discussed in your sessions, in our sessions.

A good reminder for me that I always put in the middle of my presentations is to remember to talk slowly because we have interpretation services. So, I would like just to remind you if you are not familiar with that. If you would like to listen or to deliver your messages in other languages than English, you need a headset. So, this is a good time for you to take it if you need interpretation.

So now jumping to our agenda. Please, next slide. After our welcome session here, we will have the word also from Thomas from DENIC. But later on today, we will have Kim Davies and Marilia Hirano from PTI addressing three topics from the-- The other slide, please. So, we have the caretaker operation designation for .LB, the final implementation of the ccPDP retirement policy and the yearly IANA customer satisfaction survey being addressed in that session. And right after that, the ccNSO

Council Vice Chair, Jordan Carter, will report on discussions from ccNSO Council which was held on Sunday regarding the review of potential policy gaps.

Okay. And then tomorrow, our agenda starts a little bit. we will have the celebrations also today about the 20th anniversary. And so, tomorrow, we will have our presentation will start a little bit. On the second block, we will have the ccTLD News session with many interesting sessions from AFTLD from .AU, .EU, .EC, and .DK. So don't miss that. And right after that, we will have a desk session. And in our day, we will have the cap the Registrant Capacity Building session and also, taking place at the same time, we will have the TLD ops which will have a session to have a preliminary discussion on the future of TLD ops workshop and also find volunteers. So, if you are able to join them as a volunteer, join that session.

And on Thursday, our session start with the Q&A, with the Board and Council candidates, the public forum, and the ccNSO Council plan. Also, the community forum, and ICANN AGM. So, that's the program for the week. You're very welcome to be here in our members meeting and also join IN other ICANN, sessions. So, we kindly ask you to fill out our survey, as I have already mentioned. If you're not following us on social media do so. And that's it from my end. So, thank you very much, and have a great meeting. So now I would like to give the floor to Thomas. Thank you.

THOMAS KELLER: Thank you very much. My name is Thomas Keller. I'm the co-CEO DENIC. I really would love to welcome you to Hamburg to the first

ICANN meeting since 24 years on the German grounds. So, this is a very special thing for us. It took us some time to actually get your all here. We tried to actually do that already three years ago, and then something that, like, COVID came in the way of it. And very proud and very happy to have you here.

It is really incredible, if you look at the journey we did with ICANN that 24 years Berlin was a second or third meeting, I think. And so, it's astonishing that it took us so long, 76 ICANNs to be precise to get you guys back on to Germany grounds. I'm especially curious when you see that we even had three meetings, in the other part of the world in Australia and in New Zealand. So, anyway, I took the time to kind of reflect a bit on what happened during the last years. I thought that would be very interesting to see after almost 25 years of ICANN and the 20 years of the ccNSO, what has happened when we kind of joined.

I want to start with ICANN Berlin. So, at that point of time, we had somewhere around almost 40 million domain names, and DE had one of them. That was a very big achievement for us. And at a point of time, DENIC took over the management from a university. I tried to figure out whether we could have numbers from ccTLDs in total. I couldn't do it. It was kind of impossible. And as you know, the ccNSO wasn't even founded yet, and I think that says a lot. Yeah. So, once you start to organize yourself, then numbers come up and things get a bit more professionalized, I guess.

So next thing, which is milestone and what we experienced is the meeting in Carthage. There ccNSO was founded. Unfortunately, at that time, we decided not to be part of that. There were 35 members. And

for us, it was a very interesting time because at that point of time, we had a lot of lawsuits against us, and we won them. So, that is the law that was saying that we are not responsible for any kind of content. And that was really a good thing for us. But as you can see already, the domain names go up quite a bit from the early stage. So, we're already at somewhere around 64 million domain names in total and 11 million ccTLD. We had a very, very kind of a steep climb on the e-domains at a point of time. So, web hosting was a big thing. And it really went through the roof.

So, Mexico City, we finally joined the ccNSO. It took some work to convince the former management then. I was on the supervisory board at that point of time, and we saw that we're about ready to actually join. As you can see, the numbers jump even more. So, we have now doubled the amount of domain names in few years than before. And for us, it was an interesting year because we introduced two character and numeric domain names, which we didn't have before. A very restrictive point of time, like a lot of TLDs. And we went through a couple of lawsuits. We lost one of them. And at that point of time, we had to introduce it. And afterwards, we kind of question ourselves how we didn't do it before. But, well, that's how life works.

