ICANN84 | AGM – Customer Standing Committee Work Session
Thursday, October 30, 2025 – 9:00 to 10:00 IST

CLAUDIA RUIZ

Hello and welcome to the Customer Standing Committee. My name is Claudia Ruiz, and I'm the participation manager for this session. Please note that this session is being recorded and is governed by the ICANN Community Participant Code of Conduct, the ICANN Expected Standards of Behavior, and the ICANN Community Anti-Harassment Policy.

Please observe the following guidelines to participate in this session. I will post them in the chat for your reference. During this session, questions or comments submitted in chat will be read aloud if put in the proper form as noted in the chat. If you would like to speak during this session, please raise your hand in Zoom.

When called upon, virtual participants will unmute their Zoom microphone, onsite participants will use a physical microphone to speak and should leave their Zoom microphone disconnected. For the benefit of other participants, please state your name for the record and speak at a reasonable pace. Thank you. And with that, I will now hand the floor over to Rick Wilhelm, chair of the CSE. Thank you.

RICK WILHELM

Check, check. Two, three, check. Good morning, Claudia. Thank you everyone for joining us here in the meeting room in Dublin, and thank you for those of you joining online. Welcome to 30th October ICANN84 Dublin, our regularly scheduled meeting of the Customer Standing Committee, which will take our October slot of our monthly meetings and also service of one of our various public work sessions and whatnot.

We've got our agenda that's up on the screen. It's sort of our regular monthly agenda with I don't think anything super special, although we do have some things that we've been discussing about that we take the time to, since we're in person, we sort of take advantage of that. So, hopefully everyone that is a regular participant has had a chance to review the agenda.

Recently, we did do our onboarding meeting. We did that about 10 days ago. My memory is not so good, but I remember the meeting, my recollection of is that it went well. We took about the whole hour and we took some good questions and such. So, thank you for everyone who participated in that. Does anybody have any questions about the agenda before we dive in? Questions, comments, concerns?

Looking around the room, looking in Zoom, not seeing any hands. Little agenda bashing, nothing. Okay. Very good. Good show. Thank you, Anil. So, why don't we go through the action items. Bart, you want to take us on a quick tour of the action items?

BART BOSWINKEL

Yeah, it's fairly straightforward. All the actions have been completed for this meeting that were supposed to be completed. So, everything is on the agenda. And the next one in November, I've scheduled the discussion on the PTI measurement, proposal, temporary delegation. I don't know, Kim, if that's feasible from your end. Yeah, then everything is scheduled and done.

RICK WILHELM

Okay, very good. Yeah, we'll be looking for that discussion with Kim. Hopefully, that timing works out for the meetings for Kim. Sometimes our meetings don't always align up the best in the time zone, but hopefully that's not too coffee inducing for Kim. Okay, very good. And yeah, we do have the SLA procedures that got published. Everyone's excited about that.

Okay. So, I think that takes care of the action items unless anyone has questions on that. Going once, going twice, not seeing any raised eyebrows or hands. All right, we'll go to the performance report and the findings, I'm not sure who's gonna take care of that today. Very good. Selina.

SELINA HARRINGTON

Thank you. So, during the month of September, we met 98.4% of the SLA thresholds. We did not meet one SLA, which was the supplemental technical test in the routine technical request category. This was because two test invocations during the month did not complete on the first attempt, but were automatically restarted after approximately 15 minutes and then completed successfully.

The cause could not be determined by our team, so logging has been enhanced. And service configurations will also be reviewed to help prevent similar delays. As the retries currently begin, only after the 10-minute SLA for retests and supplemental checks has already elapsed. So, the remaining 25 of 27 tests in this category are completed within three minutes though during the month.

RICK WILHELM

Very good, thank you. So, the change is going to be to start the retry before the timer expires, it sounds like. Is that fair?

SELINA HARRINGTON

Yes, that's what our development team is looking at that would help with this issue. For initial technical checks, we have 50 minutes, so it's not an issue with those checks, but for the retest and supplemental, it's a more aggressive SLA, 10 minutes. And I think that may come up in what Kim is going to be presenting later too.

RICK WILHELM

Yeah, I think that's a pretty likely may, but I appreciate your delightful and smiling hedge of may there. I find that charming but yes, I agree. And that's one of the reasons why-- going back to the thing about what we're gonna get to in the SLA review, this is appropriately illustrative about why some of this SLA review stuff is important.

Because like here we've got an SLA that was missed because the secondary check on the retry is a tighter SLA than the initial, and it's sort of a-- I'm not sure if this translates into every language, but in English you'd say it's a bit head scratching, and you can try and localize that to your appropriate language. So, I'm sure that other languages have better idioms for that. So, thank you. Okay. Yeah, Hotta san?

