
BARCELONA – ccNSO: Members Meeting Day 1 (4 of 5)
Tuesday, October 23, 2018 – 15:15 to 16:45 CEST
ICANN63 | Barcelona, Spain

ABDALLA OMARI:

Good afternoon. I'm sure it's a tough session coming of the elections and coffee break, but I hope the coffee will keep you awake. The current session is the IANA naming function. We will have presentations from the PTI board, update Customer Standing Committee. That's Byron who will make the presentation. Root zone evaluation review, Peter. Public identifiers update, Kim Davies. So, I think I'll give the floor to the PTI board to start their presentation.

LISE FUHR:

Thank you. Normally or traditionally, we are the last session, but I have to rush off for the airport, so right after this session, I'm actually leaving. This is not because I find the rest boring. I am actually very sorry I can't hear the rest of the presentations. But I just need to go back.

Traditionally, I always have a bit of art sometimes to try to keep your attention, to make a statement or whatever you do with art. This time is not going to be an exception, so of course I have some more art. Next time, we go to Japan. Japan was the country from where I chose two artists because I thought we should have the old Japan and we should have the contemporary, the modern Japan.

As you can see, sometimes an ICANN meeting feels like a wave. It goes up and down. Or you could say that we've been hit by a wave and that's

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.

actually the Internet that came and changed all of our lives and the reason for why we're here today.

This is an artist actually called Hokusai. He was born in 1760, so it's quite a while ago. He was a Japanese painter and artist. This is his most well-known picture that's called the Great Wave off Kanagawa. I don't know if I pronounced it correctly, but this is how it's spelled.

He also did erotic paintings, but not to offend anyone, I have not chosen any of those pictures, so don't be afraid. This is going to be very [inaudible]. Those you could look up yourself. I'm not going to show you those. But, back to business.

This is the PTI board. I have Wei Wang with me and also Kim Davies is a part of the board. But, Kim will also, as the PTI President, give you an operational update. This is more an update on what the board does. I'm just going to tell you a bit on the composition of the board, a bit on the budget, on the strategic plan. We had a board meeting which was not an official board meeting, but more a board workshop. We had that Monday. Then a bit on the transition. So, as you can see, we're still walking the long walk. That's here in the picture. Mount Fuji is in the background, so we have something beautiful to look at.

If we look at the composition of the board, you know that Akram Atallah has actually left ICANN, and because of this, he's also not anymore a director of the PTI board. So, right now, we're five board directors. Usually, we have three appointed by ICANN and we have two nominated by NomCom and appointed by ICANN, but Wei and I are the two NomCom nominated, but we're now lacking one ICANN-appointed

director. ICANN will appoint a new one as soon as possible. We don't have a name yet, but it's still a full functioning board. But [there] needs to be a change.

On the budget, it's FY20 and it's really early to discuss the budget for FY20 but this is because this budget for the PTI is actually an integrated part of the ICANN budget. But, as it is a separate budget still, we would like you to give your comments to the budget and it's out for review right now.

Then, we will get your comments and look at the budget again in the end of November. We hope to actually adopt the budget to send to ICANN in early December this year. Kim will talk more about the budget, but I will actually urge you all to look at it and see if you have any comments or concerns or you think it looks good. Of course, we find it excellent, but that's why we consult you, to see if you have any issues with the numbers.

The strategic and operational plan needs to be dealt with, too. We have started the discussions internally and we are trying to coordinate the timing with ICANN, but ICANN is much longer than we are. They have been discussing this for the last seven or eight months. But this is an advantage for all of us, because then we can see what's already there and take their strategic plan into account. I don't think we will make an alignment with the ICANN budget – the strategic plan, sorry. It's two very different strategies, but we will make sure there's no contradictions between the two strategies. Also, we will find out how we actually can include both the CSEs, the RIRs, and the IETF.

Now we come to the modern Japan and this is a female artist who was born in 1929. Her name is Yayoi Kusama. She has a very ... She does mostly installations. She loves dots and she loves really strong colors. I've seen an exhibition in Denmark of her and that was extremely interesting and funny, too, because you can walk around and experience her art. I like that she's actually using also nature. She has a lot of her art out in the nature in Japan, too.

Our board meeting on Monday, or yesterday, we had – which was not a real board meeting. It was only a workshop. But we actually discussed the operating update. It's good when we are not having that many board meetings to get an update on the operation. Everything looks fine and Kim will give you almost the same update.

We looked at a revised work plan. That work plan will also be out on the website. We talked about the IANA functions review, which is upcoming. It has been started by the ICANN board, but they still need to actually have all the different members in place.

We got an update on CSC. We also met with the CSC also on Monday. I think we'll hear more of that from Byron. The roles and responsibilities and the strategic work, we only make the procedures clear and agreed on those, so both will be dealt with. Roles and responsibilities, we'll have a specific meeting discussing those and concluding, so those can be public for all of you to look at. The roles and responsibilities document is not a legal document. It's more some guidelines for all of us to see because we have a lot of interfaces with CSC, with the board,

and with the other constituencies. Processes and meetings were just to define how often we would like to meet in 2019.

The last point I would like to highlight is what is actually left to finalize the full transition. As you know, our proposal, we actually made a document that described how the transition was to be fulfilled. I must say, most of what's in that document is done and over. But we have one outstanding issue and that's actually the transfer of staff to PTI. They're still working within ICANN, but this is planned to happen by December 2018. This is well before the deadline, which is the first of October 2019. The reason why we would like it to happen in December is because of tax issues. It's easier, actually, to have a clear cut on the first of January.

