SAN JUAN – ccNSO Members Day 1, Part 5
Tuesday, March 13, 2018 – 17:00 to 18:30 AST
ICANN61 | San Juan, Puerto Rico

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: ccNSO Members Meeting Day 1 Part 5. Tuesday, March 13, 2018. Room 209-BC. Starting at 5:00 P.M. and ending at 6:30 P.M.

ABDALLA OMARI: Okay, I think we can start. Welcome back, everybody, after the coffee break. I know you are tired after a long day, but I'm sure the team [can find here] will make it exciting so that we are ready for the cocktail, I hope. We'll have a presentation from the Customer Standing Committee – CSC – Review Team, Root Zone Evaluation Review Committee, PTI update on IANA functions [to] ccTLD community, PTI Board update. The first presenter is the Customer Standing Committee, Mr. Byron. Please.

BYRON HOLLAND: Thank you very much. Well, we have the prime 5:00 slot on the first day, so we're going to make this exciting. Or quick. One or the other. And maybe quick is exciting, right? Alright, well, the CSC continues to meet on a monthly basis, and I would divide the work of the CSC into two primary buckets. There is the work that it was primarily established for which is the work of

reviewing PTI's monthly performance metrics and primarily done through the report that they produce.

We continued to do that, and we had a meeting earlier this week on Sunday and did our regular monthly business there, reviewed the report which met the satisfactory category. There were a couple of items where they had missed a metric, but they are known issues that are being resolved so we saw no cause for concern on those.

The other bucket of work that the CSC is involved in – for the engineers in the room, or is what I would call through the nonrecurring engineering of this committee and process, or kind of the startup side of what the CSC has been engaged in, and that includes building out some processes for the CSC and certainly also for the community. And they include some of the what I would call administrative or process-based activities, like how do we elect a chair? There was no process per se, so we built that process, and I guess that's one thing that we did this past meeting, is we elected the chair or reappointed the chair in this case, so I was reelected chair for a one-year term which is – the chair's term every year has to be renewed.

The other two main things – and these are really the substantive issues – are around building out the remedial action procedures. So if something goes wrong and the PTI is exhibiting a systemic

problem or issue – and that's key, systemic issue, not an individual issue or individual complaint – we were tasked with building out the process by which we could seek redress and have the issue solved, problem solved.

So CSC has been working on that for a number of months and have worked in conjunction with PTI on that, and are essentially at the final deliverable. We had hoped that the PTI Board would have been able to take a look at the proposed remedial action procedures in a meeting prior to Puerto Rico, but I believe the PTI Board is going to be looking at it today, if I'm not mistaken, at a board meeting.

So once they have confirmed their general acceptance of it, certainly within the next meeting of the CSC or so, it's my expectation that we will approve and adopt is as well. So that was one of the big one-time activities that we were engaged in, and we're almost finished with that.

The other issue that we had been focused on was how to modify the service level expectations. What would be the process for that? And as we had gone through the review of the monthly metrics, it has certainly become apparent to us that even though it was a very good first effort in terms of the community determining what the service level expectations would be, as we actually did it month over month, we realized that there are

ICANN COMMUNITY FORUM 61

SAN JUAN
10–15 March 2018

certain metrics that needed some fine tuning. No major changes, but certainly fine tuning. But there isn't really a process to do that other than the big, heavyweight process of bringing them to both the GNSO and the ccNSO through the sort of heavyweight procedure to make a change.

So what we have been working on is fort minor variations in the current service level expectations, what kind of process could we put in place to do that? And I think we've been working on those, and in particular, Jay Daly and one of the GNSO reps have been working out a process, and I think we're in the short strokes of coming to conclusion on those in the next meeting or so as well.

So that will conclude the major one-time activities that the CSC has been engaged in at the outset of the CSC, at which point I expect most of the work of the CSC will be really just around reviewing the monthly reports of PTI and then issuing our own report. And that concludes my report unless there are any questions.

ABDALLA OMARI: Thank you, Byron. Are there any questions directed to Byron? It seems you were very clear. Okay. Martin, give us your report on the CSC Review Team update.