HIRO HOTTA Yes, thank you very much for the report. So, it was a kind of surprise because it was not 100% for us. So, is it possible for you to let us know what specific function was failed as a technical check?

SELINA HARRINGTON I'm not sure what specific function. It was on the retry, and the initial, I guess, attempt for the system to perform the technical checks didn't complete. So, after 15 minutes, by design, the check will retry, but I'm not sure what specific function of the check was. I can look into that and then send that to the list.

HIRO HOTTA Thank you.

RICK WILHELM

Thank you. Other questions on the SLAs and on the performance report, rather? Very good. All right. What do we have next on the agenda? I've got the zoom up on my screen, so I don't have it memorized.

JENNIFER BRYCE

This is Jennifer from ICANN Org. So, just the procedural of the CSC findings report, which the language, we just want to make sure that this group approves of the language that is in the report, which this time is slightly different from usual, because normally we're 100%. But as Selina explained, as you can see on the screen, the language here is that PTIs performance over September was 98.4% due to the missing SLA of the technical check supplemental routine technical.

So, the cause and dissolution of the missed SLA have been satisfactorily explained by PTI, and the CSC has determined that this exception is no cause for concern, no persistent problems were identified, and no further action is needed. I would just ask you all to consider that language. Thank you.

RICK WILHELM

Sounds good. Thank you. So, I think now we gotta do a vote to accept, is that correct part? You'd think I'd know this, I've been doing this for quite a while. So, we've gotta do roll call. So, I'm approving. Pablo?

PABLO RODRIGUEZ Approve.

UNKNWON SPEAKER Approve.

UNKNWON SPEAKER Approve.

RICK WILHELM All right. There we go. We've got our four.

DMITRY BURKOV Approve.

RICK WILHELM Was that Dima? All right, Dima is in the house. Very good. I think that was Dima. Was that Dima? I don't see him here on the thing. All right, very good. All right. So, the tense part of the meeting is over. That was sarcasm for the transcript will reflect. Very good, thank you. All right, and thank you to the PTI team for another solid month, and we'll track down and find the answer to Hotta San's question and-- very good, no worries. All right. Cheers.

So, that moves us past the findings. What's next on the agenda? Feedback on the onboarding of new members. So, as I said, we did the onboarding last Tuesday or Thursday. Bart's gonna remind me.

Tuesday or Thursday? Thursday. Gordon remembers. Okay. And we spent that an hour. Anybody have any questions, comments?

This is where you say that my explanations were long-winded and tedious, and my jokes weren't funny and that the presentation was dull or something like that. But we had some material. Anybody have any feedback, comments and stuff like that?

MAARTEN SIMON It's Maarten, SIDN. Oh no, I don't represent us in any. No, it was a very good session for me. It helped me a lot to onboard me, and later on I went through the SLA, that helped me understand a bit more. But I was very happy with the question Hiro asked because the SLA is very broadly and not very detailed on what systems are we talking about. So, I'm interested in to get that knowledge also, but that's for later.

RICK WILHELM Very good. Thank you, Maarten. Appreciate that. Oh, there's a hand in the window. Anil, please go ahead.

ANIL JAIN Thank you. Anil, for the records. I just want to say that onboarding was fantastic and the newcomer like me, the things explained in detail, and I was able to grasp the basic objective of CSC, what CSC work is being done and what is stored in the future. This is going to be very exciting for me. Thank you.

RICK WILHELM

Very good. Thank you, Anil. Appreciate that. Any other comments? Yes, please.

UNKNOWN SPEAKER

[00:12:57 - inaudible] .dk. Unfortunately, the onboarding was during a school holiday, and as you can imagine, between a week of vacation and a week of ICANN, I did not read the material yet, but I will and come back with any feedback, if any. Thanks.

RICK WILHELM

No worries at all. And if there's anything that we can follow up with, please, we'll find that very entertaining. Very good, very good. Did we record the onboarding session? I don't recall if we did or not. We did, okay. So, it is recorded, so you can watch it at one and a quarter speed, and then I will be even less intelligible than I am in person, so, yeah. Yeah. Very good. Any other questions here? Gordon, please.

GORDON DICK

I found the onboarding very helpful, yeah, straightforward.

RICK WILHELM

Brilliant. I bought Gordon a pint last night to make sure he said that, so. Okay, good. I thought that the deck, for what it's worth, the deck was very well prepared, and I think that it had been revised since the last time we used it. Is that correct, Bart? I think that the deck had gotten updated.

BART BOSWINKEL

Updated every year, and the major one is by now it's getting too many. So, they're now 10 columns of data of what the CSC has done over time next year. So yeah, we need to find another way to present it. But that's the main part. And I think by now what is really important for the people with onboarding is the bit about the findings and the standard language we use because it looks very weird if you read it for the first time, accident satisfactory, et cetera. But there is a whole thinking behind it, and that's important to grasp. Thanks.