So, everyone, thank you for listening. If there are any questions, I'm happy to answer. We also have Wei if you have any questions.

ABDALLA OMARI:

Thank you. She indicated she's leaving in the next few minutes, so if you have any questions, you may need to ask her before she leaves. Thank you.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE:

Just for clarity, the staff which is not transferred currently to PTI, however the salaries of these staff, are they already in PTI budget if you know, if you can say. Can you explain?

LISE FURH: Yes, they are in the PTI budget. The thing is that PTI budget is actually a budget where we, first of all, share a lot of staff. So, that is included. But they are included in the budget today, so the budget is not going to change.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: Thank you.

ABDALLA OMARI: Any other questions for her? I think there's none. Okay. The next presentation is by Byron.

BYRON HOLLAND: Okay, thank you. At this point in the year is when the CSC, the Customer Standing Committee, does a review of the year, consistent with roughly the anniversary of the creation of the CSC.

So, first, I'd just like to note that this presentation is available online. I'm going to take you through a summary version, but the full presentation is online if you want to have a little more soak time with it. This version of it is about 15 slides. I'm really only going to touch on four or five, but extremely happy to entertain any other questions.

So, who are we? And we have had a change. The initial membership for the first two years of the CSC has just turned over with two new members. From the Registry Stakeholder Group of the GNSO, a gentleman named Guarav VEDI has joined and replaced [Cal] who I think most of you know is one of the original members for the first two

years. I should note that Elaine, who has a three-year term will be staying another year. One of the original members as well was just elected the vice chair of the CSC only a couple of days ago.

Then, we have a new member, a ccNSO-appointed member, Brett Carr, who is from Nominet. I'll just call him out right now. Brett, are you in the room? Do you want to just stand up for a second? There's your other appointee, my partner in crime, from the ccNSO. He's also somebody that you can talk to about CSC-related issues if you want.

There was a little bit of turnover with the liaisons. About half of them turned over.

Of course, the main task of the CSC is monitoring a performance of PTI to ensure that they are performing at the level that we expect and need and the level that they have committed to.

So, as I think probably most people in this room know, there are 63 metrics that we look at on a monthly basis and we give them a rating of excellent, satisfactory, needs improvement, depending on the metric itself and the tolerances associated with it. I think the good news is, over the past year, their performance has ranged between 95 and 100%, and quite frankly, when they haven't hit 100%, generally it's been a result of the technical check or a couple of the technical checks, where the discussion around the metric itself has lead us to believe that we actually need to change the metric itself, and also, in this particular case, PTI is doing some development work that will in fact eliminate some of these misses. So, as a result, we actually consider the

performance of PTI over the past year to fit into the excellent category. So, that's definitely the good news.

Over the past year, clearly the fundamental substance of what the CSC does is monitor performance. However, being that this entity, the CSC is new and not all of its procedures had been articulated in the original charter, we actually had to do some of the bootstrapping for the committee itself in terms of developing our own processes and procedures, a couple of which have come to completion or are well along the way.

The first is the remedial action procedure. That can be invoked if there is a really systemic or persistent issue that we, as the CSC, note and is not being remediated to our satisfaction. So, we've developed a process that has an escalation process through the PTI board onto the ICANN CEO and then onto the ICANN board. Each one is its own defined step with several criteria. It's published on our website. So, please avail yourself to that so you can see the nitty-gritty. It's a five-page document. It's a pretty quick read. But, suffice it to say that there is a clearly defined procedure in place now.

That said, there will be a few edits in place as a result of some of the work that the Charter Review Team has done. Minor edits, nothing substantive. But, you can see the document there.

So, the other main piece of activity that we've engaged in is around some of the SLA or some suggested changes to the SLA and that is because, as we have gone through the monthly process a number of times, we've really come to note that even though their best efforts

were put against developing those 63 metrics, some of them were highly educated guesses at what they should be, but as time has rolled on and we have more experience with it and we've been able to really think about the tolerances and the associated metric, there are some things that we think bear changing.

So, the challenge right now is if you want to make a change to any of the SLAs that's in the contract itself, which is has a very high bar to change and is a very heavy weight process. So, one of the things that we've recommended is essentially that we take the SLA itself, the specific metrics, out of the contract and make them a separate document, so that we have the opportunity – with significant consultation, there's a full process still around it – but that, over time, as required, we can make recommendations to finetune the SLAs without having to crack open the contract and all of the activity that that triggers.

So, we're well down the road of suggesting a process or working through a process for that, but that's the other significant piece of work that the CSC and PTI has been involved in during the course of the past year.

One of the other significant pieces of work has been around the various community-led reviews, starting with the charter review. So, at the outset of the CSC, one of the things that was required was that, after the first year, we had to do a charter review to see if it was actually working. I mean, there's the theory, but then there was the practical. Is it working effectively?

So, the charter review was launched during the course of the past year and came to conclusion this past June. So, this is a published document. You can see it, including a track changes on what's old and what's new.

By and large, what I would say is there were really just fine-tuning elements for the most part and a recognition of some of the changes over time.

So, for example, the remedial action procedures that I just talked about weren't in existence when the original charter was created. So, the updated charter recognizes that there's a remedial action procedure, for example.

Another thing that had recognized was, in membership, of which there's four members, it spoke specifically to being a CC operator. What we experienced over time was, unsurprisingly, sometimes people changed jobs. And in our case, for example, Jay Daley was an individual who changed jobs during his tenure and actually went from being with the CC to, as we now know, he's with a G, with dot-org. That happened in this year, so it made the language a little more flexible. It just says a representative from this community. So, we as a community, have a little more flexibility in who we choose. So, I would say there are minor changes or changes that just recognize an evolved circumstance.

