KOBE – ccNSO: Members Meeting Day 1 (4 of 4)
Tuesday, March 12, 2019 – 15:15 to 16:45 JST
ICANN64 | Kobe, Japan

BART BOSWINKEL: Ladies and gentlemen, again the request, if you're not attending this evening's cocktail and you do have tickets, please return the tickets to Kim, Joke, or me so we can make other people very happy because they don't have tickets.

ABDALLA OMARI: Good afternoon. I hope you have enjoyed your coffee break. We're now about the tail end of the presentation, the second to last one. It's the IANA Naming Function. We'll have a presentation from the PTI Board update and then there will be PTI update. Then IANA Function Review. I think one of the teams from ICANN will present. Byron will do the CSC update. CSC Effectiveness Review Update will be done by Philippe. And then Peter will finish with the Root Zone Evaluation. So, Lise, please.

LISE FUHR: Thank you and good afternoon, everyone. This is the session where we try to give you a bit of art and knowledge and of course tell you about what we do at the PTI Board. I know it's difficult to

keep the attention of all of you, so we try to cheat a little bit by having some pictures.

This picture is actually one I showed you last time but I just like it so much. It's Hokusai who painted this. It's called "Behind the Big Wave" and I just love it. I think it's a great picture from Japan.

I'll talk a little bit about the PTI Board. I'm the chair of the PTI Board. And on the agenda today … Let me see if I can make this work. What should I point to this? The computer, it's not connected, so you get to enjoy the picture a little more.

The agenda is going to be … I'm going to talk a little bit about the composition of the board because we had some changes. I'm going to tell you about the board meeting we just had this Sunday. There is an open position as a director of the board. I'll give you a finance update, talk a little bit about our strategic plan, and end with the transition.

This picture is actually Manga. I chose this because it's very Japanese. Manga you can have as comic books, as animated movies, or computer games and they are actually action stories, romantic stories, and even pornography with Manga. What they have in common is actually that everything can happen and everything is allowed. It's often very exaggerated. As you can see this very skinny lady, very pale, holding a sword.

I'm actually going to show you some pictures from a Danish artist because she was very much inspired by Manga. I'm not sure if I pronounce it correctly, Manga.

But, back to the composition of the board, this needs your full attention, so no pictures. As you know, Akram Atallah left ICANN last year, so he also of course left as one of the three ICANN appointed board directors. What happened instead was that ICANN has appointed Trang who just arrived. Welcome, Trang. And also welcome to the PTI Board. So, she is replacing Akram as a director and Trang is VP Strategic Programs. Trang is also going to present to you today about the IFR, I believe, the IANA Functions Review, so you'll get to … You know Trang, but just wanted to present her again.

The board meeting we had Sunday. And here we have the Danish artist, [Annamarie Pluhar], has painted this picture and she always uses the women in the pictures combined with technology. This is called Iron Maiden because of the machine. She's making … Her pictures are very alike but she varies very little but the colors are different or a different robot or machine. She doesn't paint it anymore. It's a period she had, but I just found it's interesting to have a Danish artist painting Manga.

But what we discussed on the board meeting on Sunday was we needed to appoint auditors and we had an update on the

[inaudible] deliverables. We had a finance update that I'm going to tell you about later. We had an operating update that Kim is going to also give you an update on so I'm not going to talk that much about that part.

We also prepared for the meeting we had with the CSC and here I know Byron will talk a little bit about this.

Last but not least, we spoke about preparation for the meeting with the NomCom, and when I say we, I was not part of this because the NomCom, I'm going to [inaudible], so I didn't want to create a conflict of interest, so this pat of the meeting was without me.

That's actually the open position that I'm talking about. My term is ending this fall, so there is an open position for a three-year term. It's the NomCom that appoints the candidate and ICANN approves the candidate.

I think all interested parties should apply. Even though I [restand], I think the more the better. I think it's important we show an interest for the PTI Board, and if there is anyone more skilled than I, they should be elected. So, please don't feel shy. You should do it. And the deadline is the 22nd of March.

This picture is called Power Girl and that was part of her theme throughout her period of painting Manga. So, Power Girl was very

energetic as you can see and the red color just fits for shouting, "There is an open position."

The finance update. We had a half-year report because the first half year ended December 31, 2018. Our overall budget for the whole period, but this is only a half period that we were evaluating, it's $10 million. Even with this, the expenses are so far lower than budget by $1 million. This [inaudible] comes from that we have a lower average head counts and were people leaving and because of the timing there was some money saved or not used because it's not a budget. We pay per … We get the funding per expense by ICANN.

Then, we used [0.3 million] lower on administration. So, overall, it's a very good budget or very good financial half year and everything is on track.

For the strategic plan, we had a meeting planned in February. We had hoped to come and have some first outlines for the strategic plan to present for you today. We couldn't because we had some visa issues so we had to cancel – or not cancel, but postpone, the meeting. Now we're going to meet in late May instead.

So, that actually gave staff also time to prepare some input to us which is important. It's always good to have input from staff on a strategy. Of course, as a board, we are responsible for making

sure there is a strategy and implement it. But I always like that the whole team is involved in preparing a strategy.

We have a four-year plan and ICANN has a five-year strategic plan, so we are looking into if we should align on this. Again, we are taking the ICANN strategic plan into account, so we're not copying the ICANN strategic plan but we are building on it and that's also important.

We, of course, still need to look into how we can include both the CSC, the RIRs, and IETF in all of this together with the naming community, of course.

So, the last thing was where are we on the transition. Well, most of it is actually done. I don't know if Kim also will speak to this, but staff was transferred to PTI first of January 2019, so this is now done. The only outstanding issue is to make transition to successor plan. That's an internal plan. And the deadline for all of this, I don't think it will take that long, but first of October the whole transition should be carried out. So, first of October, all is done and hopefully we also have the IANA functions review running at that time.

I have one last picture. Thank you for listening. This is actually an artist called [Kuno Yashi]. It's taken from an article that is analyzing Manga and saying, "Is this prehistoric manga?" This picture is painted in 1845 and it's called [Mitsukuni] Fighting a

Skeleton Ghost. So, you see Japanese art has been extreme in many ways in many periods of time.

With that, I will ask if there are any questions. Not to the pictures but to the presentation of PTI Board.