Then it went to Hamburg. And we have an incredible number of domain names, all of us. The ccNSO has 176 members. That's quite an achievement. And they pretty much all talk about the same stuff, where we had different issues depending on CCs or gTLDs then or depending on the perspective ccTLD itself, now pretty much everyone is talking about DNS abuse or the consequences DNS abuse. So, in Europe and, especially in Germany, that's NIS2.

So, what we did, I think, is pretty much a journey from where we were starting in Berlin is how is the internet actually working. We didn't know anything. We were trying to figure out what intergalactic means. And now we're there, and we need to understand how we deal with all that, what we achieved. And I think that is incredible achievement that now we have so many names, people use us on a daily base. It's completely unimaginable that domain names wouldn't be around. It's a typical thing everyone is doing, even people using apps. It's so much part of our life that we don't even think about it anymore. People don't even think about it anymore.

Nevertheless, it becomes even more important that we keep on educating people, that we keep on educating lawmakers, that we participate in the multistakeholder model to actually push things forward and keep it the way it is instead of losing relevance, even though that the domain names are running, and the infrastructure is becoming more and more relevant from day to day.

So, this is what we did over the last years. As I said, it's a great story. I'm very proud, and we as DENIC are very proud of it, that we are part of that. So, that's what we want to celebrate tonight, and I hope many of you are joining us. And so, welcome to Hamburg again. Welcome to Germany. It's great that you're all here. And thank you for your time.

ALEJANDRA REYNOSO: Thank you. Thank you very much, Thomas, and thank you for having us here. It's good to be back in in Germany, even if I was not at the first ICANN meeting, but still good to be here. And with this, I would like to give the floor to Kim to give us an update on IANA. Please.

KIM DAVIES: Thank you, Alejandra. Good morning, everyone. I'm very glad to be here. At least of what the sun hadn't risen when I entered the building. Today I have some different updates to share in terms of our operations and implementing some of the ccNSO policies. And then I'll hand over to my colleague, Marilia, to my left, who will talk to you a little bit about our future planning work in the organization.

In terms of the operations update, I'm going to talk to you about work we've been doing recently on our Root Zone Management System. We have a lot of significant updates on the root zone key signing key. I want to share with you something called ZONEMD, which I'll explain to you if you haven't heard of that before, and also just a quick summary of our performance. Most significantly, I wanted to go into a bit of a deeper dive as you heard earlier about the caretaker designation we made since the last meeting for the .LB, Lebanese domain.

So, the Root Zone Management System for those that are not familiar with it is our overall workflow management system for editing the root zone. As a TLD manager, for you, it is the portal that you log into to submit change requests, to administer the change requests, and to interact with that process. For us as staff, it's also the system we use to do that, but critically, it actually manages all the logical business rules around what can go in the root zone and so forth. So, it really holistically manages, change requests all the way from submission through to implementation.

The system that we use, have been using, really dates back to roughly 2003. So, it had been almost 20 years since it was first created. So,

analyzing a lot of the technical design of the system and looking at what we wanted to do moving into the future, recognizing that there's been a lot of evolution in this community over 20 years and knowing that the next round of new gTLDs is coming up as well. We recognized that the system that we had really wasn't a good foundation for future growth, and that led to a multi-year activity to do a ground up rewrite of system. That was a lot of work that you really didn't see. It was really reimplementing what it already did in a new modern system. So, unfortunately, as a consequence of that, there was a lot of work that doesn't represent a lot of new functionality. It was really making sure that all the existing functionality got reimplemented in a comprehensive, secure, well tested way. But it provides us with a good foundation for future work.

With that said, whilst the primary focus of this relaunch of RZMS that we launched late last year was to reimplement the existing functionality. We did use this as an opportunity to make some initial improvements that I want to share with you now. The first thing that is notable is that in the previous system, when we did technical checks of your TLD infrastructure, it was highly integrated into the system. Unfortunately, that meant that it was very difficult for us to scale. So, if we wanted to make the technical check process more performant, because of that type of integration, it was very difficult to grow and sort of parallelize operations, if you will.