So, that review happened. Now we're into the CSC Effectiveness Review, which after two years, we were mandated, or the community was mandated, to do a review of the CSC's performance. Were we

discharging our responsibilities effectively? That review has effectively started.

So, the other review is the IANA Functions Review and that's getting rolling. That's not specific to the CSC, per se, other than clearly it's a subject near and dear to our hearts, and the CSC has a liaison to it. We have appointed James Gannon as our liaison. So, there's a fair amount of review work that we've been engaged in over the past year as well, which carries on.

So, in summary – and again, this document is available, so if you want to see fuller detail, please take a look at it. Also, on our website, just to do a short merchandising and marketing announcement, all of our reports are on there. There's a considerable amount of information about what we've been up to, but more importantly, how PTI is performing.

So, the good news I think is that, over the course of the past year, the performance of PTI has been very good. As I said, some minor metrics missed. Certainly nothing substantive. Without any customer service impacts or operational problems. I would also say that the relationship between CSC and PTI has been quite collaborative and constructive. I think there might have been some anxiety about what that relationship would look like in the early days, especially flowing out of the whole transition, but it's become a very constructive and candid relationship.

Most of the heavy lifting on the one-time efforts that the CSC will be responsible for, like the remedial action procedure, are either behind

us or very nearly to be behind us. Revising the SLAs will be the last big piece and that's ongoing.

So, to that end, I would say that the CSC is working well and I think that's been the general consensus from not just from me, but the effectiveness review thus far. So far, so good. Year two for PTI was an excellent year.

This concludes my review of the year for CSC and PTI.

ABDALLA OMARI:

Thank you, Byron, for the detailed explanation. Any questions to CSC or clarifications? It seems you are very clear. Peter? Sorry.

PETER VAN ROSTE:

I'm just not quick enough today to get to the mic in time. Thank you so much for the update, Byron. Could you tell us a bit more on the thinking where you're looking at the metrics and the success rate of PTI 95.3 until 100%? And the thinking on maybe the metrics [inaudible]. What changed from the time that we set them three years ago where we thought they were quite challenging to now?

BYRON HOLLAND:

There are a few metrics where I think the original metric itself was a best efforts educated guess, and as we've gone through them month after month and seen what's actually happening, just some of the tolerances could be finetuned now with the benefit of two years of actual data versus best efforts guess. So, it's really around finetuning some of that.

There are only a few that we're really looking at. The technical checks one, maybe Kim will want to speak to that a little more. Or maybe I will hand it off to him.

But, essentially, what was happening is sometimes multiple requests are coming in, in rapid succession, and processing is in serial, not in parallel. So, even though an individual check was happening, in the right amount of time, the fact is they were stacking up, so the last ones seemed very delayed. That's going to be remediated through development efforts, so it's not a perfect example of what I'm talking about. But really, it's about now that we actually have data, some of the things could be finetuned to better represent the actual needs.

ABDALLA OMARI: Any other question for Byron?

BYRON HOLLAND: I think one last point on that. Any of these changes, if there are changes to be made, just to reassure everybody, the four members of the CSC are not making those unilaterally. That would go through an entire process of which communication and participation by the two communities, ccNSO and GNSO, is part of that process. So, no changes are going to be made without it coming to this group and walking through the process, the rationalization, etc. So, this community still has their say on whether an SLA would be changed or not.

PETER KOCH:

Thank you, Byron. Thank you, Abdalla. I am now going to give you the regular update on the Root Zone Evaluation Review Committee.

So, what is this about? I believe that many people have seen that presentation before. It will be slightly different at the end, so bear with me.

For those of you who don't know, the Root Zone Evaluation Review Committee, although it is phonetically similar to the RSSAC, the RZERC is different. It has a different task. It came into existence at the end of the IANA stewardship transition and it was installed mainly to take up one tiny function of the NTIA, which is the approval of – it was the approval for NTIA on the NTIA side of so-called major architectural changes to the DNS root system, which would have included, for example, the introduction of IDN domain names, the introduction of DNSSEC into the root zone and similar things.

Now that the NTIA is no longer involved, the committees around the stewardship transition believe that there should be another committee taking over this function. The committee is comprised of nine individuals that I'll show on the next slide.

All of the materials are on the ICANN website on this URL. That includes the charter, the membership, and probably more importantly, recordings and transcripts of all the meetings we have and the documents the committee has produced so far. This is supposed to be a low activity committee that will only wake up from its dormant status from time to time when there are major architectural changes to discuss.

So, nine entities appoint one individual each to the RZERC. I am your appointee, the appointee of the ccNSO. We have the GNSO Registry Stakeholder Group, the ever-supporting organization, the IETF each sending one, an ICANN board liaison. Then the two advisory committees, SSAC and RSSAC, the root zone maintainer (that's Verisign) and PTI. All nine members of the committee are acting on equal footing and the chair of the committee has been I think from the beginning Duane Wessels from Verisign representing the RZM.

So, what's the most recent activity? Last time I presented you that we had two questions on our table. We dealt with them one way or another. I'll come to that in a second.

Essentially, we've published the first non-procedural document, which is the response to a question from the ICANN board regarding the DNSSEC key signing key rollover for the root zone. The other thing I would like to bring to your attention is that tomorrow, 10:30, we will have a public meeting in room 127 where you will essentially see a slightly different version from this presentation and can ask questions to the whole committee if you so desire. I'd invite people to actually come there and talk to us if you have any concerns about root zone evolution, strategic things, architectural things that are happening at that level. Next one.