ICANN 61 COMMUNITY FORUM
SAN JUAN
10–15 March 2018

MARTIN BOYLE: Thank you, Abdalla. Martin Boyle, and I'm member along with Abdalla of the CSC Charter Review Team. The CSC – just for everybody's memory – was set up as one of the elements of the IANA transition process and is based on a charter, and because we were so confident in our abilities of writing the charter, we built into that that the charter itself would be reviewed one year after the creation of the CSC. And that would be a one-off review because any subsequent reviews would then come out of normal and regular operation.

So we started our review in October and I gave a report back at the Abu Dhabi meeting. I click and it doesn't move. Oh, right, purpose and scope. Slide two, yes. The review is specifically limited to the charter and its fitness for purpose, bearing in mind it is the framework for the operation of the CSC, for the CSC's role. The review does not cover the effectiveness of the CSC. That comes up in two possible guises in the coming autumn with the review of the CSC and also a review of the IANA transition mechanism, the IANA review process.

We were hoping – and we were quite optimistic – in Abu Dhabi that we would have our final report available just before this meeting, and I have to admit that we have failed to do that. The draft is very advanced, and our current expectation is that we

will publish at the beginning of April. There have been a number of reasons for this, including the two elements of work that Byron has just talked about with the updating of the service levels and the remedial action plan.

So our findings. We learned very quickly that the CSC has been greatly appreciated. It's doing a very good job. And it was recognized that its success in finding its role was partly due to a very limited scope and a very focused mission. And we believe strongly that as this is working well, we shouldn't look to change this at all. So we are happy with that, and no changes there. Can I have the next slide, please?

Similarly, we learned that the membership – and the CSC's made up of two groups. Four members, two each from – nominated by the Registry Stakeholder Group and two from the ccNSO. And then in addition to that, we have liaisons from other communities. The liaisons do not have a vote but have been actively engaged by the CSC. We deemed that that again as a process, as a membership, was working well and therefore, again, no changes were needed.

However, in the period of the CSC being in operation, two of the nominees have ceased to be employed by a registry, one from the ccNSO and one from the Registry Stakeholder Group. And the charter didn't seem correctly to accept that, and so we are

looking at – we are planning to say something that would, with agreement of the Registry Stakeholder Group or the ccNSO allowing somebody who was working with a registry but is no longer working with a registry to continue to work on the CSC.

Meetings and reporting. The first of the items on this list is quite a simple proposal and is based on ensuring flexibility and responding to the likely environments in which people would be working. The original charter has that there will be three face-to-face meetings of the CSC with their communities per year, and of course with the new ICANN meeting structure – and it's still possible that CSC could meet stakeholders three times a year, but realistically, to say that it should do it twice a year makes a lot more sense.

I'll come back to the second item in a moment, because within that sort of general reporting process, the CSC produces a report every month and it goers out to the community. We believe that this is useful. The reports are factual, and that will also be a very early warning for the community if there were issues of performance arising with PTI. So we believe that the monthly report is important.

However, there is also a requirement in the existing charter for CSC meetings – and these are conference calls – on a monthly basis, and that's been quite well used over the year as Byron's

just explained in this extra work, but it was seen that this could be quite a constraining requirement, and therefore we believe that leaving it for the CSC to decide how often it needs to meet on the basis of the input it is getting on the performance of PTI and so leaving it to make it as an operational decision and therefore that is something that can be simplified from the charter.

Byron's talked about the SLE and the remedial action procedures, and so in both cases, we have taken drafts of the work that's been going on within the CSC, and our conclusion there has been that the CSC in cases of minor changes to the service level agreed with PTI can be – should be allowed, obviously giving notice to the community that these things were going to be changed, but not having to go through a major process, and so again just making sure that the changes were made that make the CSC more effective as an organization.

The remedial action process, the current charter includes an example of what a remedial action procedure might look like and also includes the requirements that the CSC look at the remediation process and define and degree the actual working remedial action procedure. And we're now at a point very soon that the RAP will be agreed between CSC and PTI.

Our conclusion is that as this happens, the remedial action process itself does not need to be included in the charter. This is an operational item, and therefore the charter only needs to require that there be a remedial action procedure, that the remedial action procedure be reviewed from time to time. And the document includes that as a requirement. And also that should there ever be a change to the IANA function operator, the CSC and the new functions operator will work to revise the remedial action procedure between them.