It also meant it was very difficult to actually evolve the technical checks in any meaningful way because of that sort of tight integration. So, what we've done is we've separated out the system that does technical checks from the root zone management system. The goal here is that

now we can evolve the technical checks on an independent track. We can do things. we expect to open source that code as well so that community can review it, they can run the tests locally in their own systems, things like that. And then when we have the capacity to actually do the work, we expect to do some additional public consultation with this community, with the other communities on what that evolution should be, what tests we should add, what tests we should change, and so forth.

We've also added some additional logging, both in terms of debug logging. This means that system administrators at TLDs can really drill into the details of the technical checks that we do and analyze the results that we're getting. We think this will be a great help because up until now, when a technical issue is discovered, it often results in this long back and forth via email between IANA staff and the TLD manager staff to work out exactly what we're seeing and what's happening and what they can do to correct it. With these enhanced debugging logs, that will make that process a lot more streamlined. Also enhanced audit logging. This means that TLD managers can get much more comprehensive logs of who's logged in to edit their TLD, which I think helps satisfy additional security monitoring concerns.

Most notable, and I know I've shared this with the ccNSO in the past, but for those that are new to this, you now have the ability to tailor authorizations in the system to better match your business needs. In the past, until recently, every TLD had an administrative and technical contact with IANA. That hasn't changed. What has changed is that up until we launch this new system, the administrative and technical contacts serve two roles. One was to be a public point of contact that's

listed in the WHOIS database that anyone can look up and contact. And the other was to authorize change requests on behalf of the TLD.

Now that might have made sense when the system was devised in the 1990s. But today, generally speaking, most TLDs don't want the same person that is authorizing change requests to be the same person that receives all the public contact via the WHOIS. Usually, you would want the WHOIS to be sort of your customer contact center, your help desk, things like that where requests can be triaged, escalated, and so forth. Authorizations on the other hand, given that authorizers can do everything up to transferring your TLD, things like that. You want it to be someone relatively senior in the organization, someone who's properly authorized to do those kinds of change requests.

So, what we've done is we've separated these two obligations. You're now free to put in the WHOIS whatever makes sense for your organization in terms of a point of contact to field general customer inquiries. And then you can configure any number of authorizers or users in the system, and you can tailor permissions so you can issue accounts for your staff. You can give certain staff permissions to do one thing, different staff permission to do other things. If you have a registry service back-end provider, you can give them access just to administer the bits that they're responsible for.

We'll continue to evolve this, but we wanted to release this functionality so you could start using it, get feedback and work out if there's any additional opportunities to enhance it. It doesn't do everything we've been asked to do. There are some constraints, but for sure, it provides

a lot more flexibility than there was in the past. And that's available for you to use today.

Based on this new platform, we're now working to evolve into new functionality. Now that the system is launched, the highest priority functionality we're working on right now is multi-factor authentication. I've talked about multi-factor authentication in the past at ICANN meetings. It's not that we don't have it today. We just have a pretty unorthodox implementation of it, and I won't belay you with the details in this session, but we're looking to add much more mainstream multi-factor authentication into the mix as an optional opt in service.

The firs, cut of this will be for TOTP. This is an IETF standard. You might know of it as those rolling 6-digit codes you have on like Google authenticator, that kind of thing. We expect to roll that out in the coming months. Down the road later, we'll be looking at web authentication, also known as passkeys, and this allows for passwordless authentication.

Part of the driver for this, as well as just our discussions with our customers it is an SSR2 recommendation that we do this. I will note that the difficulty here is not actually the technical implementation. The technology is not that complicated, and it's pretty standardized, so adding it to our operations is not the problem. The problem that we see predominantly to solve here is that we don't actually know who all of our customers are. A lot of the points of contacts in our database are role accounts. And this is a problem because we don't actually know the people behind the role accounts in every situation. It used to be the

case when there was a lot less TLDs, but now with 1,500 TLDs, it's just not something that's practical for our team to do.

Why do we need to know who's behind the role accounts? Well, when you implement multi-factor authentication, you give people these credentials that they have to use from that point onward to authenticate themselves. But what happens when they lose the credentials? They lose their phone or whatever. So, we need a process to restore trust to reissue credentials to the party. And if we don't know who they are, then how do we know they're the people to give new credentials to?