ABDALLA OMARI: Any questions? I'll say I miss your pictures, all your presentations of [inaudible] come with pictures. Now that you're leaving, I don't know who will be giving us the pictures.

But one question from me. The PTI Board, I can see you invited people to apply, the ones who are qualified. Are there any regulations which try to ensure this gender balance? Are there any regulations?

LISE FUHR: Yes, there are some [inaudible] to try to have diversity on the board. I can't remember where that was put. It was, anyway, in the proposal. But most focus is not as much on gender but more on the skill set. So, you have to have a certain skill set to become elected as a PTO board member. But there are some intentions in the proposal we made back then to ensure both different regions, different genders, etc., to have diversity. But I don't know if that's been put in any of the bylaws. I don't think so.

ABDALLA OMARI:           Okay, thank you. Kim?

KIM DAVIES:              Thank you. My apologies for my voice. I'm giving you the IANA update. Let's see if this works.

So, just a quick refresher on what IANA is and what PTI is, for those that are not familiar. The IANA functions are maintaining unique identifier assignments. Typically, we divide these into three key areas, the first one being names – specifically, domain names. You know us for managing the DNS root zone and that's definitely the predominant part of our naming function. We also maintain dot-int, dot-arpa, and a number of other domains that are closely related to those.

We also maintain numbers, [inaudible] number resources. This includes managing the global IP address and autonomous system number spaces.

Lastly, protocol parameters. This is essentially the long tail of naming and numbering schemes and code elements that are used by different Internet technologies. The common unifying theme there is that these are all technologies that have been standardized in the IETF. So, whilst domain names, IP addresses, these are identifiers that have been more customer-facing and

there's a lot of identifiers used inside protocols that an end user wouldn't necessarily see but it's more critical for software developers, engineers, and so forth and that's our primary audience there.

What is PTI? PTI is a not-for-profit organization that performs the IANA functions. We were created in 2016. We are technically called an affiliate of ICANN. We are fully funded by ICANN but we're not ICANN, obviously. The creation of PTI was one of the measures that came from the IANA stewardship transition process previously before 2016 and the IANA functions were directly performed by ICANN.

So, this is the PTI staff as it is today. We have 17 people. For those that are paying attention, our team has actually grown a fair amount since the last meeting. We had a number of vacancies that we had to fill. The new entrance to the team is, top right, Aaron Foley, who has joined us as a cryptographic key manager. His responsibility is helping ensure the KSK is kept secure, ensuring that we continue to follow and enhance security procedures, as well as conducting key ceremonies which are public events where security professionals come and monitor how we use the KSK.

Also joining us is two request specialists, George [Sarkisian] and Claudia [Stevens]. Both joined us recently and they process IANA

change requests. So, don't be surprised if in your interactions with our team doing [inaudible] changes, you see their names in that exchange.

Beyond that, the rest of our team have been here quite a while. Three of us are here at the ICANN meeting this week. Myself, and Marilia, and Naela are out and about as well.

So, the key thing [inaudible] today is customer satisfaction. Customer satisfaction is important to us in the general sense but also help students drive future improvement activity and, really, our goal is not to rest on our laurels but to continue to re-evaluate how we provide service and to continually monitor the trends and wants of our customer base in order to refine how we deliver service to you.

Now, the primary [perch] that we've used today for gaging customer satisfaction has been using annual surveys and I'll talk a little bit about that. But we are moving towards a model where we're trying to get more actionable and immediate feedback, and to do this, we wanted to find a way to gather feedback sooner than once a year.

So, I'll explain both our annual approach and our new more actionable approach on the following slides but we intend to now basically have both in our method of operation.

So, to speak a little bit about the annual customer survey. Folks here were polled around the time of the last meeting in Barcelona. We've now had a third-party assessor compile those results and they were published towards the end of last year.

On the response rate, it was around 5%, of people that were polled responded. Now, this is actually half of previous years which kind of hovered around 10% so it's a marked reduction. ccTLD managers, there was still around 10%, so perhaps trigger awareness of this, the ccTLD managers were actually much more responsive than other customer groups. However, we didn't get any responses from those who had completed ccTLD transfers or delegations in the 12 months.

So, overall satisfaction. 96% of respondents reported being satisfied or very satisfied. This actually represents the highest satisfaction results we've had since we started conducting these surveys in 2013. So, we're quite happy about that. Probably can't see the numbers. I certainly can't. But those stats are in the report that is on our website.

Generally, across all the different categories, courtesy, reporting, transparency, timeliness, process, quality, accuracy, and documentation quality we received high marks from the customers.

We have questions that pertain to specific segments of our customer base, ranking things like importance and satisfaction. So, when it comes to this group here, root zone management for ccTLDs, customer satisfaction, accuracy was 100%. Customer satisfaction with the performance reports would give us 92%. That was the only one that we didn't get 100%. I certainly would like to learn more from the community about what we can do to improve there. But we also received 100% marks on staff courtesy, timeliness, and the information we provided throughout the life of the request.

One of the questions we posed directly is how easy our RZMS is to use. This is our web portal where TLD managers can interact with us automatically through self-service, I should say. And 100% said it was easy or very easy.

Lastly, there was some questions about customer service issues. We found that 73% were aware that we had process for customer service issue resolution. 58% reported comfort level approaching the IANA functions operator [inaudible] customer service issue and the remainder 42% were very comfortable. So, that's a 100% sum. 96% reported they had no customer service problems in the last 12 months and 100% that did reported that they were satisfied with the resolution of their problem.

So, that's it for the annual survey. One thing that we just launched right after the last meeting was what we call internally how did we do. This is a customer sentiment satisfaction survey that we now send right after we complete a request. It's just a simple one-question survey seeing if you are happy or not happy with how your request went. We optionally provide the ability for you to provide a comment which we'll then review. If there's something we can do to remedy your experience, we can then do a follow-up.

We only send one survey in a period so you don't get bombarded if you send lots of queries in a period. And if you want to opt out permanently, there's a functionality to do that.

So, the preliminary data we've gotten from this after running it for a couple of months, overall feedback has been positive that we've received from our customers on the surveys. Still fine-tuning algorithms as to who receives surveys. We've had some situations where it needs a little fine-tuning. We're trying to connect it with various ticketing systems to make sure the right people get the surveys.