This slide picks up on a couple of observations that we made, neither of which really directly fell within our remit because neither of them are included in the current charter. The first is, and as people will have heard all through this week, the concerns of quite how many reviews are taking place within ICANN. And this autumn, we have got the CSC effectiveness being reviewed and we've also got the first IANA functions review which will look at the overall IANA functions, of which the CSC will appear.

So our report will point to the potential over-reviewing of the CSC, particularly given the demands on the CSC and their volunteers to have to respond to both of these reviews, and we will be suggesting that the reviews when they are commissioned pay attention to this so they don't end up doing the same thing multiple times.

The other one was to do with travel support, and the current system is that members of the CSC do not get travel support. And that was probably fine when all the members were supported by their own TLD. As I mentioned earlier, two of the members no longer work for a TLD, and yet one would still want them to be able to turn up to an ICANN meeting. And therefore, we will suggest that there is a need for these members to be able to receive travel funding, and we will be pointing back to the normal ICANN travel funding as being the process for dealing with that.

I'm conscious I actually jumped over a point on a previous slide, and I'll go back to Slide 6 where I said I'd come back to the: include in the charter a provision that the CSC meets with the PTI Board. This is a new item. It's not required in the current CSC charter. We are conscious that the PTI Board has responsibilities for strategy, for vision of the PTI and also for resources for budgeting, and therefore we think that there should be an option for the CSC to requires a meeting with the board, or for that matter for the PTI Board to request a meeting with the CSC, and therefore we will be putting into our document that as a recommendation.

Next steps. As I said, we're hoping to produce the report during the first week of April. There'll be a 40-day consultation period, and then the review team will assess the comments and take

ICANN 61
COMMUNITY FORUM
SAN JUAN
10–15 March 2018

them into account for a final report. That final report will then go to the ccNSO and the GNSO for their review and decision on the report. And then when it comes to charter review, any subsequent charter reviews would be done by the community, and I would expect that to come up at the review of the efficiency, effectiveness of the CSC which happens – I can't remember how frequently – is it every two or every three years? Something like that. And that's my report finish, and I'm happy to take any questions. Thank you.

ABDALLA OMARI: Any questions? It was clear. So Peter.

PETER KOCH   Yes. Thank you, session Chair. So this is about the Root Zone Evolution Review Committee, RZERC. I must say I did not prepare slides because they would mostly look like the previous ones. But if you want to follow what I say you can just go to the website www.icann.org/rzerc, and you'll probably find all the information.

The committee is a bit odd in that it is not a bylaws committee, it is not an AC or an SO, it was instantiated as a result of the IANA stewardship transition to fill a very tiny gap next to the big gap –

ICANN 61
COMMUNITY FORUM
SAN JUAN
10–15 March 2018

or not, tiny gap that the NTIA left in their oversight role over so-called architectural changes to the root zone system.

And the community has kind of a canary function, canary as in canary in the coal mine, which means that the nine members who have been appointed by the various ACs and SOs, including for example the IETF, the ASO, the Registry Stakeholder group and the GNSO and the ccNSO, for which I was appointed roughly two years ago. These members are tasked with learning about proposed changes to this root zone distribution system, architectural changes, whatever that is, and are then supposed to convene and make sure that any of those changes that might be at risk of endangering the security, stability and resilience of the DNS in total be addressed, most likely by a call for public comments and so on and so forth.

So for the one and a half years that he committee has been in existence, first of all, no such concerns have been raised by either the outside or any of the members. we've had 14 teleconferences that were mostly concerned with administrivia like internal procedures, selecting a chair, discussion, how we would react to certain proposals, and finding out what the committee members think could or could not be in scope for the committee given that we have other ACs especially in the ICANN sphere like RSSAC and SSAC that already address the topic of security, stability and resilience.

We found a bit of agreement, and after my last presentation in Abu Dhabi, there was a public meeting which was a tremendous success. We had almost all of the committee members there, and then we had to drag some people in to make it really public. No questions raised, no nothing, which is one of the reasons why we did not repeat the exercise here in Puerto Rico. And then there was another teleconference in December, and after that, the committee has decided to go dormant which is not repeat the biweekly calls or monthly calls until there is any issue raised, and with the exception of a meeting that is probably going to be held in Barcelona to fulfill the duty imposed on the committee by the charter to at least meet once a year.