So, we need to implement new procedures there. It probably will involve collecting more information from our customers in terms of their identity. We obviously want to do this in a safe and secure manner. We want to minimize our PII collection, if you will. And so, to that end, we've engaged some consultants, experts in this field to advise us, and that is work that's ongoing right now. So, the technology is on the way. The operationalization through operational procedures is ongoing. And once we have those two things, in place, then we will launch.

Other things for the platform is pass/fail warn technical checks. Today it is pass/fail, which means that you either, everything works, then you pass, or if there's any problem whatsoever, it's a fail. There's no graduation between checks that might be minor versus checks that are the significant problem. By introducing a warning category for the more lower severity issues that we identify in our technical checks, it will allow TLD managers to self-dismiss, to go in and say, yeah, review

the issue, but then dismiss that it is an issue and move forward in a much more expedited fashion.

We're also looking to take that concept and expand it into health checks. Basically, instead of today, when a TLD manager submits a change request, we do the technical checks at that point in time only to proactively just testing periodically every TLD. Should we notice that there is a new issue that we haven't seen before, we can proactively notify the TLD manager of what we see and then the TLD manager could take action that.

So, if yesterday, we pulled your name servers and found that it all matched, but then today, we check your name servers, and there's a mismatch. Your NS set, for example, in your zone doesn't match the root zone. Probably an indicator that you want to actually do a root zone change to update to match what's in your zone. So, we can proactively notify you. Possibly there's a potential there. We can even start pre-drafting a change request on your behalf, and then you can go in and lodge it and submit it, things like that.

And then the version that we launched is evolution, is a preliminary API. We've implemented an API predominately for our customers that manage big portfolios of TLDs to make their life a lot easier. We've had some feedback on the initial version of the API. We think that there is room to continue to improve it to better match their needs. So, we will be evolving that as well.

So now switching gears, and apologies, the titles are cut off here. Talking about the red zone key signing key. This is the cryptographic key that's used to secure the root zone and in turn the whole DNS really.

We have a few areas of interest for you. One is that we're doing an algorithm rollover study. This is research into how we change the cryptographic algorithm for the root zone. It's never been done before. And being the root zone, it's critical that we do it very cautiously.

So, we've enrolled a number of community experts to participate in a design team. They've analyzed the issue and developed a draft set of recommendations. They were posted just last week for public comment. If you have security expertise, please take a look at that draft study and provide you feedback. That'll be very valuable in finalizing the report. When it is finalized, we will then take that into IANA to work out how to operationalize their findings. The goal here is not necessarily to change the algorithm right away, but to be prepared so that at a later date, when there is a decision that there was something better to be used for the root zone, we have everything in place to enable us to do that.

Those who are not familiar with how we administer the KSK, we have a very unusual way of doing it. It's highly transparent. We have community experts play key roles in the way we administer the KSK. We call them trusted community representatives. You might have heard of them as the seven keyholders to the internet. They're basically individuals picked from around the world to keep secure parts of access keys to access the KSK, and also to oversee operations and to provide guidance on how we can evolve our operations.

Many of the volunteers that do this work have been in place since 20 10 when we first signed the root zone. Based on many of them wanting to retire from their roles, we're actively seeking new recruits. If you think

it's something that would interest you or someone you think that might be qualified, please take a look at that link, iana.org/tcr, and submit a statement of interest. We're looking for qualified candidates.

The other thing we're actively doing is working on replacing the key itself with what's called a rollover where you replace one key with another. As I mentioned a moment ago, we started DNS secondary root zone in 2010. We've done exactly one rollover. It happened in 2018. We're now looking to do the second key rollover. It's good security practice to periodically change the key. Because it is the root zone because of its criticality, it's good you don't do it too often. But it is a very complicated effort because when we generate a new key for the root zone, literally every piece of DNS validating software in the world needs to be updated with that new key, which means that we need to provide a couple of years of advanced notice, what the key is, what the public key is, to allow that to propagate in software updates and other kinds of updates.

So, we started on the second key rollover process this year. In April of 2023, we generated the third key. We're working through that process. And by midyear, we're getting ready to start that two-year propagation period. Then we ran into a big snag, which is that the hardware vendor that we use for the specialized equipment for storing the key actually announced that they've decided to stop manufacturing those devices. Now this is not a problem immediately. We can continue using the devices we have. We have a lot in our inventory we can continue using for years to come. But we recognize that it's probably not a good idea to start using a key when we already know that the hardware it's stored in is end of life.