Now, some of the feedback we've gotten has been negative. I'll get to that in a few moments. But generally speaking, I would say that most of the negative feedback we've received is essentially folks who have come to IANA to ask questions about things that

are outside of our area of responsibility, but perhaps true to our name or perhaps a Google search has landed them at the IANA website. They've come to the conclusion that IANA is the place that can solve their problem. It could be a problem with their ISP. It could be a problem with a domain registrar, that kind of thing, that's really outside of our bailiwick. They've written to us, we've provided the best response that we could. But because we couldn't solve their core issue, they've marked us negative on the survey result.

So, we're looking to tweak the approach so that we can disseminate between those queries we get that our inside our responsibility versus outside as a way of reporting that.

I'm going to show you some quick stats, but our goal is to make sure that we can report this in real-time ultimately on a dashboard and so forth. So, the information is currently internal as we refine the tool but once it's stabilized, we do intend to share this data with you on our website.

So, [inaudible] satisfaction, something like 83% I think it says. The response rate to the survey is around 33%. This was just a quick pull of data I did a couple of days ago for 30 days. That's roughly the last 30 days of data.

Breaking this out into satisfaction by segments, domain name satisfaction was 100%. Protocol parameter satisfaction was

100%. Number resource satisfaction was 100%. Then it's there in the general questions category that we start to see that behavior I mentioned where I think perhaps not all, but a large number, of those people that have come to us with queries about things that are outside of IANA's capabilities.

Lastly, some quick updates on various other things. Last time we met, I had talked about the FY20 budget. The good news is that has now been fully approved by the Board Finance Committee of ICANN and the PTI Board is now rolled up into the ICANN budget process that is now concluding as well. That means that the next time we meet I'll start talking to you about the FY21 budget, so prepare for that.

We've successfully completed what we call [inaudible] audit for 2018. This is an audit that our security controls, for our various systems that are appropriate and correctly implemented. One notable thing here is this is the first time using new auditors, so there was definitely a learning curve there but it was successfully completed.

Another thing that's been successfully completed for the most part is the KSK rollover. There are still some remaining actions, but nothing significant. At this meeting, we're commencing some outreach on how to do future rollovers in order to make the key rollover process [inaudible] part of our normal operations.

Working with the Customer Standing Committee on a number of issues. I'm sure you'll hear about those in a moment. One key area is implementing SLA change procedures and then jointly revising some of the SLAs with them.

Work continues within our development team to do a ground-up rewrite of the root zone management system. I did give a more fuller presentation on this in Barcelona, so if you're interested, please refer to that or come talk to me in the corridor.

One update that we rolled out in November is we did find a way of optimizing how the technical check process is performed in our current system, so we did roll out some updates and I think that's had a bit of a tangible improvement on how technical checks are performed to timeliness. But the next generation RZMS will do even better but we're architecturally limited about what can be done in the current system.

So, with that, thank you. Happy to answer any questions.

ABDALLA OMARI: Thank you, Kim. Any questions for Kim? I forgot to explain when we were starting, you can put your questions online. You can log in remotely and the team here will pick your questions. I know most of us are busy multi-tasking trying to do a bit of our work while we are participating. So, you can send in your question

online. I'm sure the ICANN team here will be very gracious to assist.

Now, how many workforce systems [inaudible] here? Raise your hands kindly. You can raise your card, your hand, or you can stand up if you're tired. Okay, I can see … Okay.

There's a reason why I've asked that question. I can see Kim is struggling to get responses for the survey from us. A very small number is responding. So, let's assist him. If we answer the survey, we are assisting him and his team to give us better service. So, maybe you stand there with a questionnaire before anyone. [inaudible]. Okay, that was on a light note. But it's good to respond on a survey, because when you respond, the team is able to know how they are performing, the areas to improve on, and so on because that's what [inaudible] in the presentation, but I think the response rate is not very encouraging and they're doing quite a good job [inaudible]. So, thank you. But you can put your questions remotely. The team here will capture and then we'll answer.

JOKE BRAEKEN:          There's a question from remote participant asking are there any plans to do a review of technical questions? This is Brett speaking from Nominet UK.

KIM DAVIES: Thanks for the question, Brett. In short, yes, but it's not been scheduled. The technical checks that we perform today were the result of a public consultation that we did in I think around 2007, so it's been 12 years. Technology has moved on a little bit since then. So, I'm personally very eager to have that discussion with technical community about whether the technical checks themselves are fit for purpose today, whether they need some adjustment, possibly new ones need to be added or maybe some old ones need to be adjusted. But we want to do that process right, so we want to schedule it at a time when we have the resources to support that engagement and that dialogue with the community.

So, my expectation is at some point and I think I've said in the past sometime this year and I still hope that is the case. We'll probably put together a discussion paper as a starting point to explain firstly what the checks currently are. Some of the things we've observed as staff that we run into that might require some attention and then put that to the technical community to provide their input [inaudible] wish to refine or alter our technical check procedures. And then once we get that feedback, we can obviously come up with an approach, turn it over to our software developers and they can build tools to do those new tests.

So, yes, that's planned. When it's planned is still open for debate. Thanks.

ABDALLA OMARI:       Alright. Okay. Trang?

TRANG NGUYEN:       Thank you, Abdalla. And while the slides are loading, you had asked a question earlier about any diversity requirements on the PTI board. Lise, I had to look it up after you asked me to because I didn't remember and I wanted to just clarify that the PTI bylaws do have some requirements around diversity for the PTI Board. Section 5.3.6 says that in aggregate the PTI Board has to display diversity in geography, culture, skills, experience, and perspective. So, I just wanted to clarify that.

So, thank you for inviting me here today to give you an update on the IANA naming function review. I'm providing this update obviously not in my capacity as a PTI board member but as a member of ICANN Org. If we can go to the next slide, please.

For those of you who are not familiar with the IANA naming function review, it's a new review that is basically a new accountability mechanism that was introduced as part of the IANA stewardship. It's a review to allow ICANN Org to review the performance of the IANA naming function.

It is in the ICANN bylaws, so it's a bylaws mandated review. On September 16th of last year, the ICANN board convened the review as part of the bylaws requirement.

Now, this review is essentially, like I mentioned, is a new accountability mechanism and what it's going to do is it's going to be reviewing PTI's performance of the naming function against the contract that ICANN has with PTI for that naming function.