So, in terms of meetings, we've had two teleconferences since last time with the whole committee to deal with the two questions on our plate and a couple of work party sessions in between. We've also had a face-to-face meeting yesterday, on Monday. Next one.

So, the two issues that I mentioned were the DNSSEC root zone KSK rollover, and if anybody here has never, ever heard of that, be brave enough to raise your hand. Thank you for that reinforcement.

So, this one was special circumstance. The KSK rollover process, the design of the process and anything around it was started before the end of the transition, and with that, before RZERC came into existence, that was the reason why RZERC was not part of the deliberations or the oversight of that process.

However, after the root zone KSK rollover had been postponed for a year in 2017, and further research had been conducted, the ICANN board was especially eager to get advice from both the Root Server System Advisory Committee and the Security Stability Advisory Committee which are bylaws committees. But also from RZERC so that question on whether to proceed and with RZERC would have any specific input to the KSK rollover process was put to the committee and we responded to that. I'll get to the details on the next slide.

The other issue brought to the committee was also a bit special in the sense that it wasn't really addressing an architectural change, but a study that was to be conducted under the auspices of the office of the CTO, the so-called OCTO team, and the study was inspired by CCWG proposal. So, again, going back to the genesis of all this and the transition. The idea of that study was to examine and understand whether there were any open security issues in the root zone maintenance or root zone management process and OCTO had come up with some draft text for an RFP to an external party.

We had some discussions informally going back and forth between RZERC and OCTO, and in the end, the office of the CTO decided that the question to the RZERC should be withdrawn because – and they are right, in a way – formally, OCTO is not a party that can actually invoke RZERC, because if you look at the charter, RZERC can be asked by any of its members, PTI which again, is a member or has an appointee on RZERC, as well as the Customer Standing Committee, but not by departments of ICANN.

Now that RZERC, of course, has knowledge of this, we may or may not consider to follow-up on the question, but this is only receiving little attention.

However, I encourage everybody to look into the proposal. The URA is in the slide material, if you're interested in what gap this study is trying to address.

Now, we have our first document, which is RZERC 001, like the first non-procedural document. There was a response sent to the ICANN board in response to the question regarding the KSK rollover and later published on the website on 10th of August. It's a one-pager, again, available on the website, on the main website, just as I pointed out.

It basically doesn't really look very different from what the other committee said when asked whether the ICANN board should say yes to the KSK rollover. None of the committees were very eager to take that decision out of the board's hands and neither was RZERC. If you look at the end of the response, it will say that the committee would like to make some suggestions regarding the frequency of future KSK

rollovers. That's a part of the document that I'll come back to on one of the next slides because it touches upon what the actual role of the committee really is.

So, you know how the overall story went. The ICANN board approved the KSK rollover for October this year with one no vote and one abstention and things proceeded as planned, and so far, there's only one minor issue reported. All went well, but that doesn't necessarily mean that the concerns raised in advance were [inaudible] and [justified].

In the context of the committee and the governance question, it's probably interesting or important to see that this is not so much a technical but a governance question when it comes to determining if we change major parts of the infrastructure, can we assess in advance the negative impact, and if we cannot completely prevent negative impact, how would we arrive at thresholds of how many users or systems we would leave behind.

So, next steps. I just said that tomorrow will be a public meeting. We'll then go dormant again probably until January. But in the meantime, on the mailing list, we'll again review the role of the committee or our individual stances of the role of the committee. In the light of the KSK rollover response that RZERC rolled, it seems a bit too technical. That's my personal opinion on one hand. And we figured out that the consensus-building in the committee was a bit difficult on this particular topic, so we are trying to take this lesson into account and

maybe adjust the procedures or flesh them out a bit. I think that should have been ... Yeah. That's the final slide.

We currently don't have any issue in front of us. We do know, though, that there are discussions around scheduling the next KSK rollover and frequency and so on and so forth, but unless and until there are concrete proposals to work on, the committee has not yet taken this formally up for consideration. Any questions or comments? It does not seem to be the case. Thank you.

ABDALLA OMARI: Thank you, Peter. Maybe you are very clear or too complicated.

PETER KOCH: Probably the latter.

ABDALLA OMARI: Okay. Our last presentation is from Kim.

KIM DAVIES: Thank you. This is the IANA update for the ccNSO. I don't want to presume that everyone in the room is steeped in all the acronyms and the terminology that we use, so occasionally, just do a quick refresher as to what IANA actually is and also what PTI is.

The IANA is the Internet Assigned Numbers Authority. It's a set of functions that maintain the unique identifiers that we use on the Internet that need unique assignment for them to work and to

interoperate globally. We typically divide these into three areas. The one that is probably of great interest to you is the naming function. This is predominately management of the DNS root zone. What do we do in the DNS root zone? We assign TLDs.

We also operate a number of other domain names related to the root zone and also infrastructure domains as well. The two other areas of the IANA functions are number resources. This is the global IP address space and also the autonomous system number spaces. These are used, obviously, for Internet routing.

Finally, and probably the most complicated part of our work, actually, is protocol parameter assignment. Whilst domain names and IP addresses are a highly visible component of the IANA functions, protocol parameters are kind of the unsung heroes that work behind the scenes to make sure everything works as you expect. This includes the assignment of port numbers, media types, Internet telephony area domains and all sorts of things like that that are used internally within protocols that are not necessarily visible to a user of a piece of software or a technology but are nonetheless required behind the scenes for things to work correctly. There are around 3,000 different Internet technologies that we maintain registries for.

