
COPENHAGEN – ccNSO Members Meeting Day 2 (Part 4)

Wednesday, March 15, 2017 – 15:15 to 16:45 CET

ICANN58 | Copenhagen, Denmark

DANKO JEVTOVIC:

Hello, everybody. I think we are two minutes after scheduled time. My name is Danko Jevtovic from .rs. I will be having the privilege to Chair this session. I think it's a triple privilege because actually first time I'm doing such a thing and I was privileged to have such distinguished speakers that are experienced so that I don't think I will have to do anything basically.

We will talk about very important stuff, about IANA Operations, Customer Standing Committee, Root Zone Evaluation Committee, and all this Post Transition IANA Update we will be having in the second part.

Let me begin with Byron and Jay. They will be presenting Customer Standing Committee report. I think after we will have actually four presentations so after each of them we can have couple minutes for question and at the end because I think all the subjects are a bit related we could have if need be, a few more minutes for additional questions [until] time runs out.

We are nearing the end of the ccNSO session in Copenhagen and Byron, please.

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

BYRON HOLLAND:

Good afternoon, everybody. I'm going to walk us through a relatively brief presentation and then we do have an opportunity for Q&A, so all of your hard questions my partner Jay here is going to answer.

I thought it would be worthwhile to just touch on the Mission Statement based on the Charter of the CSC – the Customer Standing Committee – because it's important from the perspective of what is it that we're actually responsible for and also what is not in our remit. I think the second bullet is really the key one, that we are focused on regular monitoring of the performance of the IANA Functions against the agreed-up service level targets.

That's really the meat of what we do on a monthly basis. In addition, we are certainly responsible for a couple of other key things which I'll talk about in a few moments, but that is the essence of most of what we do right there.

Who's on it? It's a relatively small working group. There are four voting members – two from the gTLD community and two from the cc community whom you have appointed which are Jay and I – and we're the four voting members, all registry operators of some sort.

There is the opportunity for a fifth non-ccNSO ccTLD or one of the other gTLDs like an .arpa or .int or one of those. Right now there's been no request to fill that role so there are four voting members. Then there's a liaison – Elise, down the table – from PTI, and we have five SO/AC liaisons. They participate fully but are not voting members on the rare things that we actually vote upon.

The main things that we do, like I said, monitoring is the primary regular activity that we do. We do it on a monthly basis. We receive a report from PTI and really what we're doing is looking for exceptions. There are 63 metrics that we monitor there. There are defined boundary conditions for each of those metrics. And essentially what we're looking for is that PTI has met those requirements and in the places that perhaps they haven't, we question them to try to understand what has happened, is there a reasonable explanation for it, are we concerned about it or not?

And then it's another important responsibility of the CSC to then inform the community. So we have a website, we have a Dashboard, we publish our own report about this on a monthly basis, and we also push our report to a whole range of various mailing lists. So it's widely, widely, available. And of course, our meetings are open. We meet face-to-face at the ICANN meetings like we did earlier this week and they're open. And our monthly meetings are transcribed and recorded which is available to everybody. So we make sure to try to push that message as much as possible.

The other two important blocks of work that we're involved in is setting up a Complaints and Performance Remediation Process. That's something that is on our Work Plan going forward now that the committee's really gotten up and running. We haven't done it yet but it is literally next on our Work Plan. And then we will be involved in the consultation and reviews and surveys that happen in and around the CSC and PTI, and I'll speak a little bit more about those in a moment.

How do we work? As I mentioned, we have monthly meetings. They're virtual meetings except when there's an ICANN meeting and we can meet face-to-face. And really what we do, as already indicated, is receive the report and discuss it. PTI staff are there at the meeting with us and they walk us through it and then we have an opportunity to question them on specific or general issues.

This is a relatively new committee, as I think you all know. We got started in October just after the Transition – October 1st so we have – this slide is just out of date since we had our last meeting. We've received five PTI reports. Currently we've issued four monthly CSC reports but February's report will be coming out later today. So essentially it's five PTI reports received and five CSC reports written.

We have also been focused on the IANA Survey – PTI Annual Survey – and that's where they survey their customer base – us plus the [g] operators – to discover how we're feeling about the service that they're offered and if there's any issues.

PTI has certainly done this in the past, but as the CSC, we're going to try to help out with the survey just making sure that the survey is effective, it's getting to the heart of the issues that need to be, and also to help promote it because it's been drawn to my attention or the committee's attention that this community has been a little light on participating in that survey.

So I would strongly encourage all of us when it comes your way, it is your opportunity to provide feedback – good, bad or indifferent. And if it's good, please say so. If it's not, please also say so. But I would

encourage that. That's one of the pieces of work that we'll be doing, but first up for us we'll be working on the complaints process.

I think it's important to note on the complaints process, we're not responsible for individual complaints. We more look at is there a systemic pattern? And if we uncovered that, that's the type of thing that then we would start to act on. We've also in the last four months taken care of some of the basic administrative stuff in terms of creating internal procedures. We're involved in putting up the website – although, of course, ICANN staff did a lot of that – but putting a CSC website up and being involved in making sure that PTI had an appropriate Dashboard of metrics that's real-time updated.

In terms of the specific monitoring, there are 63 individual checks. Those specific metrics came out of the work of the IANA Transition era, and in particular, Design Team A of which Jay was a key member. So Jay and Alain who's also on the CSC, were both key to that. That truly was where the heavy lifting got done in terms of determining what specific metrics were required and what the boundary conditions were that could be lived up to – and did that, of course, in consultation with IANA. But that's really the core responsibility here that we're focused on.

We provide the detailed report. PTI provides the detailed report. We also push it out, post it, do all of those things. The CSC report tends to focus, is much shorter, so if you're interested but don't want to dive into 63 metrics, our report, the CSC report, is typically a couple of pages long and it will really only speak about the variances and

provide a rating. And the rating's pretty simple: Excellent, Satisfactory, or Needs Improvement. So you can keep tabs on IANA first and foremost through this report and you can certainly dig deeper if you want, but this allows you to keep your finger on the pulse of how IANA is performing.

I wanted to provide just an example of things that are being met and things that aren't being met just to give you a sense of what we're actually doing. In this case, the SLE for IANA to process a request for the creation or transfer of a gTLD is 10 days. Since we've been monitoring it, it's been significantly less than that and in fact in December on average it was only taking 2.9 days instead of 10 which was the required metric. It's just an example of one, and once we have more data we'll be able to fine tune the SLEs themselves or the metrics themselves in coming years.

Here's one that is an example of something not met. This is for one of the technical checks and it was required to be done within 50 minutes 90% of the time. December, 10% of the checks were not done in that time so didn't meet the 95% threshold. There was a reasonable explanation provided. One of the fundamental issues is likely to be resolved as part of the development path and Work Plan for IANA. So it was discussed. It was understood. And we understand the path forward. Essentially CSC said, "We're fine with this. We understand it. It's not a problem."