Now, it may sound on the surface very similar to the work that the CSC performs on a regular basis, but in fact it is not a substitute for the work that the CSC does on a monthly basis. This is an additional review mechanism that occurs every five years and the first one was to convene last year which the board did convene. So, I just want to clarify that.

Also, another point of clarification is that it is also not an organizational review of PTI of any sort. It is strictly a review of PTI's performance against the contract that it has with ICANN to perform the naming services. Next slide, please.

So, per the ICANN bylaws, you can see on this slide here the composition of the review team on the ccNSO side, the ccNSO was required by the bylaws to appoint two representatives from a ccNSO ccTLD and one additional representative from a non-ccNSO ccTLD, you can see there, the other parts of the ICANN community also had appointments that can be made to the

review team as well. The CSC, ASO, and the IAB also have … Well, not the CSC. The CSC has to appoint a liaison, but the ASO and the IAB also has the option to elect a representative and appoint a liaison to the review team as well. Both of those organizations have declined to appoint a liaison.

As of today, all of the appointed organizations have appointed members. However, on the ccNSO, I understand that there is some issues with being able to identify a qualified non-ccNSO ccTLD representative. So, that is an issue that at this point we have raised to the ICANN board and have requested that the ICANN board direct us with regards to the next steps because, as of this point, review is on hold. The review team's work is on hold due to this issue. So, the ICANN board is expected to consider this matter during this public meeting on Thursday of this week.

So, I'll stop there and see if there are any questions. Yes. Unless there are any questions or any additional requests, that's the current status of the IANA naming function review.

ABDALLAH OMARI:     Any questions? We are waiting for the [inaudible]. Okay. Byron is [inaudible] of the CSC.

| BYRON HOLLAND: | Okay. No slides for me. You have to look just at me. Or not. So, I am just reporting out on the work of the CSC since our last meeting. We continue to meet on a monthly basis and we use our full 90 minutes. I don't think there's been a single meeting that we've had that we don't use all our time for a good frank and candid discussion amongst the members, liaisons, and PTI staff. |
|---|---|

As you will probably recall, we have two relatively new members that are just coming on board – Gaurav Vedi from the Registry Stakeholder Group and our very own Brett Carr from Nominet. We also have one new liaison, Nigel Cassimire from the GAC. Those folks are quickly getting up to speed and becoming productive members of the CSC. And of course Elaine Pruis and I are two of the original members and we're in the final year of a three-year initial term.

We had our meeting earlier this week, our monthly meeting, and I'm happy to report that PTI performance was 100%, so they have met all of their metrics. The other interesting thing this month is that we had changed the reporting format – or they had changed it – from a month to month view to a 13-month view, so you now get a much broader sweep of the data and at a glance, essentially. It can get a sense of how they're doing year over year as well as during the course of the entire past year. So, that's definitely worth taking a look at.

Some of the work that we've been doing beyond our regular oversight monitoring role is dealing with the reviews that have been taking place. I've reported previously on the charter review, and most recently the effectiveness review has tabled its results and recommendations. I think the good news there is it was very positive overall. Dare I say quite laudatory as far as effectiveness reviews and committees go. They did make some constructive recommendations primarily around process and more administrative issues, such as how do we onboard new members effectively, how do we make sure there's institutional memory that we can pass on? Those types of things. So, I think actually quite useful going forward. And we will take those recommendations on board for discussion in the next meeting for sure and in the coming meetings.

One of the major pieces of work that we've been engaged in and I've reported on previously is around service-level agreement changes. Now that we've lived with the transition, not just us and the CSC, other communities within ICANN as well, but certainly from our perspective we have noticed that we need to do some fine-tuning around some of the metrics, the performance metrics, that we hold IANA accountable to.

However, based on the original contracts from best efforts back in the transition days, making those changes is extremely laborious and intensive, so we are recommending some changes

that allow us to finetune the metrics more easily without going to ICANN bylaw changes.

We're well on our way there. In fact, the ICANN board has this on their agenda for Thursday's board meeting, I believe, as well as the PTI Board. All indications are – I mean, I can't guarantee it, but all indications are that we should have a successful outcome there and will provide a clear picture to all communities of how we can make changes to the SLAs based on different categories, different requirements, and an escalating level of effort and consultation depending on what change we might recommend over time. But we expect a positive outcome in the coming days.

One thing that we have asked for, the CSC has asked for during the ICANN budgeting process, as most will recall, there was no travel funding available for members or liaisons for this committee. As we have gone through first near three-year cycle, what's become apparent is people's lives change. They change jobs, etc. We've certainly had the occasion where members have changed employers and the employers aren't necessarily willing to fund travel to ICANN meetings for one reason or another. Our very own Jay Daley was in that circumstance.

We believed it was important that if the community, ccNSO or the Registry Stakeholder Group, continues to support an individual who may no longer have the financial support of their initial

employer when they took on the role as a member of the CSC, that effectively it would be unfortunate for the committee and certainly for this community to lose the skills and ability of a member strictly for financial reasons. So, we have asked for eight travel slots over the course of a year for CSC members if required. Because we do have at least a couple of – two of the three – ICANN meetings we have face-to-face meetings. We also meet with the board sub-committee, an ICANN board sub-committee and the PTI board as well. I just wanted to make sure that everybody was aware of that because it is a budget request. Not specific to the ccNSO because it has the potential to be used for both GNSO members and ccNSO members of the CSC.

Also, this week already we have had a meeting with the PTI board and I think it was important meeting because, as you just heard, there's been some transition both in terms of where PTI reports up into ICANN as well as changes on the board itself. As you just heard, Trang has come on the board, Akram has left the board. And where PTI reports into, ICANN has also changed. So, it's an opportunity to talk about the transitions, what's happening, but also really to provide PTI board a real sense of what the CSC is actually doing on a day-to-day basis, or rather at least a month to month basis. What we're seeing, what we're focused on, the particular issues that we've been working on, the big building block issues, as well as our relationship with staff, with IANA staff.

So, it was a good and frank exchange and I think very useful going forward to be able to have that kind of direct drive relationship with PTI because all of us who were around for the IANA transition will recall, PTI was set up as an independent structure for very specific and particular set of reasons, so it's important to ensure that we maintain that notion of its uniqueness and its independence and maintain, if not build and foster, the relationship with PTI's board as well as and separately from the ICANN board. Any questions?