So, we pause that activity to do the rollover. We're now conducting a study on alternative vendors. We expect that that analysis to complete, basically, at the end of this year. Once we've selected our preferred new vendor, we will essentially restart the process again. So, expect that this work will restart again in 2024. There'll be roughly a two-year propagation period. And then instead of what's showing on the diagram here of the rollover actually happening in October 2025, it's quite likely it's going to happen in October 2026.

All right. So now I'm going to talk about ZONEMD. ZONEMD is a new record in the root zone. To be clear new record type, I should say. New record types are extremely rare, and DNS software usually has to have some understanding of the record type to not break in the process of reading DNS records. So, we're very cautious about adding new record types to the root zone. To that end, this new record type was provisionally added to the root zone in September. It was done in an unverifiable way, and the sole purpose of doing this was to let software implementers shake out their systems so that see if this new record type actually caused any problems so they could get fixed before the record is actually put into production use.

So, it was added in September and sure enough something's broke. In fact, I'll be honest and say, some of our internal tools within IAN broke. So, within a few days, we had to do some modifications and we managed to fix that, and there was no impact there. Some other people have reported much bigger problems. One notable one, and I share it just because they've been very transparent and have a really good write up on it, Cloudflare. Their DNS service stopped working because the way that they ingest the root zone didn't support ZONEMD and that

caused the whole system to start to break down, but they again identified the problem and have remedied it. The plan is that unless there is some kind of show stopping issue, full production launch of ZONEMD will happen on December 6th.

Just in terms of our overall performance, I think it's going relatively well. The only notable deviation our performance in recent months is missing one SLA in terms of technical check performance. On that case, the CSC reviewed it and determined it was nothing of concern. One technical check that we performed where we were meant to complete within 10 minutes, but it took 13 and a bit minutes to complete. And this was because the TLD's nameservers were essentially so broken that it took forever for our responses to time out and continuous checking and so forth.

Just generally, if you're not already familiar, we have lots and lots and lots of reports on our performance, both SLA adherence, customer satisfaction, annual surveys, and the like, all available at iana.org/performance.

All right. So now I wanted to sort of conclude my piece talking about the caretaker designation for Lebanon. Recently, we made a change to the .LB record in the AINA roots zone database. It was novel, which is why I wanted to share it with you today. We essentially removed the ccTLD manager from the record as in the managing entity, the ccTLD manager itself, as well as the administrative contact.

We made this change based on two factors. One was that the party listed as the manager for the TLD demanded that we remove them from the record. They've not been involved with managing the ccTLD for a

number of years. They were not appreciative that they were still listed given that they had no operational oversight or role whatsoever. So, that was one factor. And the other factor was the administrative contacted regrettably passed away earlier this year.

So based on these two factors and based on discussion with government representatives and other people directly involved, we took the decision to put designation of caretaker operations in the grid zone database. Our database doesn't allow it to be blank, so we had to put something. So, we just denoted it as in caretaker operations. There is some slight precedent with this approach. In the early 2000s, Libya, . LY. There was a lack of an operator during the conflict there, I guess, you could say. And then while that situation clarified, it was also denoted as in caretaker operations.

All right. So, before we made this change, some of the things we did is we did establish what the ground truth was, like what's happening in the country, who's actually running the domain, confirmed our understanding. We did consult with the relevant parties, GAC representative, others inside the country. We also consulted with the ccNSO leadership around the time we were planning to take this action. And wearing my PTI hat as the IANA naming functions operator, we formally contacted ICANN as our contractor to get permission to make this change.

Now importantly, when we said caretaker operations, that doesn't mean we're running .LB. I think this was misinterpreted by some and possibly misreported. We didn't take over operations of .LB. We're not registering .LB domains directly. Former associates of the

administrative contact who passed way, continue to run it, but they're just not in a formal structure. They're doing it, essentially, on a voluntary basis. Keeping the lights on. We were satisfied that all the parties, there's no risk there in the short term. They're doing the right thing. But the people that were running .LB zone continue to do so.

We continue to maintain contact with them, make sure things are stable. And then when I wrote these slides, IANA's helping foster local work. That is true. It appears that they have found a successor organization. So, we're actually working on processing a ccTLD transfer requests now. If that is ultimately successful, then this situation should resolve in the coming months.