Complaints process is part of our mandate. It is not a process that we've built out yet but that is the next major block of work that we'll

be involved in in the coming months. But again, I just want to stress we don't deal with individual complaints. We deal with systemic or persistent problems, much broader patterns. And it's probably worth noting there are currently no outstanding complaints either with us or PTI.

Since I know we have quite a few presentations I'll just quickly touch on the fact here that there are levels of escalation for us. If we encounter a systemic problem and we can't get it resolved working with IANA staff, there are three levels of escalation that we can take. First is to the PTI Board, then to the Head of the GDD, and then to the ICANN CEO and Board. So there is certainly a range of options available to us should PTI not resolve any systemic problems that we uncover.

As I have already mentioned, we will be working with PTI on the survey to make sure that PTI is uncovering and aware of any issues that the customer base is feeling or worried about. Elise, can you remind us of the dates on that?

ELISE GERICH: I'm sorry. The dates on what?

BYRON HOLLAND: For the survey. When they can expect to be receiving notification.

ELISE GERICH: In the late summer, early fall.

BYRON HOLLAND:

Okay. So put that in your calendar please.

In addition to those items, believe it or not since we've just started, we're also starting to think about the reviews because we as the CSC are subject to some reviews ourselves. And these are the key three areas. There will be a CSC Charter Review and that will happen this October on the one-year anniversary of the CSC. That's the work of the ccNSO and the GNSO so there'll be an opportunity later in the summer and early fall for this community to be involved in thinking about: Is the CSC actually delivering on what we'd hoped, and does the Charter need to be refined or changed in any way? So far it seems to be working relatively well. However, there's at least one small, logistical, change we'll want to make. But by and large, it seems to be working for the committee itself.

Then a year later in 2018 there'll be an Effectiveness Review of the CSC itself. And again, that'll be a joint GNSO/ccNSO responsibility. Simultaneous with that, there will be a review of PTI itself, and that's also in October 2018. But that could also include the performance of the CSC.

In summary, I think the short story here is this is a very new committee. We're hitting our stride in terms of forming, storming, and norming. And I think overall, the members and the liaisons are working well together and PTI has performed satisfactorily, so we are happy with the way that PTI is performing based on all of the work

that we've seen and the metrics that they're responsible for delivering on. So at this point, it's working well.

Jay, did you want to add anything?

DANKO JEVTOMIC: Thank you, Byron. I think as a community, we're very happy to have such great representatives in the CSC because it's critical for operations. So as you said, I understand that if any cc has individual complaint, it first goes to PTI? Okay. And we can through your reports more easily monitor the performance.

Do we have any questions for this presentation?

BYRON HOLLAND: And just as a reminder, Elise, what is the e-mail address you can send your complaint to?

ELISE GERICH: The e-mail address is iana@iana.org. However, if you're dissatisfied if we're not able to work with you to resolve that complaint then there's an escalation@iana.org. So we're hoping that you never send anything to escalation and that we can resolve it well before it gets there.

DANKO JEVTOMIC: Okay. Thank you for that.

Then we will move to the next subject is RZERC and Peter Koch from .de will tell us a bit more. It's the Root Zone Evaluation Review Committee that was also set up after the IANA Transition to help us as a community take care of the most critical technical issues we might have.

PETER KOCH:

Thank you. That was almost half of the presentation already because you will see there is little to report except a bit of progress since my report from the previous ICANN meeting.

First of all, there's a website now that was set up where you can find all the documents that describe what the purpose of RZERC is, what it deals with, and who the members are, and [I'll] go into a bit more detail during the presentation.

RZERC – the Root Zone Evolution Review Committee – what is this? We have a committee with a similar name that does something completely different which is the RSSAC – the Root Server System Advisory Committee. There's a overlap between the two. Both deal with topics and issues around the Root but what was the RZERC designed for?

It is a result of the Transition process, as was already mentioned, and it was brought into existence to fulfill a tiny role that the NTIA had. We all know that the NTIA had an operational role in “approving” changes to the Root Zone. This is not what this committee is set up for.

The other thing amongst many more others that NTIA did was approve of architectural changes, and what is going to be considered an architectural change will be subject to discussion, of course, and I will give you just one example: the introduction of DNSSEC to the DNS Root was definitely an architectural change. That is not necessarily the minimum threshold, a change like that, but we know that that is a sufficient change to invoke the committee because NTIA was involved at that time.

So think of changes in that dimension if you think about this committee, which also suggests that the committee will not be invoked very frequently, hopefully at least because we don't anticipate or foresee so many architectural changes here.

The architectural changes to the Root Zone Management and to the Root Zone itself doesn't deal with Root Servers, especially not with individual Root Servers. All these topics are covered by RSSAC. The Root Zone Evolution Review Committee is not there to make decisions but eventually to advise the ICANN Board regarding those decisions, and we are set up to consult the community to get the most broad input and the most competent input that we can get.

This is the URL. You can find all the details there. I'll just give you some more information.

The RZERC is set up of nine individuals that have been appointed by nine different organizations, that is, the two names community organizations – I will [unpolitely] start with the ccNSO and therefore with myself. We have the Registry Stakeholder Group and the GNSO

represented by Howard Eland, Carlos Martinez from the Address Supporting Organization, Jim Reid appointed by the IETF, Kaveh Ranjbar from the ICANN Board, Brad Verd from SSAC, Russ Mundy from SSAC, Duane Wessels represents the Root Zone Maintainer aka Verisign, and Kim Davies over there is the PTI appointee.

Other than the CSC, this committee has nine equal participants and it is set up to decide by consensus for given values except in the case where we do elections, and I'll come to that in a second.

You can see the progress update here. This is all just copied from the website. We haven't met in person so far. One of the reasons is that the initiation was a bit late in late November last year following the preliminary appointments and then preliminary appointees being replaced and so on and so forth. So it took some time until we had the committee set up stable. We had three telephone conferences since then and we may or may not have an in-person meeting for community outreach next time, but that will be communicated early in advance.

During these sessions we've actually not dealt with any subject topic that we were tasked to but did some administrative issues like looking at the Charter, getting a common understanding of what the tasks are, and finally also electing a Chair, and the Chair is Duane Wessels, as I said, the RZM Representative from Verisign.

We decided to publish everything we do, that includes the minutes of the meetings, and it will also include any transcripts should there be any, and it will definitely include the recordings from the telephone

conferences. And the telephone conferences are also open to observers. Notifications will be available on the website. The reason that the February 28th minutes aren't published yet or at least weren't when I took the screen shot, is that we had some discussion over some wording issues there but that's going on and it could actually follow that discussion on the archive or the mailing list which is also completely open.

That means we have two documents. One is the Charter. You see that at the bottom of the slide – the Charter that was actually not designed or built by the committee but then the one document where we summarized the requirements for being a Chair, the role and the tasks of a Chair respectively. And the task of the Chair actually is to run the meetings – no surprise – and represent the committee if the need be, that is, if there is no actual liaison for a particular constituency or there's any other necessity to represent the RZERC anywhere else.