RICK WILHELM

Thank you very much. Okay, good stuff. So I think that now we're going to talk about this agenda item number five, which is updating the CSC charter and the ICANN bylaws which those are denoted a little bit in shorthand in the agenda. So just to elaborate, we've got the CSC charter and the ICANN bylaws which these were recommendations that came out of the most recent CSC effectiveness review and it was a CSC effectiveness review. There's so many reviews, I have to keep them straight in my head.

Right now, in the bylaws and in the charter, the CSC is designed to be reviewed every three years. And one of the findings of the last CSC effectiveness review, which concluded, I'll just say a while ago, but it's written down somewhere when it concluded, was that the frequency should be elongated from three years to five years.

The reason being that at a three-year frequency, if the findings are sufficiently interesting, it takes too long to implement them and have their effects be noted and felt before the next CSC effectiveness review starts up, and then needs to tell and determine whether or not those things had any effect, positive or negative or neutral, and then to determine a finding.

It's a bit as if you go to the doctor and the doctor prescribes some medicine and the doctor will say, well, Rick, don't come back for two weeks because the medicine needs to take effect. If the doctor has you come back in 48 hours and you've only been taking the medicine for 24 hours, an appointment in 48 hours doesn't make sense because the antibiotics or medication hasn't had a chance to have some effect on your body.

I'm not sure if it's an exact metaphor, but it's something I think we can all vaguely relate to. So, what one of the recommendations was, is to change the frequency of these reviews. That sounds very simple in practice, but to actually apply that, we have to amend the bylaws.

The ICANN bylaws are purposefully very difficult to change because they are the underlying framework and foundation of how ICANN works, and they're meant to be the constitution of a country that if you want your governmental operations to be stable, you can't just have them be able to be changed on a whim. Sorry, that's probably not the best analogy to use in whatever. So, maybe we should talk about our houses.

So, anyway, to change the bylaws takes a lot, and so that's the process that we're in here. We also have to change the CSC charter. Now, what is in process right now is to change the charter as it says there on the screen. The Registry Stakeholder Group and ccNSO Council need to agree on these proposals. They need to go through public comments. And then the changes need to be ratified by both the GNSO Council and the ccNSO Council.

So, there's a slightly different path for the gTLD side and the ccTLD side. They sort of rhyme, but they're different, but they do require a public comment period, that has its own timeline. And so, right now, both of these are with the CSE charter. They're in process with the Councils, is that correct, Bart? I'm gonna hand the charter bit over here to Bart because he's much closer to this than I am.

BART BOSWINKEL It's currently with the RSIG and the ccNSO, they need to agree upon it. There is one caveat, which makes it even more tricky. There is, you have a bylaw change, and it really applies to the change of frequency, but also the inclusion of alternates. So, there are two elements, again, implementing the second effectiveness review.

And the bylaw change, this is a fundamental bylaw change, and that makes it from a management point of view, a process management point of view, tricky, because that means approval by all the empowered community, and it has to go to public comment as well. The goal is to align the public comment periods of both the charter and the bylaw changes. And so that needs to overlap so they can refer to each other, and then they go their own path again for approvals.

The bylaw change has to go through this fundamental, so the approval action procedure, and at the end, the empowered community approving it. And the charter changes, again, for the two items, we'll go through the, say the first, the RSIG and ccNSO, and then at the end, after the public comment period, through the ccNSO and GNSO Councils.

So, they've all been alerted and it's a matter of, yeah, aligning and keeping the ducks in a row over the next couple of months. And to make it just a small correction on the frequency, it's five years after completion of the previous review. So, effectively, there is no fixed date anymore for a review. And that's important because otherwise, there is a similar thing with the IANA function review, and the goal is, and now I'm going to confuse everybody, the goal is to align the two changes, the bylaw change, because in a way they're tied together.

Both are a fundamental bylaw change, both have to go through the same process. So, from a, I would say, ICANN Org perspective, the easiest way and the best way to do it is align the change to the IFR frequency and the IANA frequency or the PTI, no, the CSC effectiveness review frequency.

RICK WILHELM

Yeah. Who is about right? Neil asks in the chat, "What are the timelines for these tests? I think the answer is, it's a bit indeterminate, but let me pose that to you. You probably have better idea of the range of timelines, Bart.

BART BOSWINKEL

The range of timelines, we hope, and as this is a fundamental bylaw change, one of the, and is one of the requirements or not requirements, is a community forum. In the community forum, we hope that it can be done or that say that it will be scheduled around a Mumbai meeting, so March. Now, if you backtrack, that means that the public comment period has to be before Mumbai.