We memorialized the activity we took in a in exchange of letters between myself and Alejandra, as posted as ICANN correspondence. In communicating our decision, we identified to the ccNSO that we felt that this is an area where there's no real explicit policy, and it raises some interesting policy questions about this notion of if a ccTLD manager no longer wishes to be listed, and they have no meaningful role, what's IANA's obligations, what's the manager's obligations, should there be policy governing this situation, but more broadly, to consider the situation where there is essentially a mismatch between IANA's records and the ground truth.

And to that end, the ccNSO accepted that request and invited us to participate in dialogue with the ccNSO to explore some of these issues. Subsequently, and Jordan will talk about this in a few minutes, a small ad hoc team was devised from the ccNSO Council. We've been meeting

for the last few months, and we'll share some of that preliminary work with you today.

So, I think I mentioned much of this. Like I said, it's a specific unauthorized case, it might never happen again, but I would encourage looking at it as a more general problem. Our data drifting from reality, and perhaps limited motivation or limited remedies to keep to date. I think it's fair to say most of our policies and procedures assume ccTLD managers do the right thing. That they always keep their data up to date with IANA. If someone leaves their organization, they're quick to contact us and say, take that person out, add this person in. But the reality is not quite so clean. So, this results in poor data quality, and so forth.

So, looking forward to the discussion. And hopefully, as we analyze this and other case studies, gives us an opportunity to work out how to evolve, whether it's the policy, procedures, or both, to support better data quality and better operational sanity, if you will. With that, next slide, I think this is where I hand it over to my colleague, Marilia, who'll talk about our forward planning. Thank you.

ALEJANFRA REYNOSO: Before that, can we have a little bit of a pause? I think we may have some questions from the audience, for you Kim. If not, at least we do have a comment in the chat. So, may I have someone from the secretary to please read it?

BART BOSWINKEL: Hi, Kim. I hope you can hear me. This is Bart.

ALEJANDRA REYNOSO: Yes. We can hear you.

BART BOSWINKEL: Good. So, we had a question and a comment from Paul Yule. The first one is a comment, and his comment is the division of technical administrative effect is really important, and I understand the sentiment that requires an administrative contact in country, whatever exactly that may mean. But I'm concerned that the approach appearing on the slide and related documentation can ultimately lead to a couple of problems pertaining to skills development and availability. I don't know if you want to react or whether Paul is in the room?

KIM DAVIES: I'm happy to react to the observation. I mean, I think that it's a fair assessment to wonder about the impact of this change to local presence requirements. But I think the reality is that even absent this change, the local presence requirements were not necessarily a good fit because the circumstances have changed a lot.

Just to set the context for everyone in the room, RFC5091 published in 1994 has a requirement that the administrative contact must be in the country. Now in 1994, there was no such thing as a ccTLD manager. In the Internet records of the time, there was an admin contact and a technical contact only. So, it is fair to assume that at that time, what was intended by that language was that what we would today consider

the ccTLD manager was in the country. And that's, respectively, how we interpret it today.

So even though RFC language says just the admin contact, I think our practical operationalization of that is whenever we assess a ccTLD transfer, we look that this ccTLD manager is inside the country, not just the admin contact. But that being said, there's a lot of weaknesses and gaps there. For example, we only assess that at the time of a transfer request. It's not an enduring obligation that we constantly monitor for, and we've certainly seen situations in some countries where it was in country, and then later is transferred outside country. So, without going down the rabbit hole of the discussion, there's some opportunity there to revise that. And to that end, that was actually one of the topics of discussion in our small group with the ccNSO recently.

In terms of general skills and so forth, I think there's no policy or procedure that obligates the points of contact to have certain skill sets. I think one concern or question that we get periodically from ccTLD managers is they ask us for advice. What kind of people should I make my contacts? Who should be my admin contact? Who should be my technical contact? And our response is, frankly, there is absolutely no policy guidance on that question. Just know that it will be in a public database. People will look it up. You will get queries from all over the place. You'll probably get a lot of spam. And act accordingly. So, we don't really have guidance.

And to that end, there might also be an opportunity there for the ccNSO to provide some best practices. Like, here's the kind of parties that should be your contacts, here's the skill sets they should have and so

forth. So, I think we don't have the answer there. It is unstated. It is constrained. And if there's evolution then, then please, I'd encourage you to talk about it. Thank you.