ABDALLA OMARI:     Thank you, Byron. I'm always amazed on how you can talk about CSC just off the cuff like that. I think it's the many conference calls you have had about it. Keep up the good job. Any remote questions? Philippe?

PHILIPPE FOUQUART:     Thank you. Good afternoon, everyone. My name is Philippe Fouquart. I'm going to talk about the CSC Effectiveness Review on behalf of the team. So, I think Debbie Monahan will be with us at this meeting. Martin Boyle might be in remote; I don't know. And of the ccNSO, Donna Austin was the fourth person on the team. I think Byron alluded to the conclusions, so there's going to be no surprise for you. We should also commend the CSC for their

cooperation. They're in the good spirit in which this review was done.

I'll give you a brief update on the findings. This is essentially a follow-up for the presentation we gave at the last meeting, so I'll say through most of the slides here. So, if we can go to the next one, please.

It's a bit of background for the review. It's determined by both the ccNSO and the GNSO. The CSC had their first meeting in October 2016. The charter, the review and revised two years later, which was done. That played an important role in the way we conducted the review which was essentially charter based. Next slide, please.

So, how did we do that? The idea was clearly to avoid an overlap between the CSC Effectiveness Review and the IANA Naming Function Review. We had some thinking at the very beginning of this exercise as to whether that might be part of the IANA naming function review. We had concerns about the starting dates of the latter and I think, with hindsight, that was a good decision to do it separately, so we did that.

And we also build up from the charter review. Those reviews were back to back, so we essentially relied on the review of the charter to define our metrics to proceed with [inaudible] review.

So, this was determined by both, as I said, the ccNSO and the GNSO. We adopted a template for review in September. So, as you can see, it's been expedited. I think that's the word we use now in the GNSO, expedited review. Within a few months. So, that's something we can do here.

Two members appointed each for the review. [inaudible] the names. As well as liaisons from the CSC, observers from PTI and ICANN Org.

The findings will be adopted by both councils. I believe they're on the agenda for both councils at this meeting, both tomorrow and on Thursday. So, next slide, please.

Since the scope of the review was limited, the idea was to determine whether the mission with CSC was met according to the charter. How did we do that? I guess we can say it was both functional and organic if you like. We relied on the charter to define criteria that had to be met and to what extent they were met.

Also, we had a look at how the IANA functioning of the CSC and provided some advice on things that could be documented or things that could be improved in terms of [inaudible].

So, I won't go through all the metrics. We went through that at the last meeting. I would probably focus – and as an engineer – things

where we have room for improvement. So, as you can see, most of the criteria were met. So, next slide.

There was one finding which actually led to a pretty much immediate action from the CSC I think which was to document the procedure that the CSC uses to track complaints. That's something that was identified earlier during the review and hopefully it's on the way within the CSC. Next slide.

I won't go through this because all those criteria were met. Let's focus on the things that we've identified as room for improvement. Next slide, please.

It appeared during the review that maybe some of the appointing organizations had not been aware that the appointees encountered difficulties in participating to the work, so we found it interesting and important to raise that issue and make sure that, moving forward, that these organizations were aware of that lack of attendance and possibly improve the current situation. I have to say that this was limited to liaisons, essentially, not to full members of the CSC. So, next slide.

So, the finding is that the CSC and its no surprise that the CSC is operating effectively. As I said, we have four recommendations that I alluded to. The draft report was published in January. We had five [elements] I think all together. Most of them were supportive. A couple of them provided inputs on substance. We

accommodated those inputs into the final report which was published last week I think. I think it's fair to say that the changes are minimal, so that we are hopeful that both councils can approve the final report at this meeting. Next slide.

As I said, the recommendations are essentially focused on ensuring cohesion of the CSC in terms of the quality of the membership. I think there's recognition that today that the CSC is made up of very experienced and highly qualified people but also that we cannot rely [solely] on this and that we need to have the safeguards to make sure that we have the capacity building moving forward, for instance, and we have a couple of recommendations on the matter.

Also, on defining metrics in terms of skills and experience that are required for the appointing organizations. And also I mentioned to monitor the attendance and make the appointing organizations aware of how those demands are met in terms of [inaudible] documentation of the complaint procedure. I've mentioned that already.

Those are the recommendations we came up with. But essentially the takeaway from this is that the CSC is indeed functioning effectively and that we're just about to approve the final report. I'd be happy to take questions if there's any. Thank you.

| KATRINA SATAKI: | Thank you very much, Philippe, and thanks a lot to the entire team. I am not going to comment on the substance. I think it's self-explanatory and all those recommendations are very good and up to the point. We would like to use your example to encourage other reviews be as efficient and quick as possible. |
|---|---|
| | So, the question to you, first, how did you manage to be so efficient in ICANN environment? And second, what recommendations could you give to future reviews and future – well, any groups that try to get results? So, what would be your recommendations for them to do, not to do, to make sure they can achieve what you did? |
| PHILIPPE FOUQUART: | Thanks, Katrina. Thanks for the question. I'm certainly not here to lecture anyone on the way to do reviews. But I think you're right. I think the way the team proceeded is, first, it really was quite a small team and we worked in good spirit. I have to mention that because it's not always the case. |
| | But in terms of methodology, we highly relied on the charter to define the metrics. That was helped by the fact that, as I said, the review of the charter had just been finished. So, we actually used the charter to define our criteria and I think that's something that could easily be applied to other reviews. It's not rocket science, really, to do just this. So, that would be my for what it's worth. |

I joined the team for the second part. I was not part of the team for the charter review but it was clear to me that by doing the charter review exercise, it really helped this review, and I think moving forward that's something that can certainly be applied elsewhere.

Really, that's the only advice I could give is that reviews tend to review history and reinvent the wheel. We didn't have the time for this. Our functional review was essentially based on what the CSC was chartered to be doing. And as a methodology, I think that's what you reflect in the response from the ccNSO that could be applied elsewhere. Thank you.

ABDALLA OMARI: Thank you, Philippe. I would just like to inform the team here. Peter has been kind enough to lend himself time on his next presentation. The next presentation is his so he will lend himself time to do this presentation to eat into his time. That's what he has agreed.