So, that's IANA. What is PTI? PTI is a non-profit organization and PTI is responsible for providing the IANA services to the community. It was created in 2016. Now it's affiliated with ICANN and it's fully funded by ICANN, but it is a not-for-profit organization and is one of the measures that resulted from the IANA stewardship transition process. Prior to the

transition to PTI, those IANA functions I just described were directly performed by ICANN.

So, this is the team that provides you the IANA services. Currently, there's 14 of us. Three of us are here at the ICANN meeting, and in fact, all three of us are in the room today. I'd like to draw your attention to Naela who many of you. And also to introduce you to [Marilia]. This is her first ICANN meeting. She is responsible for our operational improvement activities within the IANA department. Please feel free to reach out to any one of us in the corridor if you have any questions or would just like to get to know us a little better.

So, what's new and what's on our plate at the moment? Customer satisfaction is obviously key to what we do. We want you to be happy and for our services to meet your needs, and getting feedback from you on how we're doing is really the best way we have to judge what we need to do in the future to continue to improve.

Typically, our primary approach of getting that feedback in a systematized way is to perform an annual survey. We've been doing this for a number of years now and we ask questions both pertaining to how well we delivered the service to you as well as questions about what our areas of focus should be and our priorities in terms of evolving the service.

We've just recently solicited your feedback for our 2018 customer survey. In fact, the survey window just recently closed a few days ago and we're in the process of compiling the results right now.

What I will say is we do have some preliminary numbers on the level of response from the community. In fact, it's so fresh I didn't have time to put it in the slides.

Overall participation rate across all of our customer segments, this includes not just ccTLD operators but various others was around 5%. But, for this community, the ccTLD community, it was 10%. So, I feel that some of our outreach activities to improve response rate have been successful there.

But, there is a fundamental problem and the fundamental problem is that we do this once a year and a big component of the survey is asking those that have conducted business with us to rate how we did. That survey can come anywhere up to 12 months after the actual interaction. I don't know about you, but thinking back to how an interaction I had that might have been relatively fleeting, relatively quick, almost a year later might not give the most accurate results.

So, we are moving towards a model where we intend to survey our customer groups that interact with us shortly after the actual interaction, so we can get and judge their satisfaction with the service shortly after the transaction.

So, we're working on this. We will retain the annual survey, but intend to reduce it just to strategic questions while the approach – once the approach has been fully built and deployed.

So, what's that process going to look like? Our intention is to ask you one simple question. How did we do? You just give a simple response,

either good or bad. Yes, I was satisfied or I was not satisfied. Once you submit that one single question response, you'll be given a follow-up opportunity, if you wish. If you wish to make a comment, we'll provide you with a way to do that. The idea is if that's triggered your memory about something that you need a clarification on, want it to be done differently, you can do so. And if, of course, your response was that we didn't do a good job, you can provide us with some description about what we did, what we could have done better and so forth. And if you want us to then follow-up on your comment, our team will be activated to respond to that.

Our intention as we roll this out is to make a very low impact on you. Some of our TLD operators interact with us very regularly, submit hundreds of requests, so we don't want to send hundreds of surveys. The idea is you would just get one, no more than one, in a period. The period we're tentatively working on is 60 days. So, if you send a big bunch of requests, we're not going to spam you with survey requests. And of course we'll provide you with the ability to opt out on a permanent basis if you have no desire to respond to them.

So, roughly speaking, this is what it's going to look like. It's still to be tweaked but this is our working prototype that we're working on internally. So, very basically – and I think this design patent is probably not a surprise to many of you. I think a lot of other organizations do something similar. At the conclusion of a request, we send you a request for feedback shortly thereafter just asking a simple question and you can click the green box or the red box depending on how well it went. Then, once you've done that, optionally a comment field where

you can add any additional information you'd like us to review. It's really that simple. Designed to be very low friction. Increased response rate, and importantly, increase accuracy of response because you just interacted with us. Hopefully, you have a sense of whether it went well for you or not at that point and you can provide us accurate feedback.

So, the rollout. We've actually mostly developed the software to drive this right now. We're actually doing our internal testing right now to make sure it works as expected, that it sends it to the right people, etc. And we're going to be rolling out in phases to our customers. We have different customer groups of which you are one. But, you will be the first. So, those that interact with root zone management is our intended first launch group for this.

Finally, once we've stabilized the tool, we've tested it, it's proven itself, we have a corpus of data that's built up over a period, our goal is of course to share those findings more broadly. Initially, we intend to share them with the PTI board and the Customer Standing Committee. But, my long-term goal and our long-term goal is really to have sort of a metric that we can post for everyone to review to track the trends in terms of our customer satisfaction.

That is top of mind development activity at the moment, but I just wanted to refresh your memory on some of the other development activities we're working on. I think Byron alluded to this a little bit in his presentation, but another key activity for us in the summertime this year was rebuilding our name server technical check systems. We've built out a new modular design for them internally. Not something you

would necessarily see from a user perspective, but that modularity really enables us to make a lot of improvements to the system that weren't architecturally possible until now.

RZMS as a system was built 15-20 years ago and is quite monolithic and has some old design philosophy about it and this is sort of separating out the technical check piece into its own separate system that will allow us to update that on a more regular basis and solve some of the architectural problems that we've had.

Some of the improvements will be providing richer feedback to our customers, explaining better any issues that we find, and also providing improved interactivity. That will be visible to you once we launch the next generation RZMS which I'm not presenting on today but I have presented on at previous meetings. It will also address, as I mentioned, some key pain points for the current implementation. And key to that pertaining to service levels is improving the speed of tests, improving concurrency. You heard that the way the current system works is that effectively in queues checks. It doesn't run them all in parallel. And also our ability to scale it sideways as well.