What [are] we going to do? As I said, exercise openness. You can follow and read and listen to anything that was said. We're going to reach out to the respective communities – I'm hopefully doing that just now and here – explain the committee's purpose, and if what I've said so far wasn't sufficient, I'm happy to answer questions in the Q&A.

And the basic idea is that the committee sits and listens. The committee is not going to hunt for work and define or suggest architectural changes to the root system itself. It is waiting for input.

Architectural changes to the Root should not happen accidentally and should not come as a surprise, so there will be time which is the

reason why we can just wait for issues to appear with ample patience, of course. And again, we're not going to hunt for work, which doesn't mean that we're not going to do the work. We will be committed but things need to be brought to the committee.

Other than some of the ACs, we will not be asked for anything that happens. We have a very, very focused mission and we've tried to stick to that and fulfill that to the best of our knowledge for the benefit of the community.

And I guess that was basically it. Any questions?

DANKO JEVTOMIC:

Okay. I see we have a question. First of all, thank you, Peter, for clearing everything very [detailed] because for us sometimes it's not easy to all get all through these new changes and now we know the full function of the RZERC.

Ondrej, please.

ONDREJ FILIP:

Hello. I'm Ondrej Filip. I'm from .cz. I think many of you know what will be topic of my question. We are quite progressive registry and in our country we have a lot of domains signed by new algorithm ECDSA, and it is also a lot of technical [identities] so we decided to [sign own] domain by that new algorithm as well. However, IANA or PTI is currently not ready. That's understandable. It's a new thing. So we informally requested to help us with that issue. Today morning I was

assured by Kim that there is [broken process] on that issue although there is no date set yet.

That's fine, but the question is more general. Is there any process about implementing the new standards that IETF agrees or is there any way how this will work in the future or how this should work? For example, if we have some issue, whom should I talk to – to RZERC or to CSC or PTI directly? That's a little bit unclear to me so I just want to understand how to resolve such issue in the future. We are a registry obsessed by new technologies so I'm sure it will come again in the future.

ELISE GERICH:

Thanks for the question. We do collect requests for features and enhancements to the Root Zone Management System to add new, in this case, elliptical curve algorithm, and we have to prioritize those requests with other things that are going on obviously. But if you want to submit a request, and sometimes requests don't get done as fast as other requests, you can do that by sending it to iana@iana.org, and we do track that and we keep the list.

Primarily Kim maintains it but I know you can send things to anyone as an individual, but if it goes to iana@iana.org then we can have a system for tracking them and seeing who else might ask them. Because if I got one request and Kim got one request and Naela got another request, it could very well be that we don't really know that we're getting a lot of requests for the same type of enhancement.

So I would send it to iana@iana.org, and we'll speak more in our presentation about what we're doing in this area right now for your specific request.

[DANKO JEVTOVIC]:

So I went back to the first slide and just to clear things to the end, the RZERC will consider issues raised by any of its members, the PTI, or by the CSC. So direct proposals by ccNSO members should go to iana@iana.org

PETER KOCH:

Or to [yours duly] representative on the committee. However, in that particular case I would expect that the threshold of architectural change is not met. However, I can understand that in the course of this we might identify gaps not in a single process but in the concert of processes.

There seems to be violent agreement that the suggestion made by CZ.NIC is valuable and we want this and it's a matter of priority. There might be other topics coming up regarding technical changes and so on and so forth, definitely not for RZERC to deal with. This is not a micromanagement body – and I know you don't suggest that but just to make this crystal clear – it's not a micromanagement body for IANA/PTI. It's not even a management body for them. They have a Board for that. Thank you.

DANKO JEVTOVIC: So it seems that we are a bit ahead of our schedule, so if there are not any more questions I would like to give microphone to Elise Gerich from the PTI for the PTI presentation.

ELISE GERICH: Okay. Thank you.

Hi. We're always happy to come and give the IANA Names Function update to the ccNSO. We'll have tag-teaming through this presentation. So first, Lise Fuhr, who's on our PTI Board will give a short little conversation about what the PTI Board is and is doing. Then Naela Sarras to my left, your right, will talk about the reporting that PTI is doing at this point in time. And for those who may not be in the know, PTI stands for Public Technical Identifiers. It used to be called Post-Transition IANA. Then I'll take the clicker back and I'll talk a little bit about the FY18 budget. And then finally the pièce de résistance is all about our technical development and policy, and I think that's probably where all the most energy will be spent.

Lise, I'll pass the clicker to you.

LISE FUHR: I don't have any slides and I know you have a picture that I don't like, so I'll leave it here.

As Elise is saying, just to give you a brief update on the PTI Board. As you might be aware of, the PTI Board is five persons. It's Elise Gerich, it's Jonathan Robinson, it's David Conrad, it's Akram Atallah, and it's

me. So we're two – we're not supposed to call them Independent Directors – but we are not from the ICANN family or the ICANN company. We are from the ICANN community. That's Jonathan and me. And Jonathan Robinson is the Chair.

Right now, the PTI Board is in the midst of actually creating procedures and establishing norms within the Board. Jonathan and I went over to Los Angeles in January, and we did that because, of course, we've been working a lot with ICANN. We found that we know a lot of IANA, but we actually wanted to meet the staff and also to see and understand some of the core operational issues. So in order to actually get to see the organization itself we went there for two days and we also had a Board meeting.

We've had – I can't remember if it's three or four Board meetings – but it's all on the website so if you want to look into what the resolutions are and the subjects that we discuss you can see that on the PTI website.

Furthermore, we're now looking into a thing that's a very boring thing but very important, and that is actually to create a document of responsibilities. So we're trying to look into what's the responsibilities of the ICANN Board, of the ICANN CEO, and the PTI Board, in relation to PTI itself. So we will make a legal document also when we have [established] this table of responsibilities.

And this is everything going from human resources, budget, follow-up and target, etc. It's all these nitty gritty details that you never think of when you actually establish a proposal like we did, but we still need to

be crystal clear on who has the responsibilities, who has the duty to react, and actually to create a common understanding of this. So that's actually something that we will be looking into together with the PTI Board itself and ICANN Legal.

Regarding the CSC, this has not been mentioned in responsibilities part because that's another function that the CSC has and we need also to create and be crystal clear on the relation between the CSC and the Board, and that is also to be worked out. So this is very much a work in progress and we'll try to keep you all updated and be transparent about what's going on because I think it's important in this phase that we agree and get things settled and then have something that is crystal clear to be posted on the website.

Jonathan and I are trying to actually attend the CSC meetings, not as liaisons because that's Elise who is the official liaison, but for us it's important to know what's going on in CSC and understand the dynamics. So we will follow this and [have] been doing it since it started.

Last but not least, both Jonathan and I will actually apply for a second round as PTI Board Directors. Of course, this is up to the NomCom, but I just wanted to inform you that we think that in this phase where we're in the middle of forming a lot of issues we find that the continuity is really important.