There might be issues coming up between now and Barcelona, of course. You could imagine of the KSK rollover or other things. I haven't heard anybody from the community saying that they had concerns in that direction. I'm not putting words in your mouth, but if you're thinking those directions – if that is of concern for anybody in the room or anybody in the ccNSO and the wider ccTLD community, the RZERC community could be one address to raise this to.

And this is probably all I can say. All the documents are online on the website that I mentioned in my short introduction. We'll be dormant, there will be a meeting in Barcelona, and should there be anything raised between now and then, I would let the ccNSO

members and the wider ccTLD community know. Are there any questions? Thank you.

ABDALLA OMARI: Thank you, Peter. I think we'll move to the PTI update on the IANA functions [inaudible]. Kim?

KIM DAVIES: Good afternoon, everyone. This is the traditional IANA update. I'm here in my new role, leading IANA, so it's good to be here with old friends. I'll walk through the typical updates, and very happy to hear any questions that you might have.

I thought it would be a good opportunity to acquaint you with the current IANA team. we currently have 15 staff delivering the IANA functions. Some of these are request specialists that you deal with in your day-to-day requests, in dialog as you submit change requests and we clarify them with you. Others are involved in managing the root zone KSK, the crypto offices that hold the key ceremonies and organize all the logistics and development program associated with those. We have two software developers and a product manager on our team whose responsibility is all the new services and product development that I'll get to in a moment, and a variety of other tasks there.

So our team, if you look back ten years ago, is probably double the size. But year in, year out, it's roughly been consistent, plus or minus one position here or there from year to year. And we have no grand plans to significantly alter the size moving forward.

Root zone management system, I just wanted to briefly update you or remind you if you were at the last meeting of what our development activity is here. For those who aren't aware, the root zone management system is our primary interface to TLD managers. It's the web interface by which TLD managers submit change requests for their TLDs, and it's also the system by which we as staff manage the entire workflow processing the change request for all the various steps.

We're currently in the middle of a major redevelopment of the software. The software that we use today has sort of a 15-year heritage to it, and for various reasons, we're building [it] on a modern platform that will address some issues that we've had with the previous codebase, and we're also adding new functionality.

Some of the things we're focusing on is a new technical check implementation where essentially reimplementing the technical checks and also looking during that process to ad some ability to give richer feedback. The technical operators, the technical

people inside your registry will appreciate that because rather than if an issue is found having to have sort of an e-mail exchange with me or some of my colleagues who'll provide very detailed debugging information, they'll help them track and pinpoint the areas of a problem.

We'll also look at refining some of the technical checks. Some of the common reasons they might have to come back can be moved to sort of a self-service arrangement rather than involving having to speak to us. We're also looking at a customer API. This will allow TLD managers, particularly those with large portfolios of TLDs, to programmatically communicate with us. So instead of interacting with a web interface, an alternative way is could build a tool or a script that can automatically communicate with our system. This will both optimize operations in a number of registry service providers but will also allow us to do things like bulk operations a lot more efficiently.

We're adding new security options, things like multifactor authentication and improved [audit] logging of the system. Then finally – and I've not gone into detail here because I know I've presented previous instances – a next generation authorization model which in a nutshell will give you more configurability. Today, we have this administrative and technical contact for every TLD and they're required to cross-authorize change

ICANN 61
COMMUNITY FORUM
SAN JUAN
10–15 March 2018

requests to a TLD, and they're also required to be listed in the WHOIS.

We're going to remove those sort of preconditions and let you flexibly configure things how you want them to work. So you can nominate who you want in the WHOIS, and separately to that, you can define who should authorize change requests for your TLD, and you can assign any number of people. It can be one, it can be ten, it can be any number in-between, and you can set certain staff for example have access to certain kinds of changes, other staff have access to other kinds of changes. So we're developing right now actively. We expect development to continue throughout the year with the launch possibly early next year.

Label generation rulesets, or previously more commonly known as IDN tables. This is a repository that we have on the IANA website whereby those who have implemented IDNs in their registries share their registry policies for knowledge sharing and also as part of a contractual commitment that some TLD operators have with ICANN.