And that the fundamental bylaw change was initiated by the board well before, say, 21 days, so end of January. That's the timing. If we don't make Mumbai for whatever reasons, then it will be ICANN86, the community forum. I would say that's where they really tie up again, the bylaw change and everything else, and the Council decision, yeah, we can play around with those in the sense of yeah, the timing of the Council decisions is afterwards. So, I hope it addresses the question.

RICK WILHELM

There you go. Thank you, Anil for that. Yes, Maarten.

MAARTEN SIMON

One question from me. I'm jumping into this process. So, where are we with regard to the text? Is the text already finalized, or in what stage are we?

BART BOSWINKEL

Again, the text was included in the package for today. It's been sent to the Council. It's in draft mode. And so, this text will go up if there are no issues with the text, it will go up for public comment. And depending on the replies and the comments received, it may or may not change. But in principle, this is the proposed language, say, from Staff to the CSC and to the RSIG and GNSO, and also to the Board following a consultation of the RySG, CSC, and Councils on the questions around alternates, because that was the tricky one. And there were some good questions around it.

RICK WILHELM

Thank you, Maarten, for that question. Now, I won't use the word funny because it's not really funny, but the peculiar thing is that all of this is for the work that we do here on a month-to-month basis. I won't say day to day, because this is not a day-to-day job, but on a month-to-month basis as it relates to monitoring the work that PTI does, this has really no impact.

This is all to say that its noise is a little glib and it's a little dismissive, but this is taking place at a different plane and is a much longer-term consideration about how the CSC functions and what it does.

On a month-to-month basis, all of what we're talking about makes no difference.

Because we're going to meet next month, Kim's team is working today, and right now, there's a ticket that's hitting and there are tests that are being run, and there are SLAs that are being met, and there's stuff that's happening, and next month the report is gonna come out and it's gonna be great, and we're gonna hear a report and it's gonna be fine.

This is taking place at a different altitude, and has different concerns that are way longer term trajectory. And we, the CSC, don't get a vote in any of this stuff. Our principle job here, and I'm editorializing a little bit, is to help educate people that ask us about this stuff, say, what's going on with this? Like, look, here's all it is. We want to memorialize in the bylaws the ability to bring alternates in because we need that in order to remain correlate. One.

We also want to lengthen and align the review periods for the CSC with the IFR to make the process more efficient. That's it. And that's the kind of education that we do, because people are gonna see this stuff having to do with the CSC, and since if you're listening to this tape, you're probably somehow involved in the CSC, someone's going to come to you from one of your constituencies, whether they're on the gTLD side or the ccNSO side and say, what's going on here?

And they're gonna be like, we've got a bylaws change involving the CSC, and you're gonna say, it's fine. This is all it is, da, da, da. And they're gonna say, that's all it is. And yeah, that's all it is. And we have to change the bylaws? Yes, we have to change the bylaws. It's not a big deal.

And the reason why we're spending time here in the meeting is to help explain this all to you that you, plural, not just you, Maarten, Maarten happens to be looking at me, is to help explain this all to you so that when people come to one of the group here that's part of the CSC or attached to the CSC or an alternate, that you are aware and understanding of the dynamic of what's going on so you can help them understand that these are mechanics that we need to do to help the CSC function efficiently and to help ICANN function more efficiently because these are findings that were done in the prior CSC reviews that we're implementing.

And if we don't do these, then we're actually making ICANN function less well because we're failing to implement something that a prior review did. And like right now, the review of reviews is talking about why can't ICANN get its stuff done, speaking broadly and waving my hands. Well, we're trying to help ICANN get stuff done.

BART BOSWINKEL

And maybe if you want to do the same thing this afternoon or this morning, explain how this process works about from review to implementing it, this is a very good case, a point in case, but can-- we have half...

RICK WILHELM

Yes, we can move on. So, we wanted to kind of explain this and stuff. So, yes, let's move on. Okay, good show. Thank you. IANA is going down number six. Update and invite feedback on its planned FY27 priorities. And I think that's-- who's got that one?

MARILIA HIRANO

Me.

RICK WILHELM

All right. Good show.

MARILIA HIRANO

Hello everyone. My name is Marilia Hirano. I'm the director of strategic programs for IANA in case some of you don't know me. And today I'm gonna talk about what we're planning for Fiscal Year ‘27. And since we were talking about the bylaws and charters, one of the mandates in the PTI bylaws is that we consult with SOs and ACs, the RIRs and the IEB on our priorities as we develop the operating plan and budget prior to going to public comment.

So, this allows the oversight groups to give feedback into the plan before the draft is published. So, I'm gonna give you a sneak peek on what is going to be included in the plan, and if you have any areas of concern or if we're missing anything, this is the opportunity to provide that feedback.

And also, for those of you who are-- all of you are representing one of the SOs and ACs, so if this is work that you need to go back to your constituency and discuss, of course, you have the opportunity to do so after this. So, what's new to the plan that you'll see that is different than the structure of the plan from the previous years? So, the scope of work section of the plan is going to be more aligned with the IANA 2030 strategic plan.