[That was] my five minutes. I don't know if there are any questions.

ELISE GERICH: Any questions for Lise about the PTI Board itself? If not, if you'll please pass the clicker to Naela.

NAELA SARRAS: Thank you, Lise. Let's try the clicker. And we won't dwell on your picture, Lise.

Thanks, everyone. Thanks for giving us time to come speak with you here. I have just very few slides on the reporting, and specifically what we wanted to do is draw your attention to the CSC report that Byron spoke about and give you a lot of good details about what appears in the report.

This report – and Byron explained it captures the 63 measurements that the Design Team A came up with. It's 99% an automated report that we generate once a month. The first couple pages do a summary of all the 63 measurements and then highlights in yellow what the exceptions are, and then we elaborate on the exceptions in a separate section. That's the manual piece of it.

This is a great report. We're happy to be producing it. However, it is a one-time capture report that we generate at the beginning of the month. What we're more excited about in this phase here now is, since the Transition and the implementation of the Dashboard, all these measurements are actually being collected real-time and anybody here can log in and check out this Dashboard. We actually encourage you to go and produce it.

I've worked in ICANN for years in the IANA department and we've never had this type of real-time collection happening. We keep an eye on it every day just to see how we're doing and I encourage you to go see it. It's got all 63 measurements plus other data that's more informative for us to keep an eye on. Just take a look at it. I think it's a great tool. It's something that came out of the Design Team's work and it's certainly something that has made my life easier [as] someone who manages the team behind this work and there are even other enhancements that I'd like to see in this tool.

The Dashboard, this is a new tool that we have. I wanted to just also draw your attention to the fact that we still have all the other reports that we used to produce, so always go to iana.org/performance for our performance report. I think one report that this community might be interested in is the Root Zone changes that happen in course of a month. That report is still being generated and posted at the beginning of the month. So take a look at it.

Any reports that we have are on iana.org/performance, and if you have any enhancements requests or things that you'd like to see on the Dashboard we'd be happy to hear.

That's it. That's all we wanted to say about reporting. I'll pass it back to Elise.

DANKO JEVTOVIC:

Maybe do we have some questions for this part? It may be easier.

I have a question. Are all of the 63 metrics Byron mentioned on the report site?

NAELA SARRAS: Yes. All 63 metrics are in the report and they're also in the Dashboard, and the Dashboard has additional things that we also like to see that are not part of the metrics that we have to report on.

DANKO JEVTOVIC: Great. Thank you.

ELISE GERICH: Thank you, Naela.

Talking about the FY18 PTI Budget. I'll give you a little bit of background before I read the slide that's up there. As part of the Transition one of the requests from the community was that PTI or the IANA Functions Operator would complete a budget and adopt it in advance of ICANN's budgeting process. And so we have done that.

We started the budgeting process obviously before we even became an incorporated organization because we realized that was a requirement and we needed to get a head start. The budget was posted for public comment in December of 2016. We posted the report on that in January. And at the PTI Board meeting on January 18th the PTI Board adopted the budget.

The next step for that budget is to go to ICANN to be incorporated into the ICANN budget because PTI is an affiliate of ICANN and we're a cost center, so the only way we get our money is to get it from ICANN. So the PTI budget is adopted by the PTI Board, it's submitted to ICANN for inclusion in the ICANN budget, the ICANN budget is out for public comment right now, and so you'll see that budget in there.

It'll be called the "IANA Services Budget" in the ICANN Budget. That's because it's incorporated there and ICANN could give us more money if they wanted to. But I'm not holding my breath. So if you have any comments about the overall ICANN Budget and you want to see the PTI Budget that the PTI Board's adopted, you still have an option now.

The other bullet I have up there behind me is to let you know that there's the creation of a Caretaker Budget. The community decided that just in case for some reason the PTI Budget wasn't adopted or ICANN was unable to fund the budget as PTI had adopted it, that instead of shutting down PTI and not providing services because we have no money that there would be a Caretaker Budget that would kick in. And the idea on the Caretaker Budget is that the Caretaker Budget would continue to be the budget that was previously adopted until the new budget's adopted.

That's the process. This is the budget that was adopted. It's a \$9.6 million budget for PTI. There's an additional \$0.4 million that's for the Root Zone Maintainer Agreement. So when I just mentioned before when PTI adopts its budget and submits it to ICANN, the IANA Services

Budget will be a total of \$10 million which includes the \$9.6 million plus the \$0.4 million which equals \$10 million.

I've put a link up there if you want to go read the long document with the budget and what's in travel and meetings and what's in professional services, etc.

That's all I really have to say about the budget. Does anyone have any questions?

No? Then I'm – Oh, yes. We have a question.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: Thank you, Elise. I'm sure the detail is in the report but I saw that for 2018 you have a \$9.6 million dollar budget. It's about the same, right? And for 2017 it was \$9 million. Is there any particular reason for the increase?

ELISE GERICH: Where was the...The question is...I'm having trouble hearing. There's an echo.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: It's terrible here. I know. I've been there before.

ELISE GERICH: The question is, what was the increase or why is there an increase?

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: [Why the] increase in the budget, yes.

ELISE GERICH: The increase is attributed to, we have two new head count but they're not getting all that money. There's also some additional travel and meeting time and support for the PTI Board. And then there's additional increase in the administrative fees for shared services with ICANN which includes some Legal for PTI organization as well as financial audits for PTI. Those are more the big buckets of why there was an increase. There's some other smaller ones but is that sufficient?

Great. Thank you.

Yes.

STEPHEN DEERHAKE: Stephen Deerhake, .as. How much is it costing you guys to generate the metrics that the CSC is asking of you, either in terms of man hours per month or annual?

ELISE GERICH: I'm going to repeat it just because of the echo. "How many man hours or cost is it associated with generating the metrics?"

STEPHEN DEERHAKE: Yes.

ELISE GERICH: Most of it's automated and I will actually turn over to Naela who does the manual piece of generating the exception part – the narrative. Otherwise everything is done automatically because it's pulled from the real-time Dashboard.

STEPHEN DEERHAKE: Okay. That's good.

NAELA SARRAS: Thanks, Elise. I don't have much to add to that. We have a programmer that works under Kim. That's a big piece of his work or was, between – what, Kim? – like from June until about December of last year? He still does a little bit of maintenance for us here and there or we ask for changes. But it's mostly automated plus his support, the developer's support, and the piece I do [where I] account for exceptions maybe takes me like four hours at the most.

ELISE GERICH: Thank you for the questions. Are there any more? If not, I will pass the baton.

DANKO JEVTOVIC: I would just like to add a comment. As a cc manager I think one of the things we really got from this Transition is that now from the IANA side we got all these automated reports and we really have feedback

what's going on. We have real Service Level Agreements so this is something really [real value] back from [the thing].

ELISE GERICH:

Thank you, Danko. We're pretty happy about it, too. We were somewhat stuck with the type of report we had to produce before and it was not automatable – I don't know if that's a word – we couldn't automate it, and so Naela's team used to spend hours putting together the reports we had to do in the past so this is a real help for us. Thank you.