So this started as an informal service, and a lot of the business processes we have around this reflect that. That being said, we've had a real substantial growth for the past year or two,

ICANN
COMMUNITY FORUM 61
SAN JUAN
10–15 March 2018

predominantly due to the New gTLD Program and a rapid growth in the number of new gTLDs that are offering IDNs.

As a result of going from one to two requests per year to getting thousands and thousands of tables being submitted to us every year, we're currently reviewing how we manage that repository. Firstly, we're looking at how we can move an essentially fully manual process to one that has automation built into it.

We're also instrumenting our business processes to report performance. This is something that was highlighted by the CSC to us, and we've been working with a small working team of the CSC. The idea here is in the coming months to have automated reporting on the dashboard that we have today for SLAs. We'll add support for reporting how we're managing the IDN tables. We have been doing some preliminary reporting already, but that's been manually compiled and we're looking now to automate that.

We're also looking at how we can optimize handoffs with ICANN's GDD division. A lot of the tables are submitted to ICANN as part of the contractual review, and if we can optimize that by them automatically passing them on to IANA for posting for example, that can be an area of improvement. And then we're also looking at improving how we actually display them.

So this is just a snapshot of the current prototype of how we're going to expand the dashboard to reflect our processing times for this [LGR] repository. And without going through the details, I think just a few things that are particularly unique about this area of our work. Has very unusual processing patterns where the amount of time taken to process them is highly variable.

So as an example, in January we only had two requests. One request involved posting six tables and the other request involved processing 936 tables. And the amount of work per table is roughly linear, so you can imagine those two requests had vastly different processing times for us to do. And as I mentioned, we're working on the CSC on refining how we present this before finalizing, but I think it'll be in the next month or two.

Our annual customer satisfaction survey for 2017, we sent this to ccTLD contacts who have either requested delegation, transfer or have made routing changes in the past year. We had a 20% response rate from those ccTLDs that did routine changes last year. And of the 13 people that requested ccTLD delegations or transfers, we received three responses. And while that is somewhat small, previously reported – the previous year, we had zero responses, so at least we have some data there.

87% of responses that use RZMS found that the interface was easy or very easy to use. Accuracy and timeliness as has been consistent in previous years were reported as the two most important things for us to focus on. Your satisfaction with our accuracy was 100%, and your satisfaction with our timeliness was 96%.

And then in the freeform area, there are areas for respondents to report customer service issues, and of those two that had issues, they did report that they were either very satisfied or satisfied with how we resolved them.

Just a reminder on our regular reporting that's available to you at any time, firstly, we do produce monthly distillations of our performance to the CSC, but they're available for everyone to read, so they're available on our website as PDFs, and they highlight any areas that require particular attention and then we provide a narrative. So you'll find that anywhere where the SLA wasn't 100% met, we added a textual description as to why that might be, any circumstances that are relevant in judging our performance associated with that. And then we also have real-time reporting, so you can go to that dashboard at any time and that's updated – well, perhaps not real-time, but every three to five minutes, the data gets recalculated, and so you can have a roughly real-time view of our performance.

Auditing is a big part of the culture of our team, and the last few years, we've essentially audited all of our registry systems to check for the control environment, make sure that we have suitable security processes in place, that we follow our processing procedures and so forth. We have a third-party auditor through this, and it's part of our commitment to the community to make sure we're doing things correctly.

We just had our 2017 report, so called SOC2 report. This was issued without any exceptions for the previous year, so that is the best we could hope for. This year, the one distinction is that previous years, it's either covered just the naming function or the naming and the protocol parameter function we do [through] the IETF. This year, it's included now the numbering function as well, so now it covers all the three main areas of our work. The root zone KSK audit is a separate audit that we do. We're still waiting on the 2017 report, but that should be available in the next few weeks.

And then one piece of news here is that we've used the same audit firm since 2010 in doing these audits. We held an open RFP last year to either possibly reappoint the previous audit firm or select a new one. Based on the proposals we received, we made the decision to appoint a different audit firm, so RSM now will conduct the 2018 audit program for us, replacing PricewaterhouseCoopers.