In addition, of course, we're gonna include the core operations. So, the plan structure this year will be core operational excellence, community engagement, and innovation. The last three there being the three strategic focus areas in the IANA 2030 strategy. Prior to last of this year, the core areas were operations, operational excellence, governance and technical services.

So, that's the change. So, the way the work is structured is going to change a bit just to be more aligned with how we present the strategic objectives. Also, we will include KPIs under each area. The PTI operating plan and budgets before did not include Key Performance Indicators, and we are including it now.

This will allow us to better measure progress against our deliverables. And then, we simplified some of the year-on-year budget variance tables. So, you'll see when we have the comparisons between the budget from fiscal year to fiscal year, those tables will be more straightforward, easier to interpret. So, those will be some of the new areas you'll see or changed things you'll see in the plan. Next slide.

All right. So, core operations is pretty straightforward, right? We process transactional request securing the DNS trust anchor, so performing key ceremonies, monitoring and reporting on performance, managing and supporting staff, having regular system and process assessments, testing, maintaining CCOPs, our business continuity plans, providing the subject matter expertise in all ICANN wide strategic initiatives that would impact IANA, and overseeing project delivering monitoring the schedule.

So, these are all day-to-day work that are needed in order for us to meet our contractual deliverables. Next slide. Then we get into the strategic objective deliverables, which starting with innovation, our priorities there, we are strengthening our partnership with ICANN's technical engagement teams.

And this is to make sure that we're monitoring the emerging needs that relate to internet identifiers. So, this working closely with the office of the CTO's technical engagement experts and research experts on the studies and research that they're conducting that may impact the work that we do.

The Next Round of gTLD Readiness, so for Fiscal Year ‘27, we're going to continue our system adaptations, the RZMS and other systems, to support temporary delegation. So, this is required for the names collision phase of the new gTLD program, and we are working already in 26 to start the system adaptations, and in 27, of course, we continue to prioritize this work.

And then updating the security of the DNS, and this is where we continue preparing for the next key rollover, and I'll have a call to action in the last slide. And also working with our partners and community experts, working with Verisign, and as I mentioned, the office of the CTO experts and other community experts on preparing for the algorithm rollover, which is basically we're implementing the recommendations from a study that was published in 2024 on this topic.

And now, we're getting ready to implement. Next slide. The other priority is, of course, root zone management system. The focus in 27 is on advancing best practices for authentication and also reviewing and refining technical checks. Then IANA website modernization. This is all multi-year project, so we've been working on this since fiscal year 23, and then the focus this year in Fiscal Year ‘26 is on rebranding and basically working on redesigning the website, bringing it more from early two thousands to 2025, so, we're fast forwarding 25 years.

And in 27, our focus will be on improving the user experience, and a lot of work being done with how the registries are displayed and how you can find the registries doing more search and capabilities, and also unifying the various web properties into a more cohesive platform. So, those are the two priorities for the website.

Then I think we go to operational excellence priorities. Next slide. So, here again, as with our core operations priorities, operational excellence is called out because it is the heart of how we operate.

And also, these are also contractual deliverables, engaging third party auditors. This is the information security auditors that we have.

We currently follow the SOC2 and SOC3 frameworks, but we continue to evolve the control environment mature the adoption of our quality management framework, which we are kicking off in Fiscal Year ‘26, where we switching from the EFQM framework to the Baldridge Excellence Framework, advancing staff training, development, knowledge transfer, and this is, as we recognize that IANA has very unique skill sets that are required, so we are cross-training our staff and, and offering professional development so that we can have more like robust staff team.

And strengthening governance practices, having more transparent reporting performance reviews. This includes having those KPIs in the operating plan and budget so that we can mature, measuring the progress measurement practices, aligning with ICANN's initiative to, and then publishing more of how the progress is to the community.

And then last but not least, is the focus area of community engagement. And our priorities here is expanding outreach and education to the stakeholder groups, focusing on underserved regions, engaging with stakeholders through timely responses. This is how we track our questions queued and general questions inquiries that we receive, having accessible reporting and, of course, doing what we do here.

Active participation in these meetings, conferences enhance the availability and accessibility of educational materials and sessions. So, having more materials that are ready for use in several events working with the ICANN team on ICANN Learn, so initiatives like this to build more of the awareness of what IANA does. And then monitoring effectiveness through our customer feedback mechanisms. Next.

Okay, so this is my last slide, it's just some calls to action that I have in all the meetings I'm having this week. Annual engagement survey, it is going and out to you guys in the next couple of weeks, so stay tuned for that. As I mentioned in a few months ago to this group, it is going to be very simplified. It's only gonna take five minutes to complete, so please take part in it. And I'll say it's not gonna be 11, I believe 11 statements from last year, it's only three, with opportunities for three, yes, we got it to three.