KIM DAVIES:

Thank you. I'm going to give the Technical Development and Policy Implementation update and in doing so, I'm going to touch on a couple of topics. As you'll see as I walk through them they kind of blend into one another. They're all kind of framed in the context of Root Zone Management System updates because they all in some way or another impact that system.

So I'll talk about Root Zone Management System road map, the key features that we have in mind in the short term and the longer term. Bear in mind this is not an exhaustive list. There are other things we have in mind but these are the key things.

Second item is our new authorization model. I have talked a little bit about this at previous meetings but I wanted to go into it in a little more detail today.

Implementing the Framework of Interpretation recommendations – a lot of the work there is improving our procedures but also there are elements that touch on how our automation systems operate.

Then finally, I just wanted to give a shout out about the rolling the KSK for the Root Zone, which there have been dedicated sessions elsewhere during the week but this is another audience I can fill in about that.

When we're looking at the big picture for the Root Zone Management System – and I'll just preface this by, for those of you who are not familiar with what the Root Zone Management System is – it's the fundamental system we use for managing the Root Zone. It's what you log into to submit changes to the Root Zone and beyond that, it's what we use as staff to process your requests all the way from the beginning to the end. So it manages the work flow through the various steps of processing until it appears in the Root Zone or appears in the WHOIS database.

The future road map is sort of divided into two key distinctions. One is updates to the existing system. Today we have a deployed application. I think it's version 2.2, and for the software developers this would be sort of a minor version release. This just adds some additional functionality to the system that's already deployed. I'll go into each one of these in more detail but the key headlines there [is] some new automated work flows and new DNSSEC algorithm support. They are the things we're looking at for implementing the existing system that you use today.

Following that, I'll talk about a next generation re-architecture that we've embarked on. [The RZERC] management system that we use today had its origins in a [NASC] research project came out of the [CENTR] community over 10 years ago now. In fact, I think it started almost 15 years ago. As a consequence, a lot of stuff [has] built on top of other stuff from many years ago and, given the nature of some of the changes we want to implement and the technical difficulty implementing them in the system that we have today, we're really looking at a ground-up re-architecture of the system in a major new release. So a lot of the components that we've relied on for over a decade are being re-architected and being re-implemented using modern frameworks and modern techniques.

So some of the things that will go on that major re-architecture include a new authorization model, new technical check implementation, a new customer API, some new security options, and some of the [facets] of the Framework of Interpretation implementation.

The first item was new automated work flows and that is actually something fairly specific. What I mean by that is that today changes that are made to the Root Zone are transmitted from us to Verisign once we're satisfied all the policy and procedural requirements have been met. Verisign's job then is to actually implement it in the file itself and disseminate the Root Zone file to the Root Server Operators. We do that today via EPP. It's a customized version of EPP dedicated to this task because we had some very specific requirements, but nonetheless it is EPP. And the vast majority of change requests go via

that path. All routine change requests that you might do today are automated via EPP.

There are however a few things that are not. They basically fall into three categories. One is changing the authorities for the Root Zone. This is the Root Servers themselves. Whenever we need to make a change to our Root Server, it's a manual process that we conduct with Verisign.

Similarly, whenever we delete a TLD. Deleting a TLD has historically been something that we essentially never do. It's extremely rare. But with the new gTLD program the rate is increasing a little bit so this is not as rare as it used to be.

And then the act of escalating a change request to be an emergency. We have procedures where we engage with Verisign to elevate emergency changes and they get done rapidly, but we have no electronic way we signal that to Verisign's system so this would be implementing a mechanism of doing that via EPP.

Essentially if we implement those three things, 100% of the interactions we need to make with Verisign for Root Zone changes will be automated. This is something that we aim to do not just because it's a good idea, but it's also stipulated in the Root Zone Maintainer Agreement between Verisign and ICANN.

The next topic is new DNSSEC algorithm support. You heard Ondrej talk about this a little bit a few moments ago. The DNSSEC algorithms that we support in the Root Zone are those in green on this graphic.

Essentially why just those and not all of them, it's relatively simple. Those were the ones that were in use in 2010, and that was when we signed the Root Zone and when we deployed our systems. The systems were built around what was in production use at that time.

Over the intervening six years or so, new algorithms have been added, new RFCs have been drafted in IETF and been published. Elliptic curve cryptography is one in particular that there's some interest in in the community to support.

Our aim is to support new algorithms as best we can. The key to that for us is really having mature implementations. We want to make sure our Root Zone Management System is robust, stable, resilient, as befits the Root Zone itself as a piece of critical infrastructure. So for us it's important that we have tools that we can reliably test and depend upon.

Bear in mind, we have various different systems that do different components of the Root Zone work flow. I mentioned earlier the Root Zone Maintainer Agreement. Verisign as part of their checking of what we submit to them also conducts all the same tests that we do. So Verisign in their system has to implement code to do this kind of validation as well. So with that in mind, our aim is to support [mature] algorithms as they become available when we have mature implementations that we can use.

Just one thought on deprecating them – some of the options available over time become insecure. At this time we're not proposing to remove support for any of them. I think that is a discussion that needs

to be held with the technical community. But I think that's something for our later consultation on future development of the technical checks.

One thing I want to be clear is this work is under active evaluation by both Verisign and our development teams. We have running code internally that's being tested and plans are being developed about how this could be pursued in productions. So this is definitely active work but it's still ongoing.

One question I wanted to pose – and maybe it's a little rhetorical for the moment and it's definitely more probably for the technical community – is whether we should consider a new avenue of allowing untestable algorithm types in the Root Zone. The design philosophy behind our implementation is that if we can't test it, we can't put it in the Root Zone.

There is one school of thought that if a TLD manager wishes to use a new algorithm type that our systems don't necessarily fully support, that with them accepting and understanding all the risks that might be associated with that, recognizing that we're not able to validate it ourselves, that they might wish to do so anyway accepting the risk. If this is something the community thought was something worth pursuing, it's certainly something we can have a discussion about.

So whether it's a good idea or not, I personally would like to get some feedback on that issue to work out if that's something we should expand upon.

The next topic was the new authorization model. So what's this about? Essentially in a nutshell, it's a new mechanism we want to introduce for Root Zone Management that really tries to address the main pain points that you've expressed to us with respect to how you manage your contacts for your domain. It's finding a mechanism that is more flexible than what we have today. It allows for you to configure your contacts in different ways to what is possible today. And we believe that this will hopefully address most of the issues we see day-to-day, certainly both by explicit feedback – “We want to do X” – and just generally what we see informally in terms of things we see our customers struggling with.

The key component of this is de-coupling two essential functions that contacts perform today. We have admin and tech contacts in the Root Zone and they do two essential things – one is they're listed in the WHOIS as a place to contact the domain, and two is they need to authorize change requests on behalf of that TLD in the Root Zone. So we're suggesting this new authorization model essentially separate those two functions into two separate things.