GDPR, obviously a big focus for the broader community, is how GDPR will affect the registry environment such as contracted parties with ICANN, how the WHOIS formats might be adapted and so forth, but IANA as a publisher of data and having customers ourselves, this is an area of focus for us as well. So we're in the early stages of implementing measures associated with GDPR compliance. The good news is our assessment is our model works pretty well with the GDPR principles, and furthermore, the authorization model I just mentioned, by empowering you to modify what's published, what's not and so forth, is well aligned with the GDPR principles we're implementing.

Our assessment is that changes are not likely to be substantial to how IANA delivers particularly the root zone management service as the data that we do collect is justified by business need. That being said, we do need to take some steps. Part of it is developing a privacy policy. We're currently working with the broader ICANN organization on this. It could well be there is a sort of a master privacy policy that includes the IANA functions that covers the whole ICANN organization. An alternative could be there's a dedicated PTI privacy policy that is limited to the IANA functions, and that's something that we're still exploring and we will solve in the next couple of months. And then also in areas where information might be published, then adding

explicit consent steps to our business processes either manually or via web interface refinements.

And then finally, just some other updates. Some of you are aware I used to be the technical director of IANA, so that position is now open. So we're looking for a suitable candidate who might want to work within our team. If you know of any people – I assume you don't want to volunteer your own staff, but if you know others in the community who might have an interest in this, please do pass on that information.

And then lastly, the KSK rollover that you've undoubtedly heard about in previous updates, our current planning is to resume the KSK rollover activity and actually change the signing key on the 11th of October 2018. That would be one year deferred from the original date. This is based on initial feedback we've received from the technical community who – those that we consulted and responded generally indicated that despite the risks, it's appropriate to forge ahead.

That decision isn't final. There is an active public comment period right now, and we're essentially looking by the end of the month that if there are any opinions either endorsing that approach or suggesting we rethink it or do it differently, to get them on the record because we're going to take those public comments onboard and make a final decision on the date next

month. So if you feel strongly about this either way, please do contribute your input to that process. And that was it, so I'm very happy to answer any questions.

ABDALLA OMARI: Any questions for Kim? Alright. Just one concern is our response rate is still low. I think last year it was low, and okay, the improvement this year is very low. So maybe now that ccTLDs personnel are here, they may speak with you offline to find out what the reason is. And the KSK rollover readiness in my country is very low. We did a survey, and some of them were just asking – ISPs were asking, "What is this KSK?" So we'll do it on the public list. Okay. Now the PTI Board team is here. I don't know who is that.

LISE FUHR: Thank you. I am here to give you a brief update on PTI Board for the next hour or so. No, sorry. Last time, I actually used [art] to keep you awake. I'll do this again. I'll not take long. Not an hour, sorry. I use pictures of Banksy and [Dali] to actually illustrate some things. This time, I'm actually going use pictures from a Danish artist called [inaudible] She's very special because her pictures are mixing cute pictures and child pictures and popular culture with some very new and disturbing things. She has her inspiration from horror movies, Alice in Wonderland and a

ICANN 61
COMMUNITY FORUM
SAN JUAN
10–15 March 2018

combination. Just to make it a little more fun to be here on a Tuesday afternoon very late and standing between you guys and the drinks this evening.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: That's the exciting part.

LISE FUHR: Yes, that's the exciting part. Okay. I'll get going. Well, in Abu Dhabi – that's a Banksy picture. Sorry about that, but I spoke about the search for a new PTI CEO. We've heard Kim is the lucky one, and I'm very pleased that Kim has also accepted the offer he was given. And I spoke about roles and responsibilities, I spoke about the budget, operational issues and a new board. I'll touch upon some of these issues too today. As you know, Kim is the PTI CEO. We had a thorough search process, so it was not a given that it was an insider. It was a good process, and Kim started mid-December in 2017.

Here we have one of [inaudible] pictures. I don't know if it's very easy to see on the big screen, but you can entertain yourself with it when I talk about the roles and responsibilities document. That is a dialog that we started in January 2017. We received a draft during the Abu Dhabi meeting of the roles and responsibilities. We're further working on this. We have

ICANN
COMMUNITY FORUM 61
SAN JUAN
10–15 March 2018

discussed with the ICANN CEO and the PTI Board on how to divide or maybe expand some of the responsibilities of PTI, because the ICANN CEO has been delegated the responsibilities of the PTI Board from the ICANN Board, so he's taking care of the PTI and reporting back to his board. So there are a bit of interfaces that we are working on and looking into how to make sure that nothing falls between the two responsibility areas and that everything is taken care of.