But there's still gonna be opportunities for, of course, you guys are the community leaders for IANA, so there's still opportunities and we want to hear what is the strategic directions and topics. So, you'll still have open-ended comment possibilities there. There are two public comment processes that we are going to have. Of course, this one, December opens the Fiscal Year ‘27, PTI and IANA and ICANN overall operating plan and budget.

So, you get the opportunity to review and make comments on what we're doing and how much it's gonna cost. And then February, 2026, we have the root zone KSK algorithm rollover public comment period. So, if you've been involved or haven't been involved in the work particularly, take a look at that and provide your feedback.

And then also touching on the next key rollover, the DNS trust anchor availability, so operators should monitor the system because the new key has been available since January of 2025. So, please make sure that your systems have adopted the new key. I put the link to the files there especially prior to the next rollover, which is scheduled to happen in October. So, those are my three calls to action. And with that, I will hand it back to you, Rick. Thank you.

RICK WILHELM Very good. Thank you, Maria. Three questions, that's a new achievement. That's very impressive.

MARILIA HIRANO I want to see 100% participation.

RICK WILHELM Very good. Let's look for hands for questions. Anil's hand was up earlier, and then it went down. Anil, was your question answered as we rolled forward? It may have been. Anil's hand is back up. Anil, please go ahead.

ANIL JAIN

Thank you, Rick. Anil for the record. My question is regarding a term used during the presentation as the temporary delegation. Can you please explain whether this temporary delegation is a part of new gTLD round or it's a generic word, and what is the meaning of it? Thank you.

RICK WILHELM

Yes, it is part of the new gTLD round, and are we gonna talk about that in a little bit? Is that an agenda item in just a few minutes? It's an agenda item in November. So, yeah, it's temporary, it is part of the new gTLD round. We're gonna be covering that in a fair bit of depth in November. So, can we hold that question a little bit, Anil?

ANIL JAIN

Sure. Thank you.

RICK WILHELM

Thank you very much. Yeah, it is for the next round, exactly. Other questions? I had a question. You mentioned, Marilia, something about authentication and multifactor and stuff like that, does PTI publish stats on what the adoption is of MFA among its customer base?

KIM DAVIES

The direct answer to the question is no, but I can say anecdotally, the adoption is not very high. But those that really wanted it, really wanted it for their own security, risk assessment.

That said, I don't think that's a bad thing. I think that we always made it purely optional to begin with, but I think over time we're looking to ramp it up and as is probably good security practice everywhere, start making it compulsory given the criticality of the system at hand.

So, I think we're gonna get much greater adoption and we'll obviously consult with our customers in advance of making any decisions along those lines.

RICK WILHELM

Thank you. I wonder if, and maybe it's kind of a separate topic, so maybe we will chat about that, because I understand that there are various reasons why various customers may not want it for very good reasons. And we've discussed about that before, but there's also situations where the people at the coalface might think it inconvenient, but their betters might think that, I don't care about your convenience, I care about our security.

And maybe it's their betters that we need to be informing. So, let's have a think about that. Okay, good show. And then, you said there's a public comment period on the algo role that's going on now? I I think you said.

MARILIA HIRANO

No, it's planned to open February of 2026.

RICK WILHELM

In February of 2026. Okay. So, coming up at post New Year. Okay, got it, got it. Okay, that'll be entertaining.

MARILIA HIRANO

And the team did ask me to call it out if you haven't been involved in the work to please review the plan and give feedback, especially if you haven't been prized of it.

RICK WILHELM

Is that gonna get publicized at IETF? I presume it is. Okay, yeah.

MARILIA HIRANO

We are giving this update at all of our, I was just at RIPE, and I've asked the same and we're talking, but Kim's going to the IETF, he can...

KIM DAVIES

Well, specifically the IETF, there's not really a forum for us to bring this up because it's not IETF work per se, but we're using operator groups and other kinds of forums with the same composition, if you will, to raise awareness.

RICK WILHELM

Sure, yeah, okay. Because there's obviously interested parties, and certainly opinionated parties at the IETF. Okay, very good. Thank you, Kim. Thank you, Marilia. Okay, moving on to our next item. And we're kind of running short on time, largely due to my own long-windedness. So, we're gonna be talking a little bit about the SLA process. We won't really get too deeply into this, but let me turn it over to Kim.

KIM DAVIES

Yeah, thanks, Rick. I think in light of the lack of time left, I'll go through this relatively quickly, but I think at the next opportunity, go into it again in more depth. So I wanted to start the exploration of the SLAs by just providing some context onto how we got the SLAs we currently have. So, the current SLAs that govern the naming function that the CSC reviews monthly as part of your core duties really resulted from the IANA stewardship transition that happened in 2016.