Today we're seeking feedback from you. We've commenced some level of development but we're getting seriously into this and we want to get your feedback on this as we go ahead to identify if any course corrections might be needed as we move forward.

So just graphically, real quick – this is the model we have today. Every domain has an admin contact and a tech contact, both of them listed in the public WHOIS, both of them approve change requests, and per

RFC1591 there's an explicit requirement that the admin contact be in the country of the ccTLD. So they're the properties of the contacts that we have today.

This is what we've proposed in the new model. Essentially, the admin and tech contacts just become purely contact points listed in the WHOIS. They play no authorization role. Essentially as TLD operators you might want to list your Help Desk there. That might be the appropriate thing to list in the WHOIS so that if someone has a general query about your TLD [it] can go to the right people into a ticketing system or what have you.

And then we introduced this new concept called an "authorizing" contact. Firstly and importantly this is not published. This is something that you maintain via your private interface. You can add people to it. You can nominate who gets to approve change requests on behalf of your domain. So it could be a person, it could be two people, it could be a whole group of people. That's configurable by you. There's no fixed number. Like I said, one or more. It can be as many as you like.

It must be people. We won't allow role accounts for that. But if you had a role account, every person behind that role account could have their own account. So add your whole technical team. Add them all and give them all individual accounts.

We implement stronger identity controls. Flexible threshold approval options are some of the other things. I'm not going to get into too

much detail. I have presented some of those details in the past but I'm happy to answer questions about that.

New technical check implementation. One of the biggest pieces of feedback we get is that when you do a technical check and it doesn't succeed the first time, you get cryptic error messages, there's not a lot of debugging information, you get spam because every time it reruns a test you get another e-mail. These are all flaws with the existing system that we have today.

So we're really looking at that from the ground up and re-implementing it in a new way. The idea is to give a much better assessment of the technical issues that are presented to you, provide you with self-service access to debugging logs that explain what went wrong, and various other fixes.

I think you would have heard in the earlier presentation about the CSC. We've identified an area where the technical checks can be slower because they run serially so we're totally parallelizing how technical checks are done as well, so that should be more [performing] and quicker technical checks.

For technical checks, this should be a fundamental change to how we do them. The checks themselves remain the same, but the way we present them should be much improved.

Another topic is the new customer API. What this is about is essentially providing a way for TLD managers to programmatically talk to our RZMS. Today if you want to make a Root Zone change, you log in via

our web interface, you type in your change request, you click “Review,” you hit “Submit.” It’s all designed for manual interaction.

Having an API allows TLD managers to write their own software that talks to our system. That allows for fully automated submission of change requests. This is something that we’ve received requests for from time to time.

One clear area where this is a benefit is those of you that manage large portfolios of TLDs. If you needed to do a request like roll all your DS records because it’s that time of year, you can write a script to submit them for all your domains all at once rather than manually keying in fairly cryptic details that are prone to error.

New security options. Some of the things here is adding two-factor authentication, something that we don’t have today. I mentioned before migrating from role accounts to person-based accounts. The reason for this is, it’s very hard for us to authenticate out of [band] who is a role account. So if you’ve lost your user name and password and you need to restore access to the system for whatever reason, if all we have on record is “DNS Department” or whatever, how do you really establish trust to know who that is? So by migrating away from role accounts and ensuring the records that we have for authorizing users is based on people, new options are available to us in order to re-establish trust in identity of the people that we’re dealing with.

Another request we’ve received is the ability for your TLDs to turn off e-mail based submission. You can say, “Only accept people that

authenticate via the website. Don't allow people just to e-mail on behalf of my TLD."

And then finally, a comprehensive audit trail so you can log in and see everything that's happened to your domain, the history, who logged in when, this person changed a password then, and so on. So for those that want the comfort of knowing their account wasn't used by someone else in their absence, they can see everything that was done against their account and against their domain.

FOI implementation. Some of the things here that touch on the Root Zone Management System is terminology changes. There's a number of terms that we've been asked to phase out and replace. "Re-delegation" is one of them. "Sponsoring organization" is another.

And then another one that I'm about to explore in a little more depth is implementing the concept of – I don't think it's called this – but this idea of a "delegation contact." The idea that you nominate specific people that are authorized to approve a re-delegation or a transfer of the domain so that your front line staff that might be suitably capable to approve routine change requests, you have someone more senior or appropriate available to approve giving your domain away to another entity.

The Framework of Interpretation provides guidance that informs how we should implement future requests to delegate or transfer, like I just mentioned. And then some of the key requirements – and like I said, I'm about to get into a little more detail – three things I'm going to talk about today. One is informed consent. There's very specific language

in the Framework of Interpretation that says when we get consent from a TLD operator for them to transfer their domain. We need to ask for a bunch of things and it's quite explicit. Second is the delegation contact I just mentioned. And the third thing I want to touch on is admin contact residency requirements.

I mentioned earlier that RFC1591 obligates the admin contact to be in-country, and the FOI reaffirms this. But if we make this authorization model change I just described, the admin contact is no longer the party that authorizes change requests. It can be just like a Help Desk number and who knows where the Help Desk is, for example. The question I'm going to post to you in a minute is, given that kind of change, does this requirement being tied to the admin contact still make sense or do adjustments need to be made?

Informed consent. I can't read this so I'm sure you can't read it either. But essentially the FOI recommendations have a number of recommendations: that consent must be freely given, that you as a TLD manager have to consider getting legal advice. It's enumerated [in] various paragraphs about exactly what we need to ask for.

Our proposed implementation of this is essentially to have a pro forma consent form that really touches on all those points and when we do a transfer of the ccTLD in the future, we'll be asking the TLD manager to complete this pro forma and execute it in some fashion. Either sign and have it notarized and return it to us, or some other mechanism that's legally acceptable and binding upon them that they agree to

what's stated within the pro forma. That's at a high level what we've proposed for that.

The next thing is how to address the delegation contact. This one was a tough one [when] thinking about how to implement it. The delegation contact in theory will only ever be used once, and that's when you give away your TLD to another party. We're trying to work out what was underlying this requirement, what were the requirements from ccTLDs that really drove this in the FOI implementation recommendations.

I think our take is that you want the flexibility to nominate certain people who can approve delegations but not others. Like I mentioned earlier, you might have junior staff do certain types of change requests and more senior staff that are needed to approve transfer requests.

So our idea here is to take that authorization contact model I mentioned earlier and basically add a setting on a per person basis. You can nominate people [who are] authorized to approve any change request, just routine change requests, or just transfer requests.

For example, if you want your Board of Directors to approve a re-delegation or a transfer, give them all accounts and nominate them as delegation only. If they're delegation or transfer only, they won't get bugged with e-mails for routine change requests like they're oblivious to that. But if there's a request to do a transfer, they will be involved in the process.