PETER KOCH: Yeah. Thank you, Mr. Chair. Thank you, Abdalla. Actually, I will not lend myself time. I am lending myself your time.

Seriously, because this is the RSSAC report and slides haven't changed much from last time, I will show you … No, let's make this interactive as we've been instructed to.

So, if you really, really want to see all of the eight slides of RZERC, do nothing. If you find with the final slide that we'll show one potential issue and then want to jump over into the emoji discussion or emoji presentation, show me the red slide, the red card. And if you're going to read your e-mail anyway, then … Okay. So, I got a couple of votes for rushing through this quickly. We'll [inaudible] afterwards and we'll jump into emojis, and maybe by this I already consumed too much time. Do we have a clicker?

This is the [usual one]. It hasn't changed from last time. Compilation of the team hasn't changed. We have had reappointments on a regular base, but this has mostly been confirming the previous appointees because we haven't had too much work so far and people haven't gotten exhausted, at least not from being on the committee.

Also, the last action we had done was submit a response to the ICANN board on the question of the KSK rollover. We also haven't met since.

However, there is one potential issue which is also kind of an old issue which again is the root zone KSK rollover. The one we had

was the first one and there is now a discussion on how to work on subsequent ones, how to automate them, looking at the method to be applied, what the frequency should be and so on and so forth. Some technical consideration will also happen within the IETF context. I've carefully tried to not say that the IETF is going to do this. There is a mailing list dealing with this whole topic, KSK rollover mailing list, and a group will also meet during the IETF meeting in Prague in two weeks. Maybe resulting from that there will be more to present next time or to be sent to the community in between.

Also, hot off the press, just half an hour ago, somebody approached me outside with an idea that – with a proposal on changes to the way the rollover could be done, the individual rollover for TLDs could be done and that individual would like to bring this forward to RZERC or is considering that at least, so maybe again, there's something to be considered here. All in the realm of DNSSEC. And I would suggest I keep you posted and you get the full slide set and the full experience for the same price next time.

Are you happy? Great. Interaction at that time of the day. So, I hand it back to the session chair. Thank you for staying with me.

ABDALLA OMARI:    Thank you, Peter, for being kind enough to lend yourself time. Now, any questions for Peter? Remote participation question? Okay, no questions. Let's give a round of applause to the team here. We also can [inaudible] for Lise to be reappointed so that we see more pictures in future.

Okay. We'll move out and Peter will chair himself in the next session. Thank you. I think in the interest of saving time, I will rearrange myself two seats to the left. I am sorry, sir? Oh, yeah, sure. Okay.

PETER KOCH:    So, if anybody of you has a … No. Those of you who operate ccTLDs and those of you who do accept emojis in second levels, please show me a yellow card. If your TLD accepts emojis in second-level domain names, show me your yellow card. No, this is not completely unexpected.

So, just to give you a bit of a background, I was asked to give an update on the work of the ccNSO study group – not a working group, study group – on emoji domain names at the second level. That concerns those domains that we all register for our registrants for our customers.

So, here, are some [inaudible], but for the formal parts … So, this goes back to a board resolution following the SSAC report 95 that

raised concerns regarding the use of the emojis in domain names, in domain names in general, but in particular in domain names at the second level for a variety of reasons. Details of which I'd like to refer to that very document, SSAC 95.

Now, in the gTLD space, certain action could be enforced and these emoji domain names at the second level, there might be some grandfathered in, but they're not available for registration.

As we know, ccTLD policy is slightly different because we make policies ourselves and the policy is applied and made differently, but the board can only ask the ccNSO to convey the message and start research which is what brought this study group into existence.

Just so I don't make any mistake, here is the purpose of the group. Established by the council which also means our report goes back to the council. And at the end, I'll ask for your input, but we're going to ask for your input in writing on the list afterwards anyway, so you're not put on the spot unless you jump to the mic which you are invited to do once it's time.

So, comprehensive overview of the issues associated with the use of emojis at the second level and the need for current practice by ccTLD managers to allow emojis at second-level domains. And if considered appropriate by the study group – like, big if – the study

group may advise on the cost of further action, if any, and I'll come to that in a few minutes.

So, no presentation about emojis without emojis. Actually, I can't really translate, but there seems to be stories behind this. So, the heart is obvious and the [inaudible], the classical emoji like the old smiley. Somebody thought I can do a movie thing here.

[And WS] by the way is one of those TLDs identified to have a couple of domain names registered at the second level that contain emojis and contain should mean that there is a string and you have at least one emoji and maybe, maybe not, other characters in between. So, be careful with that.

So, what were we tasked to do? We had a list of tasks, some of them rather easy. Summarize issues from the SSAC report that will appear in our draft report. We have reached out – or actually, our support staff kindly has reached out to SSAC and SSAC sends three SSAC members to join the study group. Of course, as they always do, they work in their individual capacity but that means they also bring individual wisdom which is sometimes better than community wisdom. And all three of them have been actively participating after having been finally appointed by the ccNSO Council. So, that's a good thing.

Other departments of ICANN. The OCTO, the Office of the CEO, has sent one representative and that's Paul Hoffman. He is also very active in participating in the study group doing research.

The fast-track implementation plan. So, IDN ccTLDs, what about those? What about emojis at their second level? And we were asked to [inaudible] in the report. I'll skip this very detail to get to the more overall activities.

So, first of all, finding out who are we talking about. What are those ccTLDs rumored to have emoji domain names? I'll use that expression instead of ccTLDs allowing registration at the second level, just for the purpose of brevity here.

So, we tried to reach out on the mailing list by writing to individual ccTLD managers as represented or as found in the IANA database that happened a couple of times with the very patient but also insistent support of the support staff and we got little response. There was one or two to also mention in the report.

And that [inaudible] wasn't considered satisfactory by the members of the study group, so we wanted to understand more, find out. And what we did a couple of times, different people started different approaches, more or less randomly testing for the presence of emojis at the second level. There are a variety of lists of emojis sorted by popularity and we tried a couple of those

and picked whether or not that domain name would have been registered or not.

This is a method that is – well, not really scientific. It's a heuristic. And is inherently weak. So, we will not be able – we [inaudible] able to come up with an exhaustive list of those ccTLDs but we found a list of 17 that could potentially allow such registrations.