Prior to that, there were SLAs in the contract we had with the US government, but they were fundamentally different to the way that they're structured today. So, in advance of that stewardship transition, there was a community design team that was established, tasked with creating service level agreements for the naming functions.

And then from that design team, there was actually a small sub-team that actually created the SLAs themselves. It was a team of three, I was one of the three people, so it was a very sort of tight-knit discussion at the time. But that team was operating with some guidance from the broader team.

And one of the key things that I think is reflected in the composition of the SLAs today is that the community really wanted to make sure that there was no component of the timeline from request submission all the way to final implementation that wasn't measured. They wanted every single facet of the timeline measured on the principle that if there was a component that wasn't measured, there might be an opportunity for that to be gamed I think. Fair to say.

I think there was an element of mutual distrust at the time and the notion that, well, if you don't measure this time, then may be all the bad looking numbers might get inserted in there and never get reported. So, that was kind of one of the design principles behind why we have 63 SLAs today is really measuring all those different facets of processing that we do.

Now, fundamentally, the SLAs are mostly the same as they were in 2016 today, but there have been some changes. Firstly, there was a recognition just within a year or two after the IANA stewardship transition. There was a whole area of processing that IANA did that had no SLAs unrelated to root zone management, but it is the processing of what were then called IDN tables. Now we call them label generation rule sets. Here, we have TLD operators submitting these tables for publication in a repository that IANA maintains.

We do some processing, but that wasn't measured at all. But there was a common recognition that that should be a measured task, and so we added SLAs to that. Then, there were some recognitions that some of the ccTLD delegation and transfer metrics were not fit-for-purpose the way they were measuring. So, prior iteration of the CSC took a look at that and reimagined how that was measured. And now, we measure it the way we do today.

And then sort of a housekeeping change that we made was the original SLAs were embedded in the IANA naming functions contract, which meant that any change of the SLA was a contractual amendment, which is a very heavyweight process.

So, in order to provide a bit more nimbleness to the SLAs and allow them to be sort of independently adjusted without as much baggage, the SLAs were extracted from the contract and put into a standalone document, which now the CSC in conjunction with PTI and ICAN are empowered to modify that standalone SLA document independently of the IANA naming functions contract. Next slide, please.

We're stuck. All right. So, ideally, we would do a line-by-line review of the SLAs, and I imagine we will at some point in the future. But for now, essentially root zone management's divided into five key categories that we measure. One is what we consider routine updates that impact the root zone file. These are things like DNS records, DS records, and the like. This is measured independently from the second category, which is routine updates that don't impact the root zone file.

Things like changes to the contact persons for a domain, things like that. What is the difference between the two? Well, things that go on the root zone file, there is a whole process of promulgation of those changes to the root zone itself, monitoring that they're appearing on the root servers, et cetera, et cetera. So, there are more measurement categories for those kinds of routine updates.

And then we have delegation and transfer of a gTLD, delegation and transfer of a ccTLD, and then essentially everything else. Because we do have some peripheral activities we do relatively rare that don't fit into those first four categories. Most notably when we change a root server operator, which is extremely rare, but it is a root zone change, it doesn't neatly fit into those first four categories.

And then for that last category, because of their rareness, because of their uniqueness, there's no actual SLA attached to it. So, they're just reporting categories where we report the time taken in our reports, but there's no associated time expectation with them. I mentioned on the previous slide, we have SLAs governing label generation rule sets. We also have sort of, again, meta SLAs governing that we actually produce our reports on time.

We have a real time dashboard where you can look at all the statistics that we've measured, and there's an availability metric to make sure that dashboard is available. And then we also have SLAs governing inquiry response. So, when we simply just get an email from a customer asking a question, for example, that we respond within a certain amount of time. And then credential changes, whenever someone goes in and changes their password in the system, things like that, that they get affected within a certain period of time. Next slide, please.

What kinds of measurements do we have? Most of them are time based. So, we look at how long processing takes from beginning to end in a particular phase, measured for clock time. Everything I think for the naming functions is based on seconds, minutes, hours, days on a calendar basis. This is different from our other SLAs for other communities, which are based on business days.

So here, it's all based on calendar days. And then generally speaking, the SLAs are defined as a percentage of compliance. Like you'll hit that timeframe 95% of the time, 99% of the time, whatever it might be. There's also metrics for accuracy, how many times the requests were implemented correctly. Availability measures are the percentage of time systems are available. And as noted before, not all metrics have a commitment associated. So, some are just sort of reporting only categories, but 64 of the metrics do have a commitment associated with them. Next slide, please.

You've seen this, this is sort of the easiest graphic illustration I could find to fit on a slide of what the metrics look like. As you know, the SLA table's much longer than this, and the SLA reports are something in the magnitude of 40 pages long, but this gives you a sense of them.