So basically it gives you knobs to change to allow you to custom configure it in a way that would work for you. And we're hopeful that if we do it this way, it meets the requirements of the FOI Working Group recommendations. In fact, I think it kind of exceeds them in a way if we've understood them correctly. So that's what we're proposing to implement that particular requirement for the FOI.

Here it is in slightly bigger writing. "FOI interprets RFC1591 to require that the owner operator only seek consent for a transfer request from the incumbent manager and the proposed manager. The owner operator should not seek consent from the administrative or tech contact." That's how it's written on the page.

I'm going to pose a few questions and take a pause for a moment and see if there's any initial feedback on this. My question to you is, is what I've just highlighted, is this requirement satisfied by the new authorization model? Are there concerns that you have that it doesn't? Or the authorization model that we're proposing, does that provide the flexibility to address the underlying concerns that drove this requirement?

Again, the admin and tech contacts are separated from authorization responsibilities, and the authorization contacts can be configured to be for transfer or non-transfer requests only.

The second question I have is, we're trying to automate and use electronic systems as much as possible. I showed you the idea of the pro forma. Is executing this in an electronic manner, i.e. via the RZMS,

is that sufficient or would it be better that this is done via other mechanisms?

I'll pause there and see if anyone has any thoughts on this topic.

Nigel.

[ELISE GERICH]: [Jay to your right].

KIM DAVIES: Jay.

JAY DALEY: Thanks, Kim. It's not clear to me that there is any relationship between the authorization contacts and the admin and tech contacts. So I would naively assume that anybody who is an authorization contact must be some way strongly affiliated with the admin contact or with the tech contact. I'd go so far as to say [as with] the domain name industry there would be a domain name for each of them and an admin or an authorization contact has to have an e-mail address at the domain name of either of the admin contact or the tech contact to be clearly affiliated with either of those organizations.

KIM DAVIES: What we're proposing doesn't have any requirements that they be connected. You configure it the way you think is appropriate. But you nominate the authorizers completely independent, and they can be

the same. So to be clear, we're not saying they have to be different and in fact, our migration from the legacy model to this will be that by default you'll have two contacts and they're inherited from the existing admin and existing tech contact. But if you wanted to list your registry outsource vendor as the admin and tech contact, for example, if that seems to make sense to you, you could, whereas the authorizers could be wholly independent from that list. We give you that flexibility.

JAY DALEY:

The problem with that then is that the public record ceases to be meaningful because the authorization contacts are hidden, don't know about those, and if there's no requirement that they are strongly linked to the public admin contacts or the public tech contact, they could be anything. So we could end up with a public admin and a public tech and authorizers that we have no concept of or any knowledge about, no way to contact, no way anything's known about them.

KIM DAVIES:

My question back to you is, is there an obligation the community knows who can authorize changes to .nz? Or is that an internal management for you?

JAY DALEY:

No. The obligation is that the admin contact and tech contact that are published are meaningful. That's the obligation. And so therefore – [alright, go on, grown up].

KIM DAVIES: I agree they should be meaningful and that's why we proposed to keep them there. They're public points of contact but they're not authorizers of fundamental changes to the domain.

DANKO JEVTOMIC: Sorry to interrupt. I saw that there is one more slide after these questions for the presentation about KSK. Maybe it's better to start with the questions later because I see we will have a discussion so if I can stop you for two more minutes and then...

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: We would just ask for input at this point by Kim.

DANKO JEVTOMIC: I think this is also very important point but I think Kim should finish and then...

KIM DAVIES: I can do it either way. If you don't mind, I'd actually like to continue on this slide, if that's okay.

DANKO JEVTOMIC: [Yeah]. Okay.

KIM DAVIES: Thank you.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: Can I offer some...?

[KIM DAVIES]: Sure.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: I'll just be very quick because I know Keith has got some valuable input but I don't want us to get too distracted in this backwards and forwards on the detail [there]. There's something I want to say at this point. There's a lot of thought gone into this and I'm really pleased to see this. Everybody who's heard me talk on this knows the history and so on going back to long before ICANN existed. I'm pleased to see that you're reaching out here on this at this stage. You've done a lot of work and now you're coming to us for input which is great.

Previously, IANA made unilateral changes where they made both the admin and technical both have to approve. That was a change from the previous automated system run by internet.net. So I'm glad you're doing this on this occasion. And this has been a demonstration of this, that we clearly need a lot of explanation and working through this to see the implications of it, but I see it as pretty positive.

KIM DAVIES: Great. Thank you.

KEITH DAVIDSON: Keith Davidson, disinterested bystander. In response to Jay's comments, there were some people during the FOI process coming forward saying their transfer [or] request for change of technical contact was being held up or it was inappropriate that the technical contact knew that there was going to be a change of registry services for that organization because they're a contracted party. So the difficulty there is the technical contact could deny a transfer away from them and maintain the registry in to the future and that wasn't necessarily always appropriate if a delegation holder wanted to change registry operator.

JAY DALEY: Sorry, but that's satisfied if authorization contacts must be linked to admin or technical and they're all linked to admin. And it can then be authorized by a number of them linked to the admin contact. The issue is those that are not linked to anything with no knowledge about it.

KEITH DAVIDSON: One assumes that if you're doing a transfer, that they have some distinct knowledge about it and are doing it for a specific reason. But anyway...

One of the things that the FOI Working Group I thought had indicated as a requirement was not just the idea of a transfer authorizing person or people but also a process so that you might have in the IANA database that in order to transfer .nz you would need a letter signed

under seal by the incorporated society, signed by the Chair and the CEO, on green paper if it's a Wednesday or whatever the prescriptive process is for that ccTLD so that not just person or people but also a process so that could be recorded. And only when those conditions are met would you proceed with the transfer as a protection for an articulated process on the way through.

Is that part of it or did we not include that in our final recommendations?

KIM DAVIES:

I recall discussing this with you but I don't believe it's actually in the recommendations. It was just a suggestion on how they might be implemented, to my knowledge. I'm happy to be corrected.

I think part of our goal here is to produce a scalable process and within reason. So we're trying to look for something that can hit all the notes, that can be relatively consistent, if possible. If that's not possible, then we can look at it some more.

I guess my thought is, are we providing you with enough knobs to give you some flexibility that would be satisfactory? And I guess it speaks partly to the second question here and so on. But I'm certainly willing to learn more about thoughts on that.

KEITH DAVIDSON:

I don't know if I'm qualified to answer anything on the second question, but I am encouraged. I think everything else that I've seen is

consistent with all of the steps and balances that were felt to be very important for the FOI process. So well done. Thank you.

KIM DAVIES: Thank you.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: My comment is very much in line with the last bit of Keith’s comment. My answer to the second question would be yes. There is something else required. Maybe through an opt-in. So if you don’t want it, this is the process, but as a registry if you want something else you can either file a procedure that you want or you opt for a procedure that you offer. [I don’t know, two-factor] or identification or something like that, a registry [lock like] solution. But for us it would be very important for it to be possible to file a procedure.

[KIM DAVIES]: Okay.