This new system isn't locked into RZMS (Root Zone Management System). It can be run standalone. This will let anyone run the test whenever they want without necessarily lodging a change request in order to trigger it. We'll also integrate it with our other zone work flows that we manage. So, we manage dot-[inaudible] dot-[arpa], some other domains. Our intention is we will be doing this testing with those as well. And we will open source this once we're complete, so everyone

can use that code if they wish, but I think for us, most importantly is you can review our technique. If you have feedback on how we can evolve that and so forth, [inaudible] implementation, at least for highly technical people that might want to go into the nuts and bolts. There's nothing better than having the code available to you.

One thing that I see this as a gating factor to do, but we would like to do later – and by later I mean probably next year – is to do a consultation on what those technical checks should be. Technical checks that we have now, we've been using for a little over ten years. We've received a lot of very valuable feedback on a one-on-one basis from the community on how we might want to reconsider [inaudible] either take those existing tests and refine them, test them in a slightly different way that would perhaps reduce false positives and so forth and/or add whole new tests that we don't currently contemplate?

So, that's something that we obviously want to have a system like this built so we can easily switch in and out tests and so forth. It's not really practical in the current system, but this will enable that.

Now, Lise mentioned this in her presentation, so I can be relatively swift about this as well, but we are developing our FY20 budget for IANA and PTI. I shouldn't say covers, but it covers our 1st of July 2019 through 30th of June 2020. The draft budgets, headline is the draft budgets are currently posted for public review right now. So, there's a timeline there. I won't go into the detail, but we're right in the middle of the public comment period. Then, following that, we will take these public

comments, integrate them into our approach, and then send it out for actual review and adoption by the various boards.

Now, one thing that confused me when I started in my current role – for those that don't know, I just started as the head of IANA this year – is what is the difference between the PTI budget and the IANA budget? You would think that they're the same. But, they're not. They're subtly different.

So, we created this little infographic to try and give you a quick sense of what the difference is. PTI budget is the core IANA services. So, this is really the delivery of the root zone management services, protocol parameter assignments, net numbering services and so forth. And we divide this into three cost categories.

The first one is direct dedicated costs. Now, this is employees that are within the PTI team, the IANA team. These are the faces I showed you towards the beginning of the slide that actually do the direct work of executing the IANA functions. We have direct shared costs which are specific staff that have been tasked with IANA responsibilities from other departments of ICANN.

So, an example of this is Becky Nash, my colleague who works in ICANN Finance, actually acts as the PTI treasurer. So, a portion of her time is dedicated to performing the treasurer functions of PTI. That's a direct dedicated cost.

Then, the third category that we have is shared services. These are services that we use from the broader ICANN Organization. Think HR,

IT, a slice of Goran's time as CEO of ICANN managing PTI. These are the shared services costs that are ultimately built to PTI. So, you see them as PTI costs and then you can make an assessment about PTI's overall budget. They are charged towards the overall PTI budget.

Now, I appreciate we have a little blackout on the slides, but I'm going to go by memory. So, that's the IANA budget as we describe it. That's the PTI budget.

Now, the IANA budget is that plus more. The IANA budget additionally includes costs associated with actually implementing the IANA. The best example of this is the Customer Standing Committee. The Customer Standing Committee clearly is not part of our staff operations, but it is essential to delivering you the IANA functions. It's a bylaws-mandated committee that oversees the naming services and the costs associated with that need to be accounted for. So, they would, for example, go into the IANA budget.

Another significant cost that is in the IANA budget is the money that we pay Verisign for executing the root zone maintainer function. Verisign publishes root zone changes and maintains systems to do that at our request and they bill us for that as a contractor to us and that gets charged to the IANA budget.

So, that's it for my summary of the IANA budget. Then, finally, of course there's the ICANN budget and the ICANN budget then ultimately rolls up. The PTI budget, the IANA budget, and then all those other non-IANA related costs. I'll go to the next slide once the service is resumed. [inaudible] to show me what I was going to say.

Finally, on the budget, quick highlights is our budget proposed for FY20 is flat versus the previous year, so we're not asking for additional funding. No changes to the staffing levels that we have today. We're going to continue to invest in our development activities as we have in recent years. But the areas of focus will shift.

Obviously, the KSK rollover was an area of intense activity up until now. We expect those costs to diminish, but they will be substituted by other projects and policies that the community has tasked us with.

We will continue to evolve the Root Zone Management System and our other work flow tools. And on that, finally, comments are due 12th of November. So, please go to the ICANN website and provide your comments on what we've proposed.

I appreciate we're running short on time. Last update, KSK rollover. Again, not assuming everyone in the room knows what this is. We're in the middle of a multi-year process to replace what we technically call the KSK, what we also technically call the trust anchor. This is the most critical key for managing the DNS and we're replacing it for the first time. This is sensitive because we've never really done this in the real world and how software copes with changing that is untested, and at the risk of having negative impacts by doing so.

So, we originally planned to switch it out 11th of October 2017. But, just prior to doing that a year ago, we received some [inaudible] data that we didn't quite understand and we wanted to analyze further, so we deferred. But, the good news is we actually did it on the 11th of October just a few weeks ago and the preliminary data is that it went really

better than anyone expected. It went very successfully. There was a few minor outages, but nothing concerning to us.

Now, there's still some steps to take to revoke the old key, to destroy it. But, the most critical part of the process has been completed. We will then take the lessons that we learned from this whole procedure and plan to do it again. Really, the goal is to do these rollovers semi-regularly and we will use the feedback we received throughout this process to try and systematize that so the process is much more straightforward.