BART BOSWINKEL: Thanks. Kim, and just as a reminder, he's not in the room. He's at the beach, he has a real question. So, his question is, should we-- and this goes into the caretaker operations. Should we be viewing the caretaker operation as a unique solution to the unique problem arising within the ccTLD context, or does it provide a mechanism for core internet architecture that falls into a situation in which the AINA function comes into problem?

KIM DAVIES: I think it's fair to say that this is a uniquely ccTLD issue because in the gTLD space, there is contractual provisions for when things don't align. There's this [inaudible 00:49:42] process. And if there is a mismatch or a failing, then it triggers this whole process that is well established. So, I don't see a broader applicability beyond ccTLDs on this for the moment. I think at its heart, a lot of the challenges, when it comes to ccTLDs in the IANA database comes from the strong decoupling and obviously, subsidiarity where every ccTLD operates within their country, accountable to their local community, perhaps less accountable to us.

That's not a judgment statement. I'm not saying that's good or bad, but the consequence of that is that IANA has very little tools in its toolbox to keep its records up to date its records accurate. And then

sometimes, and this is one of the more extreme examples, but the discontinuity between the reality and what AINA recognizes as the definitive records causes these problems. Hopefully, that answers the question.

BART BOSWINKEL: Thanks, Kim. There are no more questions in chat. Back to you.

ALEJANDRA REYNOSO: Thank you. Thank you, Bart, and thank you, Kim. I'm just doing a quick time check. We have eight minutes left. S, Marilia, please.

MARILIA HIRANO: Thank you. So, I just wanted to provide a little bit of a reminder of what has happened recently with our operating plan and budget process. And the priorities Kim already started talking about all of them, so I'll be brief, because most of it is a continuation. As he said, those are all multiyear projects that are within our priorities.

So, as many of you will know, there were some changes that were approved on the PTI bylaws a couple of months ago. And the outcome of that and the main intention was to better align ICANN's strategic and operating planning process. The PTI operating planning process to the ICANN' processes. So, that means the current PTI strategic plan was extended to end FY25 so that we can, jointly with ICANN, plan for FY26 to FY30.

And then we also aligned our timing, the timing of the PTI operating plan and budget cycle is now the same as the ICANN operating plan and budget cycle. Which means this public comment period, when you guys are providing comments on ICANN's plan, you will also have a concurrent planning public comment period running to review the PTI operating plan and budget for FY25. So, it will happen at the same time, whereas before up until FY24, you were doing ours before you did ICANN's. So, just a reminder on that. And if you have questions, Becky's team is on Xavier's functions, she can provide more updates on that.

So, key priorities. As Kim mentioned, we will continue to evolve RZMS, and he did go over some of the features we are working on, which some of those will fall into the FY25 timeframe. So, that's for RZMS. And then second, he also mentioned we will continue to work on the recommendations from the algorithm rollover study, which is out for public comment now. So, if you're interested in reviewing what our design team and ICANN staff drafted, please, we welcome your feedback. So, we will be implementing these recommendations through FY25 as well as continue to plan for our next key rollover. So, those are the two major priorities for us. And then in addition, we are starting to plan for significant operational improvements to IANA.org. So, you will see more work on that through FY25.

So, with that, it's just a call to action to remember to participate in the public comment process that will start December 12th, alongside ICANN. So, there will be two public comments running at the same time. One to review ICANN' plans and one to review the PTI operating plan and budget. And there's also a session happening next door all the way through 12:30 on ICANN's and, concurrently PTI's strategic plan,

FY26 to 30. It is planned until 12:30, but if you want to give input into the plan, it is a SWAT analysis if you call it the best practice term that is happening. You don't have to stay until 12:30. You just go around the room. It's a gallery walk. It's an interactive session. So, that will give you opportunities to comment and to provide any input into that future work of ICANN and PTI.

So, I think that was it from me. If you have questions on these priorities, if you think, we welcome your feedback. What Kim described today, you have other questions or other things that you think we need to be prioritizing, this is the time to engage with us so we can consider including it in our draft plans.