So, why this careful language? The point is just the fact that we currently can find registrations with emojis at the second level doesn't mean that reflects the current registration policy. In fact, we know from gTLD space that some of the gTLDs – maybe at least one – do have grandfathered domains with emojis and obviously the current policy would no longer allow that. So, that's just the data point.

All those registries were sent letters asking for more information, asking for confirmation whether they would actually accept these registrations and further information in terms of would they have a special registration policy for emojis in terms of lists of allowed characters, lists of disallowed characters, and so on and so forth. And we got one reply. And that reply was quite informative because that was the ccTLD allowing emojis and they had a full list of code points that they would accept and that included basically some of the basic emoji characters but avoided, if I recall

correctly, most of those code points that make emojis so nice but also so complicated.

We've spoken about this before. SSAC has presented on the topic of emojis before in the ccNSO, but just one thing to remember is emojis, they aren't [inaudible] as computer scientists would say, so they aren't really a programming language, but they're [inaudible] far away. That means there are characters or modifiers using which you can combine emojis to create new emojis.

So, one example is you can combine a bunch of people to represent a family. You can combine a person in an aircraft to represent a pilot and then there are all these skin tone modifiers where you can have an emoji and change the skin tone, you name it. And probably while I'm speaking people are developing new modifiers to make this more fancy. But of course in terms of confusability which was an SSAC concern, this is becoming more and more of at least a question. So, that one reply came up with a concise list of characters allowed.

So, this is the list so that we have it on file. All the draft reports and all our considerations on the mailing list are publicly available anyway, but to make this even more clear, here's the list of ccTLDs that we contacted for information because that's the

list of ccTLDs we thought might allow emojis based on what we found thus far.

Do we have any representative of any of these ccTLDs here not being shy? It does not seem to be the case. I'm missing Nigel so much, as everybody else, I hear. I would miss Nigel in general, so not that that gets misrepresented. I'm sorry.

Okay. So, we put this on the slides just for the record so we can refer back to this later. Sorry?

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: [off mic].

PETER KOCH: Did we disclose that? It's WS, yeah. That was the reason we could put them on the spot there. So, that worked. Actually, did you check whether the domain that were there would be in line with our code list? Probably would. We don't know. So, don't take those previous examples for real domains. They may or may not be in line with their … Yeah?

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: [off mic].

PETER KOCH:           [inaudible]. Okay. That's real domains. Okay, fine.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE:    [off mic].

PETER KOCH:           Oh, that's good. So, the other task was to reach out again and prepare a session at the ccNSO meeting to report of our progress which I'm hopefully currently doing has happened at the previous ICANN meetings and is unlikely to happen the same way at the next ICANN meeting because the study group intends to deliver the final report to the ccNSO Council before Marrakech. And whether or not we have a session about that is to be determined. And also we haven't sent the final report because we want to submit the draft report for informal public comments. So, we'll send this to the list, ask everybody for input, digest that input and then do the final report. We refrain from doing a full formal public call because that would involve so much time and effort and we hope we get away with this flexible approach.

                      Other activities we were allowed to do and it happened, what I already described. Because of the lack of responses or only getting a sole response, what we did was actually members of the study group and then later we asked staff to go do some additional research and identify those 16-17 TLDs. [Bernie] also

ICANN
COMMUNITY FORUM 64
KOBE
9–14 March 2019

looked into registrars to find out whether or not only would there be emoji domains in the zone, like resolver in the DNS, but would there also be registrars that would actually be able to handle the registration requests to get through?

And there are some anecdotal things in the report mentioned, including things where the registrar would accept this and then eventually find out that, oh no, the registry doesn't even accept those domains.

So, weird things seem to happen and the marketing side or the offering side on the registrar is not always in line with the registration policy of the TLD registry. But that's a side finding, so to speak. That's not to address the core message, but we thought it might be interesting to note these things in passing while we were working on the main work.

So, next steps for us.


UNIDENTIFIED MALE:      Peter?


PETER KOCH:             Bernie, do you have a mic?

| [BERNIE]: | Just a note. We had a list of 17 to whom we sent letters and there's a list … We say 16. They overlap but they are not one for one. So, the 16 are different from the 17, just to be clear. |
|---|---|
| PETER KOCH: | Yeah. If that confused you, don't worry. It confused me as well. But you'll find all the details in the report which I'd encourage you to read once we sent it out to the list. |

So, first draft of the report. There are some details that we need to finish. We will first distribute this document to the ccTLDs explicitly mentioned in the document, because at some point, we were more or less second guessing. We had gone to websites, downloaded registration policies and so on and so forth and we want to give everybody a fair chance to amend our findings, so that we do not misrepresent what registries have published. And in one or two cases, we had significant language issues and that would also help if the ccTLDs would react and give us some guidance in terms of what the policies really are.

So, after that, the draft report, as I said, will be published for lightweight consultation. It will be drafted – published by the study group for lightweight consultation so everybody can give input. After that, we will finalize the report and submit it to the council before Marrakech. That's the end goal. Any questions? I see a hand in the very back. Could you come to the mic?

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE:     Thank you for the opportunity to ask a question. I'm curious if you know the 17 ccTLDs that look like they might be allowing emoji IDNs, if you think that's intentional or if they just don't have any restrictions in the registration process that would prevent it.

PETER KOCH:     Thank you. That's an excellent question. We don't know for all of them. We do know some because they explicitly mention that on their website or in the documents we downloaded. We also know explicitly, for WS for example, because they have this code list published. We've heard rumors that there might be registration systems that won't do any checks at all but we haven't really been able to verify that. So, there is a spectrum of policies or restrictions ranging from full restriction, as in no emojis in IDNA 2003 or [inaudible] ranging up to no checks at all which would not only include emojis but maybe random junk, so to speak, to be registered. And we hope to be able after getting more input to categorize this a bit more, not to judge on the ccTLDs but to inform regarding the categories of policy so that we can describe the points in the spectrum a bit better. Does that clarify this? Thanks a lot. Yes, please?

BARRACK OTIENO:     Thank you, Peter. Barrack Otieno from AFTLD. I'm just curious from the list that you've displayed, I've seen quite a number of ccTLDs whose names are given away for free and I'm just wondering whether this would impact on the report, say, in future because most are not really run from within the country and they can be associated with one particular organization. Could this affect the results of this report in future, as things change?