Next slide, please. All right. So, the rest of my presentation was kind of going to be IANA's preliminary assessment of the SLAs. And I don't know, I don't want to leave you with invaded breath or anything like that, but we have four minutes left. Do you want me to start tackling this or save this for the next meeting?

RICK WILHELM

Sorry. Thank you, Kim. Why don't we see if there's any questions or comments that folks have before we sort of double click into this? Thank you for that presentation. I think that this gives people a kind of a flavor because like you said, the SLAs were written before anything was operational, and now with the hindsight of many years of operation and good quality delivery, we want to measure things that are meaningful because all of these measurements cost time and effort and money.

And so, we want to make them be effective. So, if folks have any questions or thoughts, questions for Kim or thoughts. Fred is here with us. Fred's been watching this for years. I don't know, Fred, if you have any thoughts off the top of your head. Not at this time. He's gonna hold until we get into it. Anybody else have any thoughts that they'd like to bring up? Yes. Oh, sorry, I don't have my Zoom window. Please, Pablo.

PABLO RODRIGUEZ

Thank you, Rick, and thank you Kim. I just want to make a comment and commend to you and the team for all the work that you have done with this. This is really good stuff. I can see that this requires a lot more time. So we definitely should tackle this in the next meeting so that you can explain it in more detail and have the time that you deserve to present this material. But a priori, I can tell that this is really good stuff, you and your team have achieved many milestones and we're looking forward to more. Thank you.

RICK WILHELM

Thank you, Pablo. I think that if you, and even looking here on this slide on the assessment, there's some very good points here that context in which in addition to the fact that these were written before we were operational, the context in which they were written has changed. So, some of them were written when things were done manually.

Well, now there's a lot of automation in place since the SLA is set for hours or minutes, and now the activity is done in milliseconds. And so, the SLA is consistently met by a wide, wide margin. And now that doesn't mean that we should be setting the SLA down to milliseconds because those operations can fail and there's really not a point in setting the SLA to milliseconds, something like that. But these deserve some careful review and such. Yes, Bart.

BART BOSWINKEL

May I make a suggestion because this was really introduction and we said we would do this and that say maybe the leadership, so Rick and Hiro and maybe together with Kim, think through how you want to approach this whole procedure because if you're not careful, you end up in nitpicking, and on the other side, it could be a lost opportunity as well.

So somewhere in between that you think through how you want to approach this because this is the first time we will go and do this. And it's been long in the wait, and yeah, what would be the end goal as well? Something, and that we do this before the next meeting. I know you were traveling, so by somewhere mid-November that we try to schedule a call with the three of you, and then inform the rest of the CSC on the approach.

RICK WILHELM That sounds good. And the three of us may oddly try to get together in Montreal because I have inside knowledge [CROSSTALK].

BART BOSWINKEL [CROSSTALK] but that you discuss it and then make clear how you want to approach it, otherwise it's a lost opportunity.

RICK WILHELM Sure, sure. Very good. Thank you. Okay. We're kind of at time. Let's take a quick look at our next meeting dates. We've got one booked. We've got our dates set. I'd say they're probably pretty firm through Mumbai, and then they're sort of in pencil because everyone's diary's a bit tentative out once we get into April because if your diary is that firm that far out, then, well, not that we don't all have problems, but that's a different kennel of fish. So, those are our dates. Anybody have any other-- Bart, please.

BART BOSWINKEL	Just to say, maybe you didn't notice this, but I've suggested that we don't have a meeting in December because it's very close. If you do it end of November and December, there is hardly anytime. Something like that.
RICK WILHELM	Yeah, Hotta san has not QAed this meeting invite, so therefore it still has a bug in it. He's not QAed this document, so therefore it still has a bug in it.
BART BOSWINKEL	It's always the game we play.
RICK WILHELM	Exactly. Correct, yes. But we may also not have a meeting in December, 2026. So, it could still be true. Just could be quite early. Yeah, yeah, exactly. Very good. Anybody have anything else that they'd like to bring up? Yes, please.
TRACY HACKSHAW	Hi, this is Tracy Hackshaw, the GAC liaison. I saw other groups doing photos at this AGM, and I'm wondering if we should do one as well.
RICK WILHELM	We normally don't do a photo. Did you say photo?

TRACY HACKSHAW

Yeah.

RICK WILHELM

Yeah. We, we normally don't do a photo, but we're a little too-- it's really because we don't want to encourage the paparazzi. That's the real reason. The last time we did a photo, because when Fred was chair, the paparazzi were all over us for years.

I mean, such a handsome bloke. So, that's really why, but thank you, Tracy. Very good. I think that's it. We will wrap for the day. You can stop the recording. Thank you all for your time. Cheers.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]