So, my colleague Selena has walked around the room, putting this survey. If you can help us giving us feedback. If you are a member of the ccNSO, you can self-identify as being a member and you will get your survey for the ccNSO. But if you are an observer, if you are a TLD operator, you can also participate. And it's here in this QR code and she passed out some cards if you don't have time to do it now. So, it's greatly appreciated. We look forward to hearing from you. And, Alejandra, I'll pass it back to you. Thank you very much.

ALEJANDRA REYNOSO: Thank you very much. And I'll pass it over to Jordan to give summary on the Council Workshop. Please, Jordan.

JORDAN CARTER: Thanks, Alejandra. And this is to follow up just a little angle on the work arising from the .LB situation that Kim spoke about before. The Council held a workshop on—I don't know, it feels like a million days ago—I think it was on Sunday, to explore the situation and the points around whether there are gaps in the global policy framework. The Council established a small group, I think, in August to consider the situation, and to think through potential ccNSO responses to the policy gap illustrated by the .LB situation.

It's just worth reiterating or sharing because people might not be fully aware that the ccNSO itself is the policy authority for the global policy framework that defines how AINA relates to ccTLDs in the root zone. So, to the extent that there are any gaps or flaws in that policy framework, we collectively in this room and online are the people who are responsible for solving that problem. It isn't anyone else. It's kind of the core business of the ccNSO to be good stewards of this policy framework.

So, as we worked through dialogues with Kim and the AINA team with the small group, we sort of talked about three key questions. And this is sensitive and complicated stuff. So, this is probably something that we're going to be talking about for quite some time. But three things seems to arise. One was whether it would be a useful idea to consolidate all of the existing policy that applies in this area into one document. Because Kim has noted that some bits in RFC1591. We've done some PDPs that have created policy. We have the framework of interpretation reports. So, the policy framework is a little bit hard to find. And so, one of the questions was, should we pull it together?

The second is about gaps, whether there are gaps in the policy framework. We know about this gap because it's been done, but we thought it was a good opportunity to do some work as a community to see if we can identify any other gaps in the global policy framework here. And remember, this is about the policies that determine how AINA deals with ccTLDs in the root. We're not talking about any other kind of policies. It's not about ICANN having anything to say about how you operate your ccTLD. But we thought that if we were to identify gaps, we could then make some choices as a community about whether and if so, how to close those gaps, and what were the most important ones that we should act on first if that was what came out of the analysis.

And the third question we began to work on was whether it would be worth exploring ways to deal with future unknowns. Kim has explained what happened in this case. AINA created the scare attacker operation status based on some early precedent because something had to be done. The fact that there was a gap in the policy didn't mean that we could be paralyzed or that AINA could be paralyzed. So, it's possible that in future, another unknown unexpected event will happen. And it might be worth us syncing through how we want to handle such things if that situation of unknownness happens again.

So, we kicked those three things around and had an inclination as Council that we should continue with a small group exploring these questions, and prepare some proposed approaches to work through in community sessions at the next ICANN meeting. So, I just want to be really clear that no decisions have been by anyone about how to progress this work. We're going to keep exploring it and then have a big conversation in San Juan in March about what, if anything, to do next

on these three questions. So, that's the report back from the workshop. And I can hand back to Alejandra for any closing or any questions.

ALEJANDO REYNOSO: Thank you, Jordan. We are right on the finishing of the session, but if there is any question? I don't see any. Yes. I see one, well, two. Okay. Quick please. Eberhard first and then Rudolf.

EBERHARD LISSE: I'm Eberhard Lise, .na. I think this calls for a policy, for an issue manager, appointment of an issue manager, and for a policy development process to look at, first of all, in particular, the absconding of a ccTLD manager, but also the change in the location of the admin contact versus the ccTLD manager is regulated in RFC1591 as interpreted by the framework of interpretation. So, this is new from AINA, so we need to develop policy on this.

ALEJANDRA REYNOSO: Thank you, Eberhard. Rudolf?

RUDOLF: It's just a remark. It's only half serious, but if you ever find ways to deal with future unknowns, I'd be very interested.

ALEJANDRA REYNOSO: Thank you, Rudolf. With this, we are taking your comments into consideration. I would like to thank IANA and Thomas here for their

presentations. Please be reminded that our next session is in Hall 1 with the ICANN Board. And with this, I am closing this session. Thank you very much, and welcome to the ccNSO.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]