That was the end of my presentation. I'm happy to answer any questions that you might have.

BRETT CARR:

Hi, Kim. Brett from Nominet. I just wanted to [inaudible] support to the intention to look into the technical checks. I think that's going to be a really good thing to do. I assume when we do that, that will come to the ccNSO for us to input into that, right?

KIM DAVIES:

Yeah. My current assumption is that this will be actually a public comment period. But I would like to do other engagement on the topic, too.

BRETT CARR:

Thank you.

ABDALLA OMARI: Thank you. We have run out of time, but I'm sure the team is still around to answer questions. If you have a question to the PTI board, Wei Wang is still around. Let's give them a round of applause for their good presentation.

The next session is a CSC effectiveness review session shared by Debbie. Thank you.

DEBBIE MONAHAN: Hi, all. I'm Debbie and welcome to this next session which I'm pleased how many people are hanging around for. I'd like to thank Byron for introducing our subject particularly well by going on about the number of reviews. Basically, we're just about to talk to you in a bit more detail about two of the reviews that Byron spoke about.

We'll start first with Trang talking about the IANA functions review and then we'll follow-up with the CSC Effectiveness Review after that. Trang, do you want to – all yours.

TRANG NGUYEN: Thank you, Debbie, and thanks for the invitation to come and speak to the ccNSO about this topic. I don't know who controls the slide here. Thank you. Am I not pressing the right button? There we go.

So, the IANA naming function review, just a quick overview of what it is for those that are not familiar with it. It is a new accountability mechanism that was created as part of the IANA stewardship transition

to ensure that PTI meets the needs and expectations of its naming customers.

Essentially, what it is is a review of PTI's performance of the IANA naming function against the IANA naming function contract that is currently in place between ICANN and PTI as well as PTI's performance against the statement of work that is part of that contract and a statement of work essentially lays out all of the service level agreements for the naming services that PTI is expected to meet.

The review was convened by the ICANN board on September 16th to meet the bylaws requirements that this review be convened two years after the IANA stewardship transition which was October 1st. So, essentially, the review has been convened.

We are currently in the process of composing the review team. Next slide here. I'll come back to that. We are in the process of composing the review team. As you can see up there, the review team will have representation from across the community. In particular, the ccNSO is asked by the bylaws to appoint two representatives as well as one representative from a non-ccNSO TLD.

Currently, we have received all of the appointments from the appointing organizations. We have assessed those appointments against the bylaws requirements. There are a couple of issues as it relates to the appointments that we are working through with those appointing organizations. In particular, I think there has been some issues with getting a volunteer from a non-ccNSO ccTLD and the ccNSO

has proposed an interim appointment, so we're working with the ccNSO in taking a look at that.

Once composed the review team will be looking at – where am I supposed to point this? I want to go backwards. There we go.

So, once composed, the review team will essentially be, as I mentioned, review and evaluate PTI's performance of the naming function against the contract that's currently in place. In addition to that, the review will also evaluate PTI's openness and transparency procedures and also taking a look at the performance and effectiveness of the empowered community, another entity that was put in place as part of the IANA stewardship transition. So, really taking a look at the performance and effectiveness of that new body as it relates to PTI and the IANA naming functions.

It will also take a look at and review whether or not there are any systemic issues that are impacting PTI's performance.

Now, it should be noted that the IFR is not a replacement for the important work that the Customer Standing Committee (CSE) is currently undertaking. That is certainly the CSC's input will play heavily into this IANA naming function review, but it is not a replacement for the work of the CSC.

Speaking of the CSC, concurrently to the IANA naming function review, the bylaws also require a CSC Effectiveness Review to take place two years after the completion of the IANA stewardship transition. So, the

timing of the CSC Effectiveness Review will coincide with the timing of the IANA naming function review.

There is one scope item within the IANA naming function review that does touch on the CSC effectiveness. Essentially, one of the items that the IANA naming function review team will be asked to look at is the effectiveness of the CSC and its oversight role of PTI.

Given that there is going to be a CSC Effectiveness Review that would take place at the same time as the IANA naming function review, both the ccNSO and GNSO Council have suggested that the output of that CSC Effectiveness Review service input into IANA naming function review so as to increase efficiency of the review and reduce workloads to the extent possible.

So, that's it in terms of an overview of the two reviews. I'll be happy to take any questions.

DEBBIE MONAHAN:

Thanks, Trang. Any questions for Trang? This is actually kind of an important review for both the GNSO and ccNSO. No comments or input? Well, you'll have many opportunities to provide input at any other stage. But, as Trang said, the other side of this is the CSC Effectiveness Review and the GNSO have appointed Felipe and [Donna] as their two representatives and myself and Martin are the ccNSO representatives on this review team.

What we're going to do is ... Felipe wears another hat as well. He's the GNSO liaison to the ccNSO, so I think it's entirely appropriate that

Felippe walks you through, if you like, how the CSC Review Team has been set up and the work we've done including at this particular meeting. So, Felippe?

FELIPPE FOUQUART:

Thank you. I'm Felippe Fouquart. I'm with the GNSO Council, as Debbie just said. I hope the slide will come in a moment. I'm sure you're familiar with the background. It was mentioned earlier. But the bylaws mandate that a review of the CSC happens two years after the first meeting of the CSC and it would appear that that first meeting was in 2016, so that would seem appropriate for us to kickstart that review, as was also said earlier.

There was, this year, the concurrence of the Customer Standing Committee review and the IANA broader IANA naming function review. So, there had to be some thinking as to how we would organize these.