If we look at the budget, it was concluded with minor changes. We did get some comments, but none really substantial on the content. But the good news is that we actually managed to combine two open positions, and with that, we decreased the budget by $0.3 million, which is good in these times when we want to save money.

So the budget for PTI is, as you know, a part of the bigger ICANN budget, so we only approve the PTI budget that now needs to go into the ICANN budget that needs to be finally approved. And then the new board, that was decided in November 2017 and actually finally approved by the ICANN Board in December. We had our first meeting in January where the board constituted itself with me as the chair. Sam Eisner is our secretary, Becky Nash is our treasurer, and because both Wei Wang – Wei is our new board member, he will present himself in a minute – and I are conflicted by American [rules], we cannot be on the audit

committee so we need to have an independent auditor, and that is Gary Rolfes. Akram Atallah is also a part of the PTI audit committee. But these are minor hiccups. We can still participate in the audit committee meetings, but we are not voting members because I'm on the board of PIR and Wei has the same of being connected to a registry.

And with that, I have one more slide but I'm going to ask Wei to give a short presentation of himself for all of you, because we think it's important that you know who are the members of the PTI Board. So Wei.

WEI WANG: Thank you, Lise. Hi, everyone. Good afternoon. It is very great to attend the ccNSO event as a PTI Board member. Actually, I'm currently serving in a new gTLD registry, but before 2014, I worked for CNNIC. I used to be a ccNSO member. So it's great to attend the meeting on behalf of PTI, but I really enjoy being a ccNSO member before 2014.

I think we had a PTI meeting, board meeting this noon. We talked a lot about the PTI's future work, and this year, I think there are many important missions the PTI Board needs to work together to complete. Of course, we need to achieve the goal, we need the support from the community, including ccNSO as well as the other community. We'll do our best. Thank you.

ICANN
COMMUNITY FORUM 61
SAN JUAN
10–15 March 2018

LISE FUHR: Thank you, Wei. And actually, you can interpret the female spider as you want in this picture, and I will leave it to your own imagination. I'll proceed with one of my last slides, and that was the meeting today. We had to make a resolution on choosing who is to audit our accounts. We chose BDO, and we had an update where we talked the remedial action procedures. And that was not concluded today – I'm sorry, Byron – but we gave ourselves two weeks to comment on the draft and get back to you with our comments. We hope that that won't delay you too much.

We had an operations update and a 501(c)(3) update which is that we are to be considered a not-for-profit organization, and with the benefits that come from that in relation to tax and other issues. And that is a process that needs to be finalized within 24 months after we established PTI, so we're still on time, but it has not been finalized yet.

Then we discussed the implementation of the proposal itself, and we discussed the roles and responsibilities document, and it's a good process. We have talking about how to interpret the IANA bylaws, the PTI bylaws, and how to make it manageable in a way that is as efficient as possible for all of us.

So with that, I will say thank you for listening, and let's hope that we will not be divided by the big [tray] coming up of the table. But I don't know if you have any questions for either Wei or me, but we're here and we'll be here – I'll leave tomorrow, but Wei will be around if you have questions at a later stage.

ABDALLA OMARI: Thank you. We may need to clap for the team, because there'll be no drinks if we don't close the meeting. Please, a round of applause. So, Katrina, I think – you want to invite the team?

KATRINA SATAKI: Yes, so thank you very much. Thanks for a very successful first day of our ccNSO members meeting. There's nothing particular – I should say now apart from the fact that we reconvene tomorrow morning at 9:00 A.M. and we will talk about how we the community could address cases when natural disasters hit some parts of our world, and we will have, again, presentations from Pablo. We will hear from Hiro and from regional organizations who run surveys in their particular regions to see how well we are prepared, and we'll discuss what can we do to address different issues. And after that, we will have many other interesting sessions tomorrow, so tonight we have a great party thanks to .us, .pr and [Neustar], so see you all there and see you

ICANN 61
COMMUNITY FORUM
SAN JUAN
10–15 March 2018

all tomorrow. Thank you very much for your presentations, and I hope to see you soon. In a few hours.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]