ELISE GERICH: Am I interpreting what you said properly when you’re saying that we need a individual procedure for each ccTLD that could be different so we could have hundreds of procedures, one per ccTLD?

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: Yes.

ELISE GERICH: Okay. That’s what I thought you said.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: I would call it customer intimacy.

ELISE GERICH: Pardon?

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: I would call it customer intimacy.

ELISE GERICH: I still didn’t get the last word. Intimacy, I see.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: How many TLDs are there? It’s not that huge a number. How many of them are transferred on a frequent basis? Less either. And it’s a very, very critical process, especially for a relatively large cc. I don’t think my Board would be very happy, I don’t think most of my country would be very happy if they knew that with a single “yes” I could transfer the whole thing.

ELISE GERICH: No. I’m not complaining about the intimacy. I was mostly curious because of the bootstrapping effort to be able to collect all the data and make sure that we’re – it’s not a process [once] you have it.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: I think you know [inaudible]. Because I think you're aware that [SIDN] has been trying to kind of instruct ICANN how to deal with specific emergency situations where the registry has collapsed and the government now should have the power to do something about it. And I think that would be part of such a procedure where in case of emergency where the registry is no longer operating and not responsive, that at least something can be done. But it is better, I think, beforehand to have a procedure for that than start fighting over procedures when it happens.

ELISE GERICH: I get your point. I'm mostly only thinking about the bootstrapping effort.

KEITH DAVIDSON: One of the reasons for the concept of having multiple processes available or potentially one per ccTLD is that there are so many different types of ccTLDs in actual fact. Some are government run and they may say you need a legislation or you need an Order in [Counsel] or so on. Some other countries may have a requirement for a High Court finding or something like that, and others might just be as casual as, "It's alright as long as it's a Wednesday" or something. Any of those might apply.

KIM DAVIES: I think, without trying to boil the ocean, this is about incumbent operator consent. I think in the context of the broader transfer evaluation that we do, [like we've got] government and significantly interested parties, and we analyze all the other factors as well. We're not trying to cram everything into this one thing. This is just about informed – all those nice things you and Becky say about informed consent – trying to capture those in this piece.

KEITH DAVIDSON: And clearly you understand the requirements, yes. Thank you.

DANKO JEVTOVIC: We are shortly running out of time so if I can [inaudible].

KIM DAVIES: I had one more question on the next slide which was about the admin contact being in-country, and I think Jay's comments kind of reflect this a little bit as well, which is, if the admin contact is fully unbound from the authorizing contact, it's simply a point of contact for the WHOIS that you think is the appropriate place for general administrative queries on behalf of your domain that becomes that and has no authorization role. That's separated. What's the impact on that RFC1591 requirement? It's written in such a way that there's an implication that somehow the management of the domain is in the country and does that need to be reframed or rethought or recalibrated?

That’s an open question. I think Nigel maybe has a comment on that and anyone else have any thoughts on that aspect of it?

[NIGEL ROBERTS]:

Thanks, Kim. A lot of what we’ve tried to do over the past few years both in the FOI, the DRD, and in fact for many years before that, is put ourselves in the mind of the framers of RFC1591, a document which holds up surprisingly well considering its age and the fact that it was written back in the days when the Internet was completely different and not particularly ruled by lawyers, contracts, and things like Intellectual Property and so on.

There’s a very specific construction of this requirement of in-country. First of all, it would appear that the requirement for being completely in-country – and there was at least one ccTLD where this didn’t happen – but the requirement of having just one person, an admin contact, in-country was that the local Internet community would be able to get hold of that person and discuss with them how the Internet would develop in that country. Later on, it became shorthand for saying, “Well, at least that’s something that subjects you to the jurisdiction of that country.” I don’t think that was necessarily the original intention but it was something [that carried] along with it.

So a very, very quick point – and this is something that I know for a personal fact that Jon Postel himself considered – that when we say “country” we do not necessarily mean the country or territory that corresponds to the two-letter code because many (and I speak from a territory) many territories belong to a country. And in certain cases

they requirement was fulfilled by being in – if you want to use the rather imperialistic or colonial expression – the “Mother” country. So if we’re going to do tests here and automate tests and so on, that probably needs to be taken into account. Most territorial ccTLDs are run from within territory but I just want to make that point clear.

KIM DAVIES:

Okay.

I think we could debate the specifics but we’re out of time. Can I ask one favor of you, and this is a suggestion from Debbie, which is, just to get a sense of the room about the authorization model and some of the questions posed – I think some of you have cards with colors on them – just to get a flavor, maybe those can...

[ELISE GERICH]:

[Just raise hands. They don’t have the cards].

KIM DAVIES:

Oh, you don’t have the cards. Never mind. We don’t have enough time to dish them out, I don’t think. So let’s just get a sense, maybe people that think this is generally the right direction maybe with a few adjustments, can you raise your hand if that’s your sense?

ELISE GERICH:

This is if you have general direction agreement, if you think this is going in the right way.

KIM DAVIES: Okay.

And those with reservations that think this needs a lot more work, perhaps can you raise your hands?

And anyone who thinks this is ridiculous, just leave it as is. Anyone?

[DANKO JEVTOVIC]: A lot of work was bit of a tricky part because maybe not a lot of work but [we've] really think this is something critical [inaudible] some sort of a process to be sure that it is in line with the Framework of Interpretation and we are very happy that you are taking this so seriously working on that, but still it's the critical thing for us.

KIM DAVIES: We'll continue to iterate and talk to you and absorb the feedback we got today.

[KEITH DAVIDSON]: One question from a remote participant and this is for Kim, from Elaine: "Would this apply to gTLDs as well or just to ccTLDs?"

KIM DAVIES: It would apply to gTLDs, yes. Sorry, let me caveat that. The restructure separating the admin and tech contact from the authorizing contact,

that would be for gTLDs as well. This whole concept of consent for transfers is not applicable for gTLDs.

[DANKO JEVTOMIC]: So Katrina is looking at me. I will have to try to keep this, we are already five minutes late. [Inaudible].

KIM DAVIES: My last 15 seconds – KSK rollover, I won't talk about it. It's important. If you're not briefed on it, please come up to speed and I have stickers if you're interested up here at the front. But this is an activity that's happening the second half of this year, so if you're not familiar with it, please, please, get up-to-date.

Thank you.

DANKO JEVTOMIC: Thank you for the panel. Thank you for your patience regarding the time. Katrina, would you please come to close our ccNSO session? We love you as our Chair and you have to be here.

KATRINA SATAKI: Thank you very much, Danko. Thank you very much for being here for these two ccNSO days. It's been wonderful to see so many people in the room staying until the end. If you wish, you can of course always join the public ccNSO Council meeting. It's going to be very fun so do not miss it.

We'll reconvene here in this room at 5:00. So thank you and see you soon. And please do not forget to fill in the survey. I'm just being reminded. Survey [because] your responses help us to set agenda for you to make it more interesting.

See you in Johannesburg.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]