PAUL KOCH:     So, we made a similar observation in terms of similarity and approach based on the documentation. So, I think there are two or three TLDs where the registry website looked more or less identical and we concluded or looked up in the IANA database – and I'll defer for details to [Bernie] in a second – but we did not explicitly explain all of this in the report. And to date, we did not consider making statements on pricing models in the report.

The study group hasn't come to the point … Well, so far it reached that there are no conclusions to draw for the study group. There might be conclusions to draw for other entities and the first entity to draw conclusions, being the addressee of the report, would be the council. Does that answer the question, at least in a way? Yes, thank you. [Bernie], do you want to add something?

[BERNIE]:                    Five registries have the same interface, yes.

PAUL KOCH:                   Okay. By the way, in terms of previous approaches, it has been mentioned before that the study group on emojis has been designed or has chosen approaches similar to what the study group on wildcards did. Since wildcards were on the plate anyway, of course searching for emojis at the second level was sometimes complicated by the fact that some of the TLDs, some of the ccTLDs, actually do have wild cards in the zone.

So, anything that you put in the DNS as a query will of course resolve. That includes unassigned code points and emojis and everything but we tried to factor that out by identifying those that had a wild card and then applied some more magic to make sure that we would only get the real registrations and not anything that was just expanded by the wildcard. So, we had to factor that in, but we hope that in the report results we have mitigated the side effects of the wildcards anyway. And we haven't reported on them in particular, at least if I recall correctly.

Anymore questions? Stephen?

| STEPHEN DEERHAKE: | Stephen Deerhake, American Samoa. Quick question for you since you are stumbling across CCs that wildcard. How many did you find that wildcard? |
|---|---|
| PETER KOCH: | Off the top of my head, I think a handful, and that is somewhere between zero and five. No, not zero. It was at least two but maybe five-ish. Like, this handful. Okay, anymore questions? [inaudible] coffee to ask a question. No? Okay. Any comments? |
| | Do you now consider offering emojis at the second level yourself? Show me the yellow card? Consider? Okay, nobody. |
| UNIDENTIFIED MALE: | Well, you know my opinion. It would be a good innovation if we can do it in a way that does not [inaudible] and interoperability, etc. So, I can only answer the question after I've seen the report, but if you don't pay any attention to, say, the technical disadvantages or dangers – and I think it would be an innovation that this industry would welcome. |
| PETER KOCH: | Thank you for that input and well-received. But responding to this on a more technical level, say, and to frame the expectation as well, what we could do in the remit of the charter is look at what |

ICANN 64 COMMUNITY FORUM
KOBE
9–14 March 2019

happens at the registry side, including going through registrars what the registration process would allow or accept.

Talking about doing harm to whatever, the DNS, the end user or something was not in the remit of the study group and would definitely need further research, including, for example, how software deals with those code points. We know because we did [inaudible] testing that for some of those domains – not for some of the domains, for some of the web browsers, for example – maybe most of them – if you put in one of those emoji domains, and you can't type them so you cut and paste them usually, but they would display. So, that piece of software would actually identify the emoji in the domain and would display it even though it is not an allowed code point.

So, some of the software seems we don't know, either not care or explicitly use these. So, the software doesn't implement the standard in the most strict sense and it can be argued in different ways.

I'm just saying we didn't go into the details of this but to judge or understand the affects of the outside and one of the affects is, of course, if you register domains that are out of the technically sanctioned code point list, then you're alone with your software and your software vendors. We didn't test that. And that will have

to be in scope for a wider test, including then all the confusability issues and so on and so forth.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE:     Okay. So, that's probably something we should maybe consider to do afterwards. It may be an unfair comparison, but there are still some purists in this industry that don't use HTML for their websites. They only use plain text for security reasons, I think. Can you imagine how it would all look if we would all do that?

There are always some disadvantages and I'm not sure how big they are for this particular [inaudible]. I think we have to make sure that we have a good insight in that [inaudible]. And if this study group isn't going into those details, then depending on what we get on your report, maybe we should consider digging deeper. I don't know.

I know that – I'm convinced that – if it's possible to do it in the right way without endangering everything we've built, this would be really an innovation for our industry.

PETER KOCH:     Thank you. [Bernie], do you …

**EN**

[BERNIE]: Thank you. Just a few points for [inaudible] of interest. We've been working off of a Google Doc so everyone in the group can access it easily. But trying to transfer it over – and I've tried several platforms – produces highly variable results is what I can tell you. Very highly variable results.

the other thing I realized when I was working on this that may be of interest to those of you who are contemplating this is that providers have quite a bit of latitude in how they implement the glyph. Unicode provides a general description and how Apple and Microsoft and Facebook and everyone else actually implements that is something significantly different. And in the report, we've got a whole annex dedicated to that and shows you how variable those things are.

The other thing that you have to remember is because the implementors are responsible for designing what will actually show up, they evolve over time and we provide examples also of some of the emojis changing dramatically from one year to the next for the same implementor.

So, maybe after we finish this work, we should start from a completely different beginning with the question if we wanted to have something like emojis in second-level domains, how would we go about it?

PETER KOCH:    Okay. I think we managed to … Well, one final remark before we run into overtime.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE:    Some of the people who are really excited about emojis have published a paper in response to the SSAC paper regarding this. I make no comment on how valid it is.

PETER KOCH:    Okay. Thanks, everybody, for your questions and comments. As [Bernie] said, currently the document is available as a Google Doc, but there is some work to do to get it into a concise PDF and reflect all the content, to put it mildly. So, that's some clerical work to do. In that, the study group itself, so we have to add some text at some point because of some wordsmithing. Then we will, as I said, submit this to the mentioned TLDs first and give you some time afterwards publishing it on the list and ask for comments for the final report.

If, in between, you have any concerns, contact me directly or write to the study group list or contact ccNSO support staff and everybody is happy to help.

Thanks so far and I think we have a now 10-minute break or something, right? Okay, see you after. Five-minute break, okay. Thank you.

BART BOSWINKEL: If you do not intend to go to this evening's cocktail and you have stickers, please return them to me or Joke or Kim because we have people who really, really want to go but do not have tickets. Thank you.

**[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]**