Also, I think it's one very important point to outline is the fact that earlier in June this year, there was a thorough review of the charter which helped the exercise a lot and actually made it possible to streamline the processes as quickly as possible. Next slide, if we can, if it works.

So, in terms of method, that is very much charter driven. As I said, at least half of the team actually went through the charter review earlier, so that was used as a basis to define the criteria and metrics to do the CSC review [inaudible] propose and that's the purpose of introducing this now.

To avoid that overlap between the CSC Effectiveness Review and the IANA Naming Function Review, specifically to make sure that we could provide an input to that broader review and avoid overlaps, we would make sure that that review could be – well, expedited might be too strong a word, but as efficient as possible as we can do in ICANN.

So, we would actually use the charter as a framework to define the metrics that we want to investigate in terms of effectiveness of the CSC. So, we did that through ccNSO and GNSO Councils who adopted that template moving forward in September 2018. So, councils, those councils appointed two members each to conduct that review, and later [inaudible] from the CSC, the PTI, and Org were appointed.

Certainly, we would expect the findings of the review to be adopted by the two councils so that we would make sure that that gives service and input to the IANA naming function review.

A word on the review. It's indeed meant to be limited in scope [inaudible] and figure out whether the CSC actually carried out its mission as defined in the charter.

The expectation was that precisely that mission was performed quite well in light of the exercise that had been done earlier on the charter. That's why we can afford to move as quickly as possible. As I said, relevant performance indicators were developed or were drafted and that's the purpose of having this presentation here for your inputs, if any, so that we can move forward with our work as quickly as possible. The idea is have any input that the community might have on the approach that we've taken.

I think the next slides are on the measure, so Debbie, you probably want to introduce that.

DEBBIE MONAHAN:

So, what the review team did is took, if you like, the charter which actually sets out quite clearly what the role of the CSC is. So, the decision was made to come up with measures – metrics that reflected what those responsibilities were, to not step outside them, to not try and make it a broad, very subjective review, but to focus very much on the work of the charter review working group and actually make this document so that everyone could look at what the responsibilities were meant to be and measure whether they were not succeeding in performing those measures.

So, since we've been here, this week we've had meetings with CSC and PTI and that built on work that the review team had actually done in evaluating how we saw the assessment of these metrics, and again using a lot of the information, as Felipe said, that came out of the charter review group.

So, what we'd like to share is we've got two to date. Bart, do we have the one with ... We want to come back to that one, don't we?

What we'd like to do is [inaudible] giving you comments you might have, but ultimately we'd like some feedback. There will be a chance to comment on where we get to, but we would like any comments or views that you might have right now. Bart, do we have the updated document? Okay, trust us. Basically, if we could go back, Kim, just to

the one that has just got the metrics just to explain a little bit more because, as Felipe kind of set out there's a lot of reviews taking place and a lot of the reviews are very complicated. There you go. Geez.

So, it's probably going to be quite hard for you to read. [inaudible] what we did is take each of those metrics and actually do our assessment. This is still very much in the more discussion in working and getting information stage, but we're getting to a position where we're close to finalizing and we would like some input. Felipe, do you want to [inaudible]?

FELIPPE FOUQUART:

Alright. In terms of summary, what we did is that we basically took the charter and developed the metrics. So, obviously, we want to make sure that the CSC performs its mission as efficiently as possible. That's what you would find in the first point. We went through the reports and the records of the meetings. That's metric number two.

Also, looked into the metrics, the SLAs, that were under the remit of the charter and determined under what circumstance, for instance, those SLAs could be reviewed, whether there was a [inaudible] report in place to make sure that if in the instance of an issue that there was a proper mechanism to report these issues. That's what you will find in metric number five, for instance. If we scroll down – and feel free to chime in if there's any question or input to provide.

Number six is about the remedial action that CSC would have taken in the instance of poor performance. That never happened, luckily

enough, so that was not applicable. But that's certainly something that we would look into since that ... Also in terms of the human factor of dealing with these problems should they happen.

Tracking complaints was the object of number seven. Number eight is essentially the consultation with the broader community and PTI and ICANN in particular. Generally speaking, the customers of the naming services.

Number nine is the changes that the CSC is in a position to enhance the provision of IANA's operational services. As you can read, ten is on the responsibility of ICANN and PTI implemented the changes that CSC recommended.

And the appointment in 11 of a liaison to the IANA Naming Function Review that we referred to early and any [inaudible] cross-community working group that would deem relevant.

So, that's a quick summary of what we developed and where we are at the moment. As Debbie said, it's very much a work in progress. We would expect to complete this process very soon, in the next few weeks, I think. Your input would be welcome in that respect.

DEBBIE MONAHAN:

Yes. What we come up with will be subject to public consultation so everyone will have a chance to comment. But this approach has got the support of PTI and the CSC, and hopefully you [inaudible] as a community and feel comfortable that this, if you like, very metric-based and I'd say focused review is fulfilling what you actually want, so that

you're comfortable with where the CSC Effectiveness Review is heading. So, we would welcome any comments that people might have at this meeting so we can continue with our work.

Excellent. Well, I will take that as a vote of support for the approach that the review team has taken and that we will continue to do this. The other slide presentation ... The slides have the timeframe, but I think Felipe's does set it out for you. We will plan to have something completed very shortly and out later this year for your comment. Thank you very much. Thanks, Trang. It's now just a bit of a break and I've just totally forgot what time we come back. Come help. What time are we back? Five minutes? Back in five minutes. Thanks, everybody. Oh, 5:00. 15 minutes. There you go. Thank you.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]