BUENOS AIRES – ccNSO Members Meeting Day 1
Tuesday, June 23, 2015 – 09:00 to 18:00
ICANN – Buenos Aires, Argentina

UNIDENTIFIED MALE:	Today is June 23, 2015. This is ICANN 53 ccNSO Members Meeting Day 1, La Pampa Room.
BYRON HOLLAND:	Good morning, everybody. Welcome to ICANN 53, the first day of the ccNSO sessions. We have a very, very full agenda over the next couple of days with a very significant program for us that will deal with a whole range of issues. But, of course, the primary issues will be around the work of the CWG and the CCWG.

The Program Working Group has constructed what I think is an exceptional program for us and for anybody participating remotely to get a deep understanding of the linkages between the two and some of the specific issues that are going to be of particular relevance to this community.

Without stealing too much thunder, there are five separate sessions on the issues related to CWG and CCWG. They have been constructed, essentially, to fit together to provide us, as a community, with a high-level overview and understanding of the linkages between the two working groups, a detailed drill drown into issues specific to us, and then towards the end of the day, Wednesday, bringing it back around for a consolidated overview.

All the way through each of those sessions, of course, will be the opportunity for dialogue and exchange and input. I would ask you, on behalf of the Council, to please be involved in all of these discussions because at the end of our two days of sessions, the Council will be looking to make a decision on whether or not, at this stage, to support the CWG's proposal to push it to the next step. I think that's a very important thing to be very aware of at this point.

The proposal of the CWG is going through a series of phases of which is this is but one of those phases. What we are really tasked with as a council, coming to out of this period, is are we ready to say yes and push the work of the CWG to the next phase in the process, which is off to the ICG to start to stitch together the various component pieces from the three different communities, names, numbers, and protocols? After which, of course, there will be another opportunity for us to participate as a community when they put their work to public comment.

But bringing it back to the next couple of days, please make your views known. Let our councilmembers hear your input, and provide it as candidly and transparently as possible, so that when we go into the Council meeting Wednesday afternoon, we'll have a really good sense of where the community is at on this phase of the process.

Lots of time to talk about CWG and CCWG, probably more than you ever wanted to know about both of them, but in all seriousness, this will likely be one of the most important decisions that the Council will

make, and we want to make sure that we do it fully understanding how the community is feeling about it.

It's a great agenda. The Program Working Group has put together, I think, a really, really robust couple of days. I look forward to the discussions and hearing from everybody in the room, on the Web, ccNSO member or not, everybody's involved in this conversation. I look forward to hearing from everybody.

And with that, over to you, Katrina.

KATRINA SATAKI: Thank you very much, Byron. Good morning, everyone. Could we get the presentation on the screen? Highlights, yes. Well, Byron just did my job and briefed you about the ccNSO meeting days. But still, there are a few things I would like to say.

Yes, these two days are really packed. Well, most of the time they're packed with discussions regarding CWG and CCWG documents and ideas that are sometimes hidden deep in the documents, and maybe you haven't had time to get through all the piles of pages that they have produced.

We think that our task here is to give you, really, a deep understanding of what's going on. By now, you should have realized that you are in Buenos Aires, and these are ccNSO days here. Oh yeah, thank you. Now we can move forward.

Two days, as always, packed with events and just as Byron already briefed you, we have these still combined these discussions around five blocks. The first block starts today at 2:00. It will start with a brief overview of CWG, CCWG, and ICG processes.

Just to make things at least a little bit easier for you, we have compiled a list of abbreviations that will be heavily used during the discussions. I think that in this case, when one can form a paragraph consisting of abbreviations only, it will be really, really helpful for you to have this list. Gabby will walk around and give you abbreviations plus two pages of summary of the process. Just, again, to make it concise and help you to understand what it's all about.

Block number two will follow closely after block number one, and it will highlight areas of agreement and disagreement that we have in our community.

On Wednesday, we'll start block number three in the morning right after the meeting with our representatives on the ICANN Board, and we'll talk about CCWG proposals and ccTLD views on these proposals.

Block number four, as you can see, it starts at 12:30 and ends at 3:15. Don't worry, we'll have a lunch break there. But, I must warn you, the lunch break will be shorter than usual. Usually, we have an hour, this time, we have to manage it in 45 minutes. Sorry, it just didn't work any other way. I know that Giovanni, for example, is really unhappy, but I'm sure you can run outside and grab a pizza. Right, Giovanni is always very unhappy when he does not get enough food. A relatively short lunch break, and we continue with block number four.

And just as Byron highlighted minutes ago, very important is block number five. Even if you sleep through blocks number one to number four, please wake up for block number five. Be here, because we really need to hear your agreement. This will be a wrap-up, and we will be seeking for your support. Or maybe if you do not support, anyway, speak up.

Here, I'd really like to thank all our representatives and these groups because they have worked really hard. You even can't imagine, and I think they couldn't imagine that themselves. They're spending enormous amount of time reading documents, writing documents, on numerous phone calls, discussions, and so on and so on.

So no matter what you think about the proposals, please respect these people and the time they have spent. They spent time that just for us to be able not to do that. We just can come here and hear short, brief summaries of the work they put together. So thanks a lot to them.

We also have some changes. Unfortunately, Annebeth cannot join us in the morning session. She has to be in another session discussing some [inaudible] things she's going to tell us about. We hope to move her presentation later today during ICANN update.

Another very important presentation during ICANN update I'd like to highlight here is a presentation about the future meeting strategy at ICANN. Bart and Keith will brief us on that. Why it's important because, as you know, strategy for meeting has changed. ICANN is going to do it differently, and it will affect ccNSO.

This is a presentation that Bart and Keith will give us. It's just to trigger your thoughts so you can think and be prepared for a decision that we'll have to take in Dublin. Not decision now, but please listen and get ready.

So two days of discussions. Luckily, we have our ccNSO cocktail tonight not far from here. It's walking distance to Sofitel Buenos Aires Hotel. Looking forward to seeing you all there. This is an excellent opportunity to discuss everything that's going on in not so formal format, and we really should thank our sponsors for this opportunity that they made this possible.

Thank you very much and, well, looking forward to seeing you all there. And, of course, during our sessions. So with this, I'd like to move to the next session, which is updates. Updates of various working groups. Giovanni is getting ready. Oh no, sorry, Giovanni. Relax. You don't have to be ready because Annebeth, unfortunately, as I already mentioned, cannot do that. Christian, could you give update on TLD-OPS?

CRISTIAN HESSELMAN: Thank you. Good morning, everyone. I'm going to give you a brief update on the TLD-OPS mailing list. How do I move forward? Click on it. Okay. Just a brief summary on what this really is. This TLD-OPS mailing list is a mailing list that acts as a content repository for ccTLDs. It enables ccTLD operators to easily and quickly look up each other's contact information. That's name, phone number, and e-mail address.

ICANN | 53
Buenos Aires

The folks that are on the list, the subscribers, are the people that are responsible for the security and stability of their ccTLD. The mailing list is open to not only ccNSO members but to also non-ccNSO members. Our goal is to try to get every ccTLD on the planet on this mailing list.

One of the unique elements of the mailing list is actually two things. One is that it uses a model of personal trust, which means that the subscribers need to join the list with their personal information: their first name, last name, personal e-mail address, and also their phone number.

We do not allow any role-based accounts or phone numbers on the list. The purpose there is to further enhance the level of trust within the ccTLD community, for instance, because people start recognizing each other's names on the list.

The other unique element is that we make this information available offline, as well, in that we extended the mailing list with a custom script that generates an e-mail message every month with the full list of subscription, a full list of contact information in there, everyone who is on the list with their names, e-mail addresses, and phone numbers. As a result, the subscribers will have this information in their inboxes so that they can also consult it in offline situations, which might occur in the face of large-scale Internet incidents.

The targeted impact of this whole repository is to improve the handling of incidents, large-scale Internet incidents that require a coordinated response of ccTLDs at the global level. The mailing list

was set up by the SECIR working group, which stands for Security E-mail Communications for Incident Response.

Alright. So this is the status in terms of subscribers. We managed to get 45%, so that's 134 ccTLDs on the list right now. The total number of ccTLDs is 246, as you can see in this table, so we still have 112 ccTLDs to go. That's 46%. On the IDN side, we managed to get 20 IDN ccTLDs on the list, which corresponds to 44% of the total number of IDN ccTLDs.

Just to give you an overview of what the TLD-OPS ecosystem, if you will, looks like. This is, let's say, the ccTLD. The picture is somewhat corrupted. This is the ccTLD that subscribes to the TLD-OPS mailing list. This is the person responsible for the security and stability of that ccTLD, and this person is then added or requested to be added to the list by the IANA admin contact, who sends a request to the ccNSO Secretariat, who then subscribes the folks to the mailing list.

The security and stability contacts, obviously, ccTLD can view the mailing list in two ways, actually. One is by querying it, which is sending a message on the list, like, "Okay, I need the contact information of this other ccTLD. Can you guys please send it to me?" And the second element is what we call the notification service, which is this TLD-OPS specific script that generates the full list of contact information and sends it on the list at regular intervals.

The whole system or whole ecosystem is being governed by what we call the TLD-OPS standing committee. This committee still needs to be

established, and the committee liaisons with IANA, for example, and also with SSAC.

Currently, we have the SECIR working group, who's basically taking care of this sort of thing, and we also take care of the interaction with SSAC and IANA, for example. But these responsibilities need to be transferred to that standing committee once we finalize the working group, which will be in a few weeks' time.

Also, the TLD-OPS standing committee will be responsible for starting new working groups to further develop the ecosystem in terms of technology, in terms of processes, and perhaps even in terms of types of stakeholders.

I basically already talked about this. These are the three different services that we offer. Subscriptions, how to subscribe to the mailing list; notifications, which are the regular e-mail messages with contact information in there so that this information is also available in offline situations; and the query service, which enables the security and stability contacts to ask for contact information.

Like I said, we currently have 134 subscribers on the list, which means that we're still missing 112 ccTLDs. In order to get more folks on the list, we developed two types of promotional material. One is a card, which has the ccTLDs on it that are not on the TLD-OPS list yet. It's in the back of the room just outside the doors, so please pick up a card.

If you're on it and you also think that you know somebody else who's not on it but should be on it, then also please pick up a card. The

instructions on how to get on the list are also available through the URL that's on the card. We also have the TLD-OPS leaflet, which provides some more information on what the mailing list is all about and why we made certain design decisions.

Okay? Once again, these materials are available outside these doors just in front of the La Pampa Conference Room. Yeah, so just this TLD-OPS leaflet.

I'm also going to give you a heads up of the conclusions and recommendations that the SECIR working group will be drawing in the next few weeks. The first conclusion is that we have been relatively successful. We managed to get 134 ccTLDs on the list, and we did that in the space of four months.

We think that this is also an indication that the ccTLD community continues to consider the content repository a service that provides an added value for incident response purposes. We also concluded that our main challenge was to devise a simple approach that would work for everyone both in terms of technology and procedures.

Finally, we realized that our outreach activities were actually crucial to get this many ccTLDs on the list. Outreach in terms of giving presentations for you guys, making this TLD-OPS leaflet, and so forth.

The three key recommendations of the working group are, first of all, to set up this standing committee that I spoke about that will govern the daily operation and further development of the TLD-OPS ecosystem.

Our second recommendation is to keep things pretty much the way they are now for about a year in order to focus on growing the number of subscribers. So until ICANN 56, roughly.

And our third recommendation is to add the security and stability contact information to the IANA database eventually. This is actually a very timely recommendation because IANA is considering to work on a new contact information model, and we've also liaising with Kim Davies about this.

Our next steps are to, first, request the ccNSO Council to set up the TLD-OPS standing committee. We'll be doing that right after the ICANN meeting, and only after that, we will submit our final report. We're planning to do that just before the next ccNSO Council meeting, which is at the end of August somewhere, I think.

The reason for doing it this way is that we provide some continuity because if we would finish now, then there would be a gap before the standing committee would be set up. Submitting the final report would then result in closing of the working group.

That that was pretty much it. If there are any questions.

KATRINA SATAKI: Thank you very much, Cristian. Any questions from the audience? Eduardo?

ICANN | 53
Buenos Aires

EDUARDO SANTOYO: Thank you. Just an idea that came to us yesterday when we saw the promotional material that you have. We in the regional organizations are going to going to use our list in order to promote within our members the registration of this list too. So I invite the other regional organizations to do something like that.

CRISTIAN HESSELMAN: Yeah. Actually, we've already been interacting with the regional organizations quite frequently. So for instance, with CENTR and also with LACTLD. It always helps to do it again. So if you would be willing to, that would be awesome. Thank you.

KATRINA SATAKI: Thank you. Just a quick show of hands. Who has subscribed to the list? I'm sure that Sweden has subscribed. Yeah. Okay. Thank you, and so that's good example for the rest of us who hasn't subscribed yet. Thank you very much, Cristian.

Sorry, it's me again. Guidelines Review Committee report. Forgotten already. This is our first report to the community. As you know, the work of the ccNSO is regulated by guidelines. And they are what they are. They are guidelines. So sometimes we follow them, sometimes we don't.

The purpose of the group was to review the set of current guidelines, ascertain whether they reflect current practices and working methods or not, and if they don't, we try to identify these discrepancies and

also potential gaps. The idea is that we propose changes to the current guidelines to the Council.

Our group is not very big, but I think we've done a lot. First of all, we had to go through the list of current guidelines, and we categorized them into five groups. There are guidelines which describe election processes, external appointments, internal organization of activities, internal organizational guidelines, and other.

Then we also set the sequence of activities. What will we do to do the job? First, we looked through the guidelines and thought are they all still relevant? Here, we came to a conclusion that the guideline on interaction on ICANN strategic and operational plan is completely obsolete. It's not used because this guideline was used before a standing committee SOP group was established.

Now there is an SOP working group, they have their own charter, so there's really no need for this guideline to be still on the list. So we advised the Council to archive this guideline.

Then we also determined priority of the review. Actually, when we started reading and reviewing guidelines, we thought it was necessary for us to rewrite them and propose our, we think, clearer and better versions.

Here, you can see the order of how we are going to review the guidelines, the order of the guidelines to be reviewed. In bold, you see those guidelines which we are currently already working on. We have reviewed them and started rewriting. How do we do that?

We developed a guideline review template, so everybody on the group who starts reviewing guideline follows this template and fills it in. For example, describes issues identified with the document itself. They have to answer some questions like, does the document fully address the issue? Yes or no. Or does the document correctly describe current practice? Yes or no. And so on.

We also thought it was necessary to set a general framework for ccNSO guideline: how the guideline should look like, what parts it should contain. Let me think. There must be title, version number, perhaps even history of versions if a guideline had been constantly updated and so on.

This is regarding the structure, but we also think there must be requirements to the content of guideline. For example, it must be clear, roles and responsibilities must be clearly defined. It should use plain English without any unnecessary layers of complexity in terms of the language, for example. It must be really clear and plain so that anybody from the community, even those people who are not fluent in English, they could read and easily understand who is doing what and why.

That's a short update, but I must say some other words. We expected this work to be completed by now but, unfortunately, we must say that it takes much more time and effort, especially because we started rewriting them. The work does not go so quickly and easily as we anticipated, so we decided that we really need some more support

ICANN | 53
Buenos Aires

from the community and we will ask the Council to issue a call for volunteers.

If you are willing to join our group and to work on the guidelines which will help us in the future, you're welcome and really would like you to join our group. Thank you very much. Any questions?

BYRON HOLLAND: Thank you very much, Katrina. As you can see from the agenda, the next two sessions we have are back-to-back meetings with first the Board at 9:45, which is in only a few minutes, and then immediately following that, there will be a short coffee break, and then we are on to the GAC.

Just as a reminder, we are back-to-back outside meetings, first with the Board, which is in Liberator AB, so the big room towards the end of the hall here, and then with the GAC in the room called San Telmo. First meeting with the Board is at 9:45, so just in a few minutes. Peter, did you have a comment?

While Peter gets to the mic, I am also just going to make one other announcement for those of you who have not heard. Gabby will be leaving us. I just wanted to let you know we will take an opportunity to more formally recognize that over the course of the next two days, but I just wanted to give you, as individuals, the opportunity over the next couple of days to say your own individual or personal thank you.

We're getting some red cards, Gabby, you're not allowed to leave. Gabby will not be leaving the ICANN family, she's just moving to a

ICANN | 53
Buenos Aires

different location within it. Yeah, she's taking the CEO position. You heard it here first.

Actually, she's moving on to the Global Stakeholder Engagement Group, so I'm sure in various ways we will continue to interact with her. But by the next meeting, we should expect that she will be in her new role, although final details and timing to be announced.

I just wanted to make that known so that you had an opportunity to chat with her over the course of the next two days as individuals. And just informally, I would like to say thank you for everything you've done, Gabby.

And with that, Peter.

PETER VERGOTE: Thank you, Byron. For the GAC meeting, I was wondering if we could a small addition to the agenda. Some of you might have seen the ccTLD focused survey that GAC members have received, and it's still unclear which GAC member initiated the initiative or what the deadline is or what the purpose is.

Some of the questions seem to be leading questions, as in how do you assure control over your ccTLD? That's the perspective that they take on that. So in the discussions on the IC, because it's in that context as being circulated, it might be useful to have somebody ask if there is more information available.

And then, secondly, suggest that all that information is already available as it was presented at the LA meeting. And the ccNSO, there was a presentation about ccTLDs and national legislation, which includes most of the information that they're looking for. So I would strongly recommend that if they're using a dataset, it's a reliable one, and it's one that's probably more complete than they'll ever get because it was created by the ccNSO and the regional organizations in combination.

BYRON HOLLAND: Good point. Thank you, Peter. So with that, given our next session is with the Board in five minutes, we'll call this one to a close and make our way down to Liberator AB for our meeting with the Board. Thank you.

KATRINA SATAKI: At 12:10, we'll start with Giovanni's presentation.

[break]

KATRINA SATAKI: Okay. We'll start in couple of minutes, but before we start, I just want to highlight another thing that might be interesting for our community. There's such a thing as Leadership Training Program brought by ICANN. Gabby has these cards, if anybody interested. The next leadership training is scheduled couple of days before the ICANN

ICANN | 53
Buenos Aires

meeting in Dublin, and the main idea there is to train current and future leaders and help them to build their network.

Actually, one of our counselors, Jordi, participated in one of the previous training sessions. If you are interested, first of all, take a card from Gabby. Second, you can talk to Jordi, and he will gladly share his experience. If you're interested, please don't be shy to grab a card. That's what leaders do. They grab cards and then participate in training programs.

Let's continue with our working group updates. Now I'd like to give the floor to Giovanni, who is the Chair of our SOP Working Group. Giovanni.

GIOVANNI SEPPIA: Thank you, Katrina. I do believe that, too, we will be soon be joined by Xavier and Carole, who are expected to give a presentation about the work they have done on the operating plan fiscal year '16 as well as they will provide us with an introduction about the dashboard that ICANN is about to launch in August this year.

Just a quick update that helps, also, to introduce Xavier and Carole. What we have done in terms of the Strategic and Operational Planning Working Group. We have submitted our comments to the fiscal year '16 strategy, fiscal year operating plan and budget at the end of April. And, together with the other comments, ICANN staff responded to our comments at the beginning of June.

We must point out a few elements of what we commented on. The first one being that we have a knowledge, a great improvement. It's, let me try to… It's this? Okay. We have a knowledge, a great improvement in the way the strategy and operating plan have been developed lately. We have done that because, contrary to previous year, what we have appreciated is that the format of the plan has been kept consistent, and also the level of information both in the strategy plan and operating plan has become more substantial.

By saying that, that will help and has helped us to provide more valuable feedback to the different parts, the different five objectives of the strategy plan, which have been, then, translated into the five objectives of the operating plan.

Also, in terms of the budget, we have been provided with more specific figures, which we have been asking for a while, including something that has been circulating on the list recently, which is the overview of the figures regarding the IANA expenses.

The second point that we have underlined in our comments is that, although we acknowledge there's been a lot of progress, we would like, still, to see more concrete and accurate KPIs and metrics for the various actions.

I can give you a couple of specific examples because ICANN staff has responded to this request in the responses to the public comments, but we believe that we are not yet satisfied with the comments we received from ICANN staff, although we acknowledge they keep on working to deliver the level of information that we are looking for.

And a couple of examples are the first one being what is called the Stakeholder Engagement Index. So the Stakeholder Engagement Index is an index that should help ICANN to assess the level of participation by the different stakeholder groups in their activities. However, this index is mentioned in the operating plan and budget fiscal year '16, and we would have liked to know more about the index. But in the response we have been provided, we have been told by ICANN staff that they're still working on the index without telling us a specific timeframe for the index to be provided to the community, at least a refined version of this index.

The second is about another index, which is also mentioned in the operating plan and budget fiscal year '16, which is what is called the [halt] index to measure the deployment of IPv6 and the DNSSEC introduction. And this [halt] index, again, should help ICANN staff to check the progress against IPv6 deployment and DNSSEC introduction.

We have, let's say, been quite supportive of the introduction of those metrics. But again, when speaking about indexes and receiving a response which says that ICANN staff is working on providing the community with the final index or at least they're refining this index, we would have liked to see a more precise timeline for the index to be shared with the community.

We have reiterated our request to see more concrete and accurate KPIs. But at the same time, we acknowledge that the quantity of KPIs and quality of KPIs that have been inserted in the operating plan and

budget fiscal year '16 is much, much better than in the previous year, so we have a knowledge to work of ICANN staff towards this goal to better serve the community and better have the community measuring the work of ICANN.

Then, the second point we have requested ICANN to be a bit more prudent regarding income projections as well as expenses. Regarding income projections, we have requested ICANN to be more prudent regarding the new TLD registrations renewal. The operating plan and budget fiscal year '16 assumes that there is a renewal rate of 50% for first year new gTLD registrations, which we believe is a quite optimistic renewal rate, especially considering the current TLD environment and the fact that many of the new TLD are experiencing not so high uptakes when they're launched in the market. So we have recommended to be more cautious when taking into account with these income projections.

Also, regarding the expenses, we have requested and obtained quite a significant clarification on two points. The first one being the new hiring. We were under the wrong impression, but that was based on some statements of the ICANN CEO, which may have been misinterpreted, that ICANN was not planning new hiring in the fiscal year '16 while the correct understanding is that the freezing of the hiring refers just to major hiring while the hiring process is a regular process in any big organization to cope with the turnover of an organization that has grown up to 300 employees at present.

The second, good clarification that we have received was against the comment that we made referring to the increase in the travel and meeting expenses, which is an increase of about 21% against the previous year budget. This increase is justified by, let's say, a more concrete approach, a more specific approach in determining what are the expenses regarding the traveling for all those who receive travel support by ICANN. Also, these expense reflects the travel needed for that new staff that was hired in 2015.

We believe that this kind of clarification is meeting our requests for clarification, so we really, again, appreciated the detailed information, which we are provided in the response to our comment.

The last point is a request for more precise timelines. This is something that we discussed during the call and the meeting we had last Sunday with Xavier and his staff. It refers to the fact that many times, when we have gone through the comment, we see that the response was, "Yeah, we are working on that," but there was not a specific timeline for giving the community appointing time in the near future, hopefully, when to check if this is there or is not there, if this index is implemented, if the metrics that we requested are going to be inserted in the work of ICANN.

And so we have, again, reiterated our request to see more timelines associated to the various actions that, at some point, have been kept quite vague in terms of the timing.

That said, during this morning meeting with the ICANN Board, one key point that we have highlighted is that we are fully supportive of

ICANN | 53
Buenos Aires
21-25 JUNE 2015

introducing a stronger culture of performance assessment at senior ICANN staff level. That's quite fundamental.

We acknowledge that Xavier and his team are there to collect the input that, at their end, they received from the ICANN staff and the different departments. Therefore, basing our reasoning on the fact that this should be really a bottom-up approach in this case, this should be provided with this kind of data with KPIs instead of imposing KPIs because that will not lead to anywhere.

I and the working group, we all acknowledge the extreme effort that Xavier and his team are making to try to get this kind of detailed information ICANN staff and the different departments.

We also reiterated that, as the ccTLDs, we have quite a long-term experience in producing a strategy plan and operating plan. We have reiterated our availability to share our best practices in this sector. Again, we are quite happy that we have seen more constructive dialogue taking place between this community and ICANN staff.

The last point, which was a quite predictable point to highlight in the dialogue we had with Xavier, is to make sure that in the next iteration of the review of the strategy plan, 16-20, which is going to take place in the second half of this year, and in the phase to draft the fiscal year '17 operating plan and budget, there is all the elements regarding the IANA transition and new schemes relating to the ICANN accountability are going to be taken onboard, and they're going to be taken onboard in the possible different scenarios because those are going to be probably major changes in the current structure of the way the ICANN

strategy plan and the ICANN operating plan and budget are currently conceived and produced.

Those are the key points I wanted to touch base. Again, we had quite an interactive and productive dialogue. We appreciated during ICANN CEO opening speech on yesterday that we are going to be shown soon this dashboard, and Xavier in his slide is going to talk a bit about the dashboard that we are going to be seeing in August.

Again, great progress, but as we were said this morning by the Board, we are very much liked for repeating for things that are not yet in the strategy plan and operating plan processes. Our working group is a working group that our comments are really taken onboard and appreciated by all ICANN staff and Board.

That said, I am happy to answer any question now or later. Otherwise, I leave the floor to Xavier, who's going to go through some points regarding the next phases of the operating plan and budget and the strategy plan. Thank you.

KATRINA SATAKI: Thank you, Giovanni. Any questions? If not, then let's proceed as proposed by Giovanni. Xavier.

XAVIER CALVEZ: Thank you. Do we have the presentation that we sent out to be put up? Thank you. Thank you, everyone, for inviting us to this session. We have in the past ICANN meetings provided feedback on various parts

of the operations of ICANN, whether it's on finance, on dashboards, on organization excellence, and so on, separately, in different settings, in different presentations. We would like to consolidate all these various topics under an operations update heading on a go-forward basis to make it a little bit more simple and easier for the stakeholders to also follow and participate too.

This operations set of activities is driven by our management systems, and can I have the next slide, please? Next. Okay. So Carole didn't put it in. Let's back up for just a second, sorry. The management system that we use basically starts from the strategic plan, where we have the establishment of the strategic plan, it then goes into the five-year operating plan that supports the achievement of the objectives, and then we have the annual operating plan and budget that that defines at a more detailed level the activities for the year.

Then we work through the year as planned, and we have discernment of, then, metrics and KPIs used to measure the performance. Then we have a report process, which is to communicate those results and KPIs and also financial results to indicate how the operations have performed through the fiscal year.

This management system in cycle of planning, completion, and reporting is the one that we're going to continue applying on an ongoing basis. What we wanted to also indicate that's in addition since about a year now is that we have an enterprise risk management function at ICANN, and we now include the management of risks into the planning process.

Those of you who reviewed the five-year operating plan that was submitted to public comment may have noticed that risks were integrated as part of each of the objectives, goals, and portfolios of the organization to ensure that the management of risk is taken into account into the planning aspect of the management system.

I wanted to provide a quick update on the budget, but this is basically what Giovanni has done with providing feedback over the public comment process. On the next slide, just a quick summary, there were nine organizations commenting, 85 comments received. The main topics where an insufficient policy support to several organizations; lack of clarity on the USG transition, this is what Giovanni was speaking about a little bit earlier; and a number of questions or comments on KPIs. There are other comments, as well, but those are the main topics.

The response process to the public comments included a number of calls that we've held immediately after the end of the public comment period to interact with the organizations that submitted comments and be able to better understand the comments, better understand the framework of the comments, as well as the expectation of the type of answers. We had a call with Giovanni and a number of ccNSO SOP Working Group representatives. Those calls where we held calls with other organizations, as well, who submitted comments.

Board members participated to those calls to ensure that we have a good understanding of the comments and that we are able to, therefore, address the comments with better answers than we had in

the past. The Board members, then, reviewed the draft of the answers that we produced to ensure that their answers were addressing correctly the comments.

Then the responses, those answers were published on June 5 on our website across all the comments. This is a document that's a bit cumbersome to read but that has all the comments by whom they were submitted and the answers in detail to every single one of the 85 comments, of course. Your global feedback on how that process and its improvements, notably by involving the Board members, has been effective or not would be certainly very useful.

As a result of the comments, changes were made to the budget relative to the policy support. We've increased the policy support in the budget by approximately half a million for two FTEs, two staff members, and as well as some professional services to support policy research, for half a million. It doesn't appear well on the slide for some reason.

We have, also, increased the language services budget by approximately half a million, as well, to face the…. No, it was not censorship. It's to face the increased volume of translations that the organization is doing because of the increased volume of documents that are being translated, not because of the increase the number of languages that we translate.

In order to not exceed the total of expenses and, therefore, exceed the revenues that we have, as a result of those changes, we have reduced the contingency of the budget, which is simply the amount of

expenses in the budget that are not allocated to any specific activities or there are simply, it's a flexibility in the budget. We had $4 million of a contingency within the $114 million of expenses of the budget. We've reduced that $4 million to $3 million, and we'll have to manage it more tightly in order to remain at the same amount of expenses and, therefore, not planning for a deficit, which we don't want to do, of course.

Those are the changes to the budget. Of course, in addition to clarification of language and edits or additions of language as a result of the comments or questions that had been put through public comment. Any more questions on that?

Giovanni, do you want to address the comment, for example, on revenue? On the projections on revenue? Just to put in context, the comment that Giovanni was sharing of the revenue projections for ICANN, notably on the number of domain names and the renewal. If you go in the draft for now of the budget, you will see that we provided scenarios on the renewal of the domain names that are, therefore, the transactions that we received and on the new gTLDs.

Giovanni mentioned the rate of 50% of renewal (this is blowing in my years) 50% of renewal, which he's indicated it could be seen as aggressive, at least for certain TLDs. By the way, in addition, instead of 50%, we've used 25% for those domain names that provided free websites, free names, simply because we knew that that providing free domain names is necessarily going to drive a much lower rate of renewal.

We provided scenarios on a lower renewal rate. And instead of about $4 million of revenues driven by new gTLD transactions, $4.3 million, we would have approximately $4 million. So bringing the rate of renewal from 50% average to 35% average makes the revenue goes down by $300K.

So first of all, we're talking about an amount of revenue that's less than 5% than the total revenue of ICANN. And then the sensitivity of that revenue to the number of transactions is, of course, relatively small. So we feel comfortable that even if there would be a lower amount of transactions resulting from the new gTLD program, it would be a relatively small impact and would be within, also, of course, a lot of other different variances within the revenue of ICANN.

For information, the main driver of the revenue of ICANN is the legacy TLDs transaction volumes, and that legacy TLD transaction volume has been forecasted at 2.2% growth. That number is exclusively derived from historical trends. One, because we don't want to start making assumptions on what the future of dot com will be next year.

More than that, the 2.2% that we have taken is simply taking the number of transactions across the legacy TLDs and trending that out. The 2.2% is the average of the past eight quarters. Yes. So instead of us speculating as to what dot com and dot net and dot org is going to have in terms of transactions or volume of activity next year, which would be substituting ourselves to the management of VeriSign, which we don't want to do, we only take trending analysis and we only extrapolate the trending analysis of the past transactions. We

ICANN | 53
Buenos Aires
21-25 JUNE 2015

definitely agree that it's not necessarily always the best predictor or best parameter to predict the future, but we cannot take a position that would be contrary or influencing listed companies' communication.

Next slide.

KATRINA SATAKI: I think we have…

XAVIER CALVEZ: Sorry.

KATRINA SATAKI: We have a question.

XAVIER CALVEZ: We can take questions now, if you would like.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: I have a question from Lesley Cowley: "What levels of actual renewals or new registrations of both legacy and new gTLDs would result in the need to revise the budget?"

XAVIER CALVEZ: There's a timing question in there. We're going to have the budget approval by the Board presumably tomorrow. So there's no time anymore now to revise the budget, and I don't know if Lesley's

comment was suggesting about knowing in the future about different levels of renewals.

At the time, we produced the projections of revenue for FY '16 (it was about three to four months ago and we've reviewed them two months ago) the amount of renewal activity for those new gTLDs was extremely small. Because if you remember, the first TLDs have started first half of 2014, so for many of them, we didn't have even one year of activity. So we haven't seen any renewal patterns at the time we produced the new gTLD forecast.

Which is why it's high speculative as to whether it's going to be 50%, 25%, anywhere in between, and we know that it will be very different depending on the TLDs. So at this stage, we are expecting to go with this forecast, also, because, again, we're talking about less than 5% of the budget. The amount of speculation that we can all make on that volume of transaction is not having a lot of effect on the budget of ICANN at this stage.

So our expectation is to monitor very closely as we continue to do the renewals, the number of domain names, the transactions to see how, to build experience, basically, on the basis of what we see happening, and then learn from that experience to have different approaches of predicting or forecasting revenues in the future.

But again, the amount of flexibility is extremely small. Just to remind you, going from 50% to 35% of renewal changes the budget of ICANN by $300K. I'm not worried right now with $300K in the budget.

[ANDREAS]:   Hello, Andreas [inaudible]. Xavier, I have a question. Since on ntldstats.com, out of the 6.2 million new gTLDs, 62% are parked, so I think you should take this into consideration for the renewal rate.

XAVIER CALVEZ: Sorry. I didn't hear. 62% are?

[ANDREAS]:   Are parked domains out of the 6.2 million new TLDs, new domains, under the new TLDs. I think you should take this into consideration for your forecast. Thank you.

XAVIER CALVEZ: Thank you for that comment, for sure. Just so that you know, we've introduced or we've developed a different way of projecting revenues at ICANN, and we are now doing it on the TLD-by-TLD basis. So the registry and registrar teams of ICANN work together. Some of you may know Mike Zupke and Krista Papac. They work together in their team to review each TLD one-by-one and put those TLDs into categories of possible growth in order to determine renewal rates, potential levels of fees, which, of course, drive whether we will invoice or not transactions fees for those gTLDs that exceed the threshold of 50,000 transactions over four consecutive quarters.

So we are doing a very detailed, now, analysis of that. And Mike is starting to use all this information in the categorization of the TLDs to

be able to be a bit more precise on the projections of revenue. Right now, it's an art more than a science simply because there's very little history and available statistics. Thank you.

KATRINA SATAKI: Thank you very much. I see Eduardo has a question. Yes.

EDUARDO SANTOYO: I'm not leaving. I just have a question for you. Probably for all of us and, of course, we could all use the opportunity to participate in discussions about the operation plan and the budget to follow up the resolution that we adopted as country codes or the ccNSO at the end of 2013 about the guidance, the contribution from ourselves, for our part to the ICANN budget. And probably could be important for us to have an update, a follow-up. How is this process going? Okay.

XAVIER CALVEZ: Thank you. In March, we produced and published, a draft and then revised draft to correct a couple of errors that were in it on the history of contributions by TLD. This is a document that's on the website that's been available for the past three months or two and a half months. We're happy to re-provide the link if you would like. But there's the contributions by year. Bart, you're saying you have provided that? Yeah.

But it's available for everyone. It's a table that's published on the website in the financial section of ICANN.org that has the

contributions by TLD by year, basically, and that table is currently updated as of 5/14. In terms of trends, what you will see is that we have seen an increase of the contributions in total that is resulting from the contributions that a number of TLDs have started to increase.

If you remember, for some of you, we had requested that you can indicate your intent of contribution, if possible, for the next three years when we asked that in FY '14. For FY '14 and possibly for FY '15 and '16, it's simply an indication, of course.

A number of TLDs have done that in demonstrating the beginning of a roadmap of growth of the contribution, so I also expect to see that materializing for FY '15. From memory from the previous year, the contributions increased by from $1.7 to $1.9 million in FY '14.

You just have to know, he's not here so I can speak about it, that UDA decreased its contribution at the same time in accordance with the guideline. You may remember that UDA had a large contribution that exceeded the cap. So UDA has started, also, decreasing their contribution to reach the cap logically, now that the guidelines are in place.

Nonetheless, we have started seeing an increase of the contributions and when we have the FY '15 numbers, then we will update that information and share it again. Thank you.

Next slide, please. May I skip that, please? So I'm going to need to… Next. I'm going to let Carole speak about the dashboard now, which

Giovanni provided feedback on the ccNSO comments relative to KPIs, so this is very timely.

CAROLE CORNELL: Thank you, Xavier. Thank you, everyone, for letting me come and give you a brief update on our progress on the dashboard effort that we've been doing. The slide that you're looking at here is an overall view of how we are categorizing and building the dashboard effort. As you can see, there are different levels of metrics that we use for different audiences, and this just shows you that we've been building a lot of operational and directional, what I'll call, portfolio dashboards.

We have about 90 to 100 of those, and we are building at the top an aggregated new group tied very much to the objectives and the goals. As we mentioned, that is in a beta version and we are going to be releasing it on the 20th of August. Shall I go to the next slide? I'd like to show you some specifics about that.

This is a little bit of what I've said. We've aligned it to our operating structure. If you know when you saw a little bit about our management system, everything is now tied to the same structure. So it's based on objective goal portfolio, and that's how the dashboards are also aligned.

Secondly, we are, right now, going to be showing a little bit about this beta, but we would love your feedback and input. It is something that we'll continue to develop and evolve, and the first version we'll be sharing, and then we hope to continue.

We would love to make sure that the KPI dashboards that we show work for you and help, as well as for helping manage and the whole effort, and so it's tied all together.

Lastly, we talked a little bit. They will continue, so I've repeated that.

Next slide, please. This is a first example of what the ICANN KPI dashboard will look like. As you can see, there are five objectives. This is based on our FY '16 to '20 strategic and five-year operating plan. As you can see, that this is an aggregation, so it shows a little bit about how you would read the score. You can also see that our on target is a fairly high metric that we're trying to meet and achieve, and that's why it is set up in that plan. As we build it, if that feedback is that we would want to change it, we would, of course, adjust that direction.

Next slide, please. For every single objective, you can see in this case, there are about six specific, if you will, portfolio level metrics that tie in to an overall goal. And you can see that we are tracking each one of those. If you go one more level, so if you were to go on the actual dashboard screen when it's available, you can click through to all three levels and see that, and see how we're progressing. If you'll go to the next slide, please.

You can see that very much we are talking about individual charts that share performance. KPI needs to be a good chart that can visually and quickly get the communication and message about what the goal is and how we're doing against that goal. You can see in this case, it's a financial metric and it is showing the revenue against how our overall

target and budget is and how we're doing against that and what the variance would be.

As you can see in this case, as Xavier would have shared, we're doing well financially, and that just shows in how that data is being reflected here.

Next slide, please. Okay. What I also would like to share is that we are showing this beta in the information booth, and we would welcome anyone to come and actually come and talk to us one-on-one, and we'll talk a little bit more about the individual KPIs and their targets and direction.

What was also shared is that we know that some of our KPIs still need further development. They don't have baselines, they don't have definitive targets, and they are something that has to very much align with our key success factors in what we hope to accomplish, and we will continue to evolve them.

Like many, most of you probably have dealt with that. There's collecting the data, setting up the direction, and/or establishing the good targets, and those take a while to evolve.

This is another part that I think is really important, and I'd like to spend a minute on. This is about organizational excellence. As one of our overall objectives is very much tied to that is a part of building a strong, resilient, both technically as well as organizationally, company. The effort that we'd want to do here is applying an EFQM

excellence model and building an assessment of how we are doing about those components.

As you might recall, IANA did this, used the EFQM model. What EFQM stands for, by the way, stands for European Foundation of Quality Management. It is something that is used throughout the world as a one-one standard of looking at excellence. The nice part about that model is that it allows you to have other auditable and other types of metric assessments to combine into it. So it allows that flexibility that we would be looking for.

The one that we did with IANA, as you'd like to know, we did three internal assessments and then did an external assessment using that model, and we were able to put a score out. Every year, now, we use that same assessment process with IANA, and now we are doing the same thing for all of ICANN, and that's the big change.

We completed our first high-level assessment, and we're in the process of analyzing both the strengths and areas for improvement. You'll be hearing more about that in the next couple of months, a little bit about those areas. Obviously, it would be an aggregated assessment that we would share with you.

The next slide, please. As organizational excellence is a continuous process, this is actually a five-year roadmap showing how and when we're going to do some of these assessments. As you can see, we started with a high-level. We're actually taking half the organization and doing a more in-depth internal evaluation for each year, and then rolling it into the assessment. Then we'll do the other half of the

department the following year with the hope that we would be able to share by FY '18 a formal external assessment score and effort.

Business excellence and organizational excellence as a whole affects all of the different management systems and processes in the whole organization. This is a collective effort and it is part of our culture and it's one more that we're continuing to engrain.

I think that's kind of an overview, and I'll be happy to take any questions, if you have any, on both the dashboard effort or our organizational effort.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: Thanks a lot, Carole. Can I just ask you to confirm that the dashboard will be made available to the community in August as announced? Is there a specific date, tentative?

CAROLE CORNELL: Yes. It is going to be on the 20th of August because it corresponds with the quarterly stakeholder call. So the data that's shown on the quarterly stakeholder call will be coming straight from the beta dashboard that will have rolled out. The two are linked together, and you'll be able to see those online at that time.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: And a second question regarding dashboard. What's the frequency for the dashboard being updated? Is it live update or weekly, monthly?

CAROLE CORNELL: Many of the metrics are updated monthly. The overall dashboard will refresh monthly. Some of the metrics have different timeframes where some are updated on a quarterly basis within that individual chart or metric and, therefore, not everything will necessarily refresh instantly on the month. But on an average, it will be updated and refreshed monthly, yes.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: And a last question. Is there the chance for the community to provide live input when they interact with the dashboard so there is an e-mail address or support to get clarification or provide, again, input?

CAROLE CORNELL: We actually do, right now. Even the beta version that we're rolling out has a feedback button, so you can talk directly. It would be an e-mail where we could correspond back and forth. Does it work directly onto the chart itself? That's something that will evolve over time, but right now, it does have a feedback, and we would love to hear feedback and input. And, of course, we'll correspondingly write back and communicate the results.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: Thanks a lot. And again, as we said during a meeting we had on Sunday, that's a great improvement. We were very much looking forward in the past, so we really appreciate that. Thank you.

CAROLE CORNELL: Thank you, and thank you for letting me come and share this.

KATRINA SATAKI: Thank you very much. So thank you. Now I have question to the audience. Is there Richard Leaning around? Oh, you are. Okay. Good. Sorry, we used big chunk from your time, but I hope you will be brief and give... Okay, so. Please, very, very briefly because we actually don't have much time anymore.

RICHARD LEANING: Good afternoon, everyone. My name is Richard Leaning, Dick Leaning from the European Cybercrime Center, which is a department from Europol, which we're based in the Netherlands in The Hague.

This presentation is going to be quite quick, and it's just to basically give everyone an update of where law enforcement agencies and other government agencies that have responsibility for protecting the public online are within the ICANN community.

I have got some slides, so I'll just carry on until they load up. Basically, as you all know, myself and some of my colleagues have been involved in the ICANN environment for a number of years now looking after the interests of predominantly law enforcement, then over the last couple of years, into the public safety arena. We sit with the GAC because we're government officials and, therefore, our normal place is with is

ICANN | 53
Buenos Aires

with the GAC, and that's where we have been for the last five, six, seven years.

Obviously, we've been involved in the RA 2013 and the law enforcement recommendations and the WHOIS reviews and the Privacy Proxy Working Group, etc. A couple of years ago, we had thought about formalizing our presence with the ICANN community, and we've had numerous discussion with ICANN staff and with Fadi himself about how we could do this and where we would sit.

As I said, we are a government agency, so we've decided to form the Public Safety Working Group as an advisory group to the GAC. Nothing else. We're an advisory group to the GAC. However, what we have decided to do is that we are doing an outreach program, for a better term, today, and we did some yesterday, where we're going to every part of the ICANN community to introduce ourselves, to say, "Look, we have formalized our presence with the ICANN, and it's a two-way process."

Any parts of the community who are looking for public safety advice can go to the GAC, and then the GAC will ask us to provide a comment or an opinion on some issue regarding public safety that may affect what you guys are doing here at ICANN, and in a bigger, wider global environment, as well. Are they all loaded?

Let me just, I've gone half through the slides already, so let me just catch up to where we are. The working group, even though it has a law enforcement issue, and we've been asked this before, it's not a law enforcement working group. It's a Public Safety Working Group.

Obviously, law enforcement are part of that group because we have responsibilities to the public, but we are just a small part of that group.

At the moment, we're going to keep it to government agencies that have responsibilities for public safety because we're starting off small, quite focused in some of the issues that we have been dealing with historically, and then we'll see how organically grows and who else wants to come into it.

Obviously, we have been trying to, for the last five, six years, get more government officials in that public safety arena involved in the ICANN. But it's a volunteer only, as we know, and trying to get buy-in from some of the public agencies that deal with public safety has been quite tough, especially globally. That's why predominantly it's always [inaudible] in the U.S., U.K., Western Europe-y type organizations. We're trying to do that better but, obviously, it's going to take time.

These slides will be circulated, yeah? Yeah. The stuff that we're sort of concentrating on at the moment, as I said, historical stuff. Issues that we have been dealing with that still have not come to some sort of implementation by ICANN or still under discussion of where we're going with that.

Things like WHOIS, I know that's a major issue for everyone and it has been for years and years and years, and it still is, and there's no timely timeline for where that's going to be resolved. That's one of the issues that we'll be dealing with. Contract compliance, obviously, which is for everyone, and implement of the new gTLDs.

I won't read that, but that's the reason that we're doing it, this is how we're going to do it. That's very quick because I know the time is short, but we're here all week. There will be further discussions on what's going on regarding this Public Safety Working Group. There is a session this afternoon in the GAC where it will be discussed. That's 2:00. Please join.

There's other sessions like this going on with other parts of the community, which is in the ICANN agenda. If you want to listen to it again, please come this afternoon to the other parts of the community. The best one will probably be the registrars, which is at 5:05, right around the 5:00 mark this afternoon.

We're here. Please speak to us if you've got any questions. I'll take some now if we have time, or you can speak to me outside over a cup of coffee or find me this afternoon, and we can have further discussions about it.

I know it's pretty short, it's a lot of information to take in, but we are formalizing the Public Safety Working Group as an advisory group to the GAC, and it's a two-way process. We'll be coming out to the community asking for your opinion and listening to what issues you have, and the same time we would like you to come to us and say, "Can you please help us or advise us what's your view in this?"

And it's not just law enforcement. I need to make that clear. It's all government agencies that have responsibility for the safety of the public online. I'm quite happy to take any questions.

KATRINA SATAKI: Thank you very much. Any questions? If you have questions, please come to the mics. If not, just as Richard said, you can grab him any time you see him and ask your questions, share your thoughts, if you care about public safety. Thank you very much.

With that in mind, we break for lunch. Please be back. Do not go to the meeting advertised by Richard. Come back here. At 2:00, we start with our discussions around CWG, CCWG, ICG, and things important for us.

So we start at 2:00 with our first block of discussions. Thank you. Enjoy your lunch.

[break]

BYRON HOLLAND: This session is broken into two components, the first half hour and the second half hour. The first half hour will be focused on the panelists to my right, to your left, and the second half hour will be chaired by Eduardo and the panel to my left, or to your right.

What we're trying to do here in the first half hour is provide a broad overview from an introduction standpoint of the CWG and CCWG, and the related, they're the associated timelines and interdependencies between the two work efforts.

We're fortunate to have the co-chairs of the CCWG and CWG here with us, who are our country code nominees or appointees there, as well as

ICANN | 53
Buenos Aires

Keith, who is one of our members on the ICG, and will be providing the update there.

Additionally, we're going to bring Eduardo into the mix to give us a little bit of an insight into what the ROs are doing and, of course, in particular the LACTLD, of which he is the newly reelected chair of LACTLD. Congratulations there, Eduardo.

I think it's safe to say that this has most definitely been an unprecedented process, even for those who have been… No coffee for me? Okay. It has been an unprecedented process and really has taken an unbelievable number of volunteer and staff, and staff hours, but countless volunteer hours to get to where we are today in both work streams.

There are many people who have done the heavy lifting to get us where we are today, but from the CWG perspective, I would like to just mention a couple of folks, and I mention them because it's also both inclusivity of the ccNSO. But I'd like to call out Lise, who is our co-chair of the CWG, who has spent countless hours, and that's probably actually true more than you can possibly count, on this, as well as Paul Kane.

Many of you will know Paul Kane, who unfortunately couldn't be here today, but is another non-ccNSO member who has spent countless hours and been on or led some of the design teams that have allowed us to get to this point.

I flag those two, not that others haven't done equal amounts of work, but really to speak to the ccNSO's inclusiveness and attempt to make sure that all ccTLDs' voices can be heard in the process. As we've already heard and I had mentioned this morning, I think our outreach in conjunction with our RO colleagues outreach has been very impressive. I would say that we have gone great to lengths, all of us, to make sure that all ccTLDs are invited, informed, educated, and to clearly indicate that we are very open to having any of them participate.

We've got a crowded agenda over the next couple of days to talk about every possible angle of these two work streams. As far as the CWG goes, I did want to kick off this block one with just giving us a sense of where I see where we're at in the process. I think it's key to mention this is a process and we're in a particular phase of it.

So to that end, we have created just a slide here to help situate us. And, as you know, a little over a year ago or almost a year and a half ago now, the NTIA made the announcement that they were going to be withdrawing from their historical oversight rule of the IANA functions, and asked ICANN, or the ICANN community, to come back with proposals on what that transition should look like and what the next state should look like. That's where the ICG was formed, which then put out an RFP.

I'm sorry for the acronyms. Hopefully, everybody has heard them enough, we all know what they are. A request for proposal was then put to the three distinct communities that all are customers,

ICANN | 53
Buenos Aires

essentially, of the IANA functions. That's the numbers, the protocols, and, of course, us in the naming community. Each of us was requested to put forward a proposal for what a post-NTIA world looked like.

Separate and distinct from that was the accountability track for enhanced ICANN accountability. Two completely separate bodies of work but, of course, material interrelationship between the two.

Over the past couple of months, both the numbers and the protocols folks have provided their submissions. Then we in the naming community, I think many would argue, have a more complex task and as a result have taken a little more time to get ours out and also ours is very much dependent on or related to, as contingencies, related to the work of the CCWG. So that has also been explicit.

The point I make right here is this, essentially, is where we are now, just prior to the step of potentially putting forward our recommendation of the proposal to the ICG. Again, this is a step because there are further steps where we can have input, both as the ICG stitches together all the proposals into a single unified one and also when there's a public comment period on that final complete proposal.

This is a point in time of which there are other waypoints along this journey that we will have the opportunity to provide feedback and input. Now in setting the stage like that, I would like to pass it over to Eduardo to talk about how they're seeing the process from an RO's perspective and maybe just quickly some of the efforts. I do recognize

that we only have half an hour for this piece of it, so we'll try to keep the comments succinct. Eduardo.

EDUARDO SANTOYO: Thank you, Byron. Good afternoon for everyone. Just to having a look at the website of the ccNSO for this meeting, and having a, also, look for the websites of our reorganizations of material about this topic. This is a good testimony of how much, how we in working on this. Not just ccNSO members. Of course, we have very hard workers representing our positions on the panel of discussion on this, but also, the interest that we have as a not just ccNSO, but the reorganization make it available for everyone, the information about how this process going.

We, as reorganizations, are also are doing some efforts in order to support the work that is being done by our representatives here and the ccNSO, and then the CCWG, of course, and the CWG. That we have been done as a more to extend the outreach done by the ccNSO, trying to arrive and to deliver the message to all the CC community.

We are aware that we, from the ccNSO, have a new list to say CC community that we are working on that list, but we are also, from reorganizations, sent many messages for all the CCs from my region, telling that this is happening, that the process is going on.

We having translated many documents to the languages that that are spoken in our regions in order to make those to all the CC community available information about this. We did seminars; we had webinars

ICANN | 53
Buenos Aires

on this. We spent time from our boards, and we dedicate a lot of work from our stuff analyzing and giving to our members the information with a little more process of what is the discussions going and what is the main topic of interest.

Of course, we are trying to get the people involved, trying to get the people participating on the process, which is not easy. Because we, as ccTLD managers, are people, they are really busy doing many things, and most of the time don't reply when you ask for comment, ask for information.

Many times, they rely on the activity that their representatives on the ccNSO or in their reorganizations and the staff are doing in order to support the activity. That happens in a lot in our reorganizations, too. But we are confident that we have doing the best from ourselves in order to get the message delivered for the CC community and to contribute to the efforts that have been executed [as the Board] here and also the ccNSO.

For that reason, I have to confess that I've been surprised this morning when one of our representatives in the Board said that most of the CCs are not aware of what is happening here. But okay, I'm confident that we are doing, that probably more things could be done, absolutely, ever. But until now, for sure, that I guess and we can give testimony that we are working hard in order to make the people aware of these processes going on in trying to get them participating on the debate.

That's it. That is that I want to share with you from the point of view of the regional organizations. Thank you, Byron.

BYRON HOLLAND: Thank you, Eduardo. Now I'm going to turn to the panelists on my right for them to provide us with, essentially, a picture of the three disparate processes and their relative timelines and any other elements they wish to add right now. But, really, we have if I could ask about five minutes each as an overview for timelines, dependencies, and interrelationships.

And I'm going to start with Keith.

KEITH DAVIDSON: Thanks, Byron, and good afternoon, everybody. The ICG, I think I'll just cover a little bit of background for a minute and then where it's going. Remember, the ICG was formed in April 2014 and consists of 30 representatives from 13 communities, of which five are not SO or ACs within ICANN but related communities like IETF, IAB, ISOC, and so on.

The ccNSO had four seats given on the group of 30: myself, Martin Boyle, Mary Uduma, and Xiaodong Lee, those four representatives. We were also added as observers to the CWG IANA working group and, for some reason, the observers are now known as participants. But I wouldn't say we're doing much more than observing on that group, although Martin has put his name forward quite often to get his hands dirty and take the pen.

The ICG has just concluded its fifth face-to-face meeting in Buenos Aires on Thursday and Friday of last week and has so far held 17 teleconference calls. That's completed the evaluations of the IETF's

proposal and the RIR's proposal and has worked on some of the testing of the combination of those two proposals and are still awaiting, of course, the names proposals.

But it's not sitting waiting doing nothing. It has already had one look at a pre-assessment of the names proposals as it stands now. There is now a slightly more formal pre-appraisal of the names proposal going forward, and Martin, Mary, and I have all put our names forward as volunteers to be part of that evaluation group. Our evaluation will occur over the next two weeks.

The sorts of things that we're evaluating are the requirements laid out by NTIA, which is to test the commitment of the proposal to openness and inclusiveness, to completeness and clarity, does it fulfill the NTIA criteria of supporting and enhancing the multi-stakeholder model while maintaining the security and stability of Internet and meeting the needs of the IANA customers and their partners, and while doing all of that maintaining an open Internet and making sure it's not dominated in any way by government.

When the names proposal is evaluated and finalized, it will be compiled into a single amalgamated proposal with the IETF and RIR proposals. Xiaodong, as the fourth member of the ccNSO group, has volunteered to be part of the evaluation team for that completed proposal.

The ICG itself is next scheduled to meet face to face in Los Angeles on 18th and 19th September, and it's hopeful that we will ever final-ish names proposal at that time.

Then our task, when we do have a final proposal, is to hand that single proposal to the ICANN Board, remembering that the ICANN Board has agreed that it will not manipulate anything within that proposal. It will either reject it or send it on to NTIA to complete that stage of the process and start the next phase.

I think for those of you who have saw at the opening ceremony Fadi's slide on the transition, it has phase one still in operation through to ICANN 54 in Dublin, the ongoing work of the CWG and the CCWG to get all of those aspects finalized. I won't discuss those in any detail because that's not our business, but the intention and hope is that will be finalized so that immediately after ICANN 54, it would go to phase two, which is the NTIA's review and evaluation. That could take up to 90 days, and then phase three after that, which could run all the way through to ICANN 56, would be the actual implementation if everything goes to plan.

I think, for the first time, we're probably on the ICG expressing some confidence that there is a plan that makes sense and can be achieved. I think rather than the speculative plans that we've heard and the impossible workload that we've placed on the two groups to my left, I think we might have something that is actually pragmatic and practical.

That's it for me. Thank you, Byron.

BYRON HOLLAND: Thank you, Keith. Our goal is certainly to have an opportunity for Q&A after the three of them have gone through their brief presentations. And with that, Lise.

LISE FUHR: Thank you, Byron. I don't know the slides that was promised should be up here. But I'll start with thanking the ccNSO for allowing a non-ccNSO member to be a co-chair. That's been, well, that is something. Oh, even though it's a lot of work and I'd like to get my life back, it was great to have that trust. I would also like to thank the CC members and participants of the working group because many of them have really done a tremendous amount of work. We have a lot of participants that are working in more in the one group. I think that's really impressive.

My first slide was actually to show you, as Byron also stressed, that we are a part of the process. This CWG proposal is a part of a larger process where one leg is the accountability work where we have dependencies, and the other one is, of course, we need to have the three proposals compiled in one by the ICG. This is actually why it's very important that we finish our proposal now and either approve it or not but, hopefully, approve it and submit it to the ICG.

Slide number three, please. Thank you. As you might all well know, the CRISP and IANAPlan submitted their proposals in January. We had to do a second round because the first public comments showed that there was not enough support for that model. So we went into a second public comment and actually, now, we have a proposal that's

ready for submission if we have green light from the chartering organizations.

The chartering organizations are the GAC, it's the ALAC, it's the ccNSO, it's the GNSO, and their SEC. Those organizations have to give their approval in order to have sent to the ICG. As stressed by NTIA, it's very important that we have a consensus proposal, so the approval has to be unconditional.

The ICANN Board has also said that they would pass on any proposal from the ICG to the NTIA. They are not going to do anything with it, but they'll pass it on. And as you see, we have a linkage to the accountability group, and the reason for this is that ICANN is a policy body for domain names and the current IANA functions operator. And by having these two functions, we are more dependent on the accountability than the CRISP and the IANAPlan proposals.

Next slide, please. That's the 11th. Oh, that's going to be the last one. Because the way forward, as I said, we have a final proposal the 11th. That's the last slide. Yep. So the plan is that by the end of Wednesday, we hopefully have green lights from all the chartering organizations to go on and submit the proposal. We'll send it to the ICG that will work with it and get back to us regarding issues they might have questions about.

They already raised a question regarding the trademark of IANA. We actually didn't included this in our proposal. We found that it was not needed for the transition, but we will work together with the numbering and the protocol communities in order to solve this issue

afterwards. It's not because the issue is not going to be dealt with. We just didn't find that it was an issue that should stop this process, so it's going to be worked out in the weeks to come.

So where we are is that hopefully by Wednesday, we'll send the group, the CWG will, the co-chairs, Jonathan Robinson and I, will pass on the proposal to the ICG, and they will start working on compiling this with the numbering and the protocols proposals in order to have one compiled and one proposal to send to NTIA. Thank you.

BYRON HOLLAND: Thank you, Lise. Mathieu?

MATHIEU WEILL: Thank you, Byron. Thank you, everyone. It's good to see a room as full as this for what is essentially the beginning of a long series of panels on the same topic but under different angles. I think we are all aware of the responsibility that we are bearing in preparing for these important decisions in this meeting and then the next meeting. I know that's where our community steps up when it's about making decisions in the interest of our communities.

So the goal of... Can we go to the overall, the slide about the overall process that shows the ICG and everything? The Accountability Group, so the namely the Cross-Community Working Group on Enhancing ICANN's Accountability, the Accountability Group was formed later. We started late.

The reason for that was that it took a little bit of time for ICANN to realize that the transition of the stewardship of the IANA function also had consequences on ICANN's governance, basically, the checks and balances around ICANN. It's the community that reminded ICANN very forcefully that there was a need for an accountability working group to take place with the goal to raise ICANN's accountability to a level where everyone was confident the IANA stewardship transition could happen.

What is striking, looking back at that, is how accurate this prediction was. It was sort of an intuition at this point, but if you look at the CWG dependencies, the linkage between the CWG's stewardship and the Cross-Community Working Group on accountability, this is exactly why the demonstration that this linkage was necessary and that there was a need for the work to be done on accountability, as well.

That's related, as Lise said, to the fact that ICANN is for domain names both the IANA function operator and the body that does the policy for the GNSO, for the gTLDs, and on very, very tiny grounds, and that's what we need to ensure for such issues where ccTLDs might be involved. And ICANN's mentioned, for instance, [FOI] working group, which is up for Board approval during this meeting.

That's why it was necessary. But we started late, so we're not at the same phase. We started in December with the chartering organizations of this working group being the ccNSO, the GNSO, the ASO addressing the GAC and ALAC, and ccNSO appointed five members, they're all here today. I have the pleasure, the honor to be

trusted to be the Cross-Community Working Group co-chair. It's a lot of fun, a little bit of work, or the other way around.

Where we are today is that we have issued a public comment early May on what our initial draft proposals, which are not consensus of the group but reflect how advanced our work was. It was extremely important that we go for public comment instead of mulling within the group forever until we find a consensus that would not reflect actually community input or interest.

So it was very valuable that we get to this public comment. We received more than 60 comments. I've seen close a little less than ten ccTLD-related comments. I'm not mentioning only the ccTLD managers. There was a comment from CENTR, as well, and so it's a good participation for overall for the public comment and for ccTLDs in particular. But obviously, it's more of the ccTLDs that were following this process closely, so we look forward to the discussion we'll have in the next few days to actually get even more comments.

Our group had a face-to-face on Friday here in Buenos Aires to assess the public comments received. I will go more in detail tomorrow, but basically we are [comforted] on the architecture and requirements of our initial proposals, and we are already swiftly adjusting our footings, taking into account some of the concerns received on the implementation model and, essentially, some of the legal implications of that.

What's important going into the next panel is to know that what has been proposed, what has been put on the table in terms of

ICANN | 53
Buenos Aires

requirement by the Cross-Community Working Group on Accountability is still very much up-to-date. That's a good basis to assess the linkage with the CWG.

Tomorrow, we'll go deeper into this, and we have prepared a number of questions, ccTLD-related questions. We'll try to provide examples so you can relate to how these broad governance questions actually relate and are of interest for the ccTLDs.

What's next? Our group is going to convene in the wonderful city of Paris mid-July, and I can tell you it's a wonderful city at this point of year. Unfortunately, we might not be able to enjoy this very much because we'll have a lot of work to do to prepare for second public comment, which should be issued by the end of July for a duration of 40 days.

We will then do our best, after receiving the public comments, to get our final proposals ready for approval in Dublin. What we're doing here this week for the CWG, we would, and I hope we will, have to do in Dublin both for the ICG proposals and the accountability proposal. So this is just a warmup that we're doing here in Buenos Aires.

It's worth mentioning, as well, that part of our work is going to be obviously then sent to the ICANN Board, which has committed exactly like the ICG to transmit this to NTIA, which will then go into the process that was described by case of Congressional approval, etc.

That includes, that's a point that is important to make. The bill that's currently being discussed by the Congress requests that the NTIA

ICANN | 53
Buenos Aires

submission to Congress includes the bylaws adopted by ICANN. Since much of the work of the Cross-Community Working Group on Accountability can be implemented through bylaw changes, that will have to be submitted probably around mid-November. There's a lot of work to be done on the bylaw changes within our group.

I think in terms of process, I've been as comprehensive as I could be. So I'm turning back to you, Byron.

BYRON HOLLAND: Thank you, Mathieu. Thank you, all, for providing that. We have the opportunity to have some Q&A. Given that we have another panel, as well, in this session, I would ask if there's any questions or issues that people want to raise, please come up to the mic. But recognizing we have five more varied sessions, if we could try to keep any questions related to the substance of what we've been talking about thus far, which is more about the processes and timelines. Not to cut anybody off, but if possible.

PETER VERGOTE: Good afternoon, everybody. Peter Vergote from DNS Belgium. I would like to thank the panel for their concise high-level overview over where we are with the CVG and the CCVG work. It might be good for this group to know what the linkage is or what's going to happen in the next couple of days within other supporting organizations and other advisory bodies within the ICANN realm.

We all know that tomorrow is going to be put for decision for the ccNSO council, but I'm curious to know, is it already on the agenda for the coming days of the GNSO council, and what about GAC? Will they also need to adopt it or formulate an advice in the coming days? I want just to know a bit how the linkage with those entities is before it can actually be passed on to the ICG. Thank you.

LISE FUHR: Thank you, Peter. Yes. We expect to have an answer from the GNSO by tomorrow afternoon. I think they will have it at 3:00 where we will have it a little later, the ccNSO. I know that the GAC is preparing, also, to have some communication regarding their decision tomorrow. We will have from those and, also, the SSAC will have a decision. So everyone is planning to give a decision by tomorrow. Thank you.

BYRON HOLLAND: Keith?

KEITH DAVIDSON: Just to add to that, the ICG, before it signs off on the final proposal, has to satisfy itself that all the communities, all 13 communities, have achieved consensus on what is being proposed. So there is an important test along the way that we see the sign-off of GNSO and GAC and others, if not fully endorsed here, at least by ICANN Dublin.

BYRON HOLLAND: Mathieu did you want to add to this?

MATHIEU WEILL: Yes. It's just a small addition stemming this session we've had as Cross-Community Working Group and Accountability with the ICANN Board. Anyway, from that session, we also understand that the ICANN Board is getting ready to start some of the implementation work that would appear necessary after the approval of the proposal from the CWG.

I think that's also a clear demonstration that all the communities is really getting together and getting ready to move to the next phase here in Buenos Aires.

BYRON HOLLAND: Thanks. Are there any other questions for the panel? Peter, yeah, I think you're going to have to get up.

PETER VERGOTE: Thank you, Mathieu. On the timing when you're talking about 40 days of consultation period. Is that working days or calendar days? While there might be a detail, if we're talking about 40 calendar days, you probably just had about a week that most of Southern Europe is coming back from their holidays if you send out the second proposal at the end of July.

MATHIEU WEILL: It's not Congressional days, if that's what you wanted to know, but it's calendar days. We are acutely aware of this issue. That's particularly the

case for France. So, yes, we know it's a challenging period to refine the proposals, and the ICG's probably going to find the same difficulties but also for the public comments. I mean, there's always a little bit of flexibility for a few days, but 40 days is your standard period. We will stick to this.

BYRON HOLLAND: Thank you.

STEPHEN DEERHAKE: Mathieu, you mentioned that…

BYRON HOLLAND: Since there are webcast viewers, can I just ask you state your name?

STEPHEN DEERHAKE: Oh yeah, Stephen Deerhake, American Samoa. You mentioned that as part of the currently pending Congressional legislation regarding all this, that they want to have a look at the bylaws that will be made as a result of what the CCWG is doing. It's my understanding, from my read of the legislation I've seen to date, that it's not their intent, the Congress' intent, that is, to actually make changes to those bylaws. Is that consistent with what you understand?

MATHIEU WEILL: Absolutely. Thank you for the question. My understanding, and I'm saying my understanding and that's…

STEPHEN DEERHAKE: It's always subject to change.

MATHIEU WEILL: It's still subject to change because I understand it's not being passed in [law] at this point. But my understanding and what the way I heard in NTIA express it in previous sessions here on the record at ICANN, is that the NTIA will be asked to certify that the proposals meet the NTIA requirements and that the bylaws have been adopted and are consistent with that. So the Congress would not change the bylaws.

BYRON HOLLAND: Thank you for the question. We'll take one last question because we do have to move on to the next panel.

JULIE CONG ZHU: Okay. Thank you. Just want to seek some clarification on the process.

BYRON HOLLAND: Could I ask you just to state your name for the record.

JULIE CONG ZHU: Yes. This is Julie Cong Zhu from China. I just want to seek some clarification on the process after ICG received the proposal from CWG and have all the three proposals combined together, they will have it posted for another round of public comment without doing any modification or change. Is that it?

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: Yes.

JULIE CONG ZHU: So what's the purpose for another round of public comment if, given that CWG has this proposal for second round of public comments?

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: I think the purpose is to ensure that everybody who has affected or impacted is aware of exactly what the transition involves. Gaining consensus is a long and iterative process, and this is another step of making sure that everybody is aware. The worst thing that could happen is when ICANN has taken the proposal through NTIA to Congress, that Congress hears from a group from affected people saying, "We don't think we were properly consulted." So it's just, again, so we can tick the box to say, "Everybody has had great opportunity to engage."

JULIE CONG ZHU: Okay. Thank you very much.

BYRON HOLLAND: Okay. As we have the co-chair of the ICG with us, you have the last question.

ELISA COOPER:

Sorry. I know you closed the queue, but thank you, Byron. My name is Elisa Cooper. I'm the Chair of the ICG, and I just wanted to add a little bit on to what Keith said because that question has come up a few times.

In addition to providing for broad public input, the ICG's public comment period will be the key opportunity for the public to comment about the proposal as a whole. There has been a lot of opportunity to comment on each of the individual components, but we're looking for input about how the components fit together, whether they're compatible, whether they work together, and also whether all three of them together satisfy the criteria that NTIA has set out.

So while there's been a lot of detailed comment on the individual components, we're really looking for people to provide input about the entire proposal together, which there hasn't really been an opportunity to do that thus far. Thanks.

BYRON HOLLAND:

Thank you for clarifying that. So just to wrap up, I just wanted to note a couple of the themes or comments that resonated with me. From time to time, ICANN might have been criticized for occasionally being a bit top-down, but what I have heard here is that in spite of the way the process started, which didn't really seem to include a substantive accountability track, like initially, it was considered that any bits of accountability related to the transition would be handled inside the

CWG, as a community made it clear that was not going to suffice, ICANN did respond and change tact.

I think that's a testament to the community and to the fact that ICANN can listen. I'm also very encouraged by what I hear from Keith that there is, already, a clear framework through which the ICG is going to view the proposal. So I think that can be transparent to all of us as they go through their machinations in trying to stitch together the proposal to see if meet, we, broadly speaking, meet the criteria laid out by NTIA.

The CWG in its early going came up with the first draft in December/January and didn't get the positive reception to that and went back to the drawing board. To me, that really speaks to the notion that a bottom-up, consensus-oriented, participatory environment is the one that has really taken root on this broad issue.

While there are clearly many interdependencies and many thorny issues to still wrestle to the ground, when I listen to the three parties here talk about what they're all doing in their respective groups, there's much work still to be done, but I have to say, I'm very encouraged by it. Thank you, again, for your work.

With that, I'm going to hand it over to Eduardo. I apologize for being 15 minutes behind, but good luck in making up that time.

EDUARDO SANTOYO: Thank you. We were intended to have one hour and 15 minutes' time too. Okay, this is the section design that they just give us the

opportunity to be in the same page on what is the proposal. What is the final a proposal from the CWG?

For that, we are going to have three sections on this panel. We're going to have a first one, just to give us a general overview of the proposal. We are going to have a general overview of whether the final proposal, and we are going to have the opportunity to see where were the changes introduced from the original one to this new and final proposal.

The second section that we are going to have on the panel is a tour through the main elements of the proposal. We are going to have our panelists participate in this, and they giving us the information about what are precisely their definition or the concept of these particular elements in the proposals.

Finally, the third part of our panel will be the question and answers from you from the floor. Each panel is probably going to have between 10 to 12 minutes to do their presentation. We are going to start with Lise. I never say "Lisa." Lise, sorry for that. But please, present us the how is the actual and final proposal.

LISE FUHR: Well, thank you. Eduardo. Actually, I'll just go quickly through the slide deck that was used for the engagement session yesterday. It will take 45 minutes, but I guess you're okay with that. No. Sorry. Joking. Yeah. He's not listening, but that's okay.

I just put the slide deck in this session because I find it's important for you to have and you can go through it yourself in a timely manner, whatever, and actually have a look at those explanations that are in the slides. I guess most of you have heard this session before, or some of it would also be more detailed presented by my fellow colleagues here. So I'm just going to give a quick overview.

I'll just give this slide a few words, and that is it looks very boring and only numbers, but this is actually very important because it shows the diversity of the group and it also shows the amount of effort that's been put into the work. Actually, the diversity is what legitimizes our work and the proposal, and it's an excellent example of multistakeholder work at its best.

Part of the process we've talked about. Well, I'd like to go a little deeper into the goals and the requirements of this proposal because I actually find it's quite important to know why the proposal is built as it is. Of course, some of it is a response to the ICG request for proposal, but another one is we settled the scope on, of course, there is a contract today with NTIA. So we found that it was important to have a contract again.

We also found that it was very important to have accountability mechanisms with respect to the IANA functions. This was actually a lot of the focus from this group for the first proposal, and we got a lot of heat from not being operational enough, but nevertheless, it's still very important that we have the adequate accountability measurements in place for the IANA functions.

Furthermore, we found that it was important to have an insulation between the operational and the policymaking responsibilities between ICANN as a policy body and IANA as an operator. We also needed a mechanism that would approve the change to the root zone environment, and it was also very important that we could ensure adequate funding for the IANA functions.

And last but not least, it was also found to be very important to have a possibility to separate the IANA functions in the extreme cases where all the other measurements had failed and we couldn't get any further with the escalation mechanisms. We would need, as the ultimate tool, to separate the IANA functions. The overall goal was to meet the needs of the direct customers that are the gTLDs and the ccTLDs. We also found that this was important to have included in the model.

This was the travel we made with a lot of models. We tried to go out with the first proposal with an external model and had to go back to an internal model. You can see the legal input we received from Sidley Austin helped us actually narrowing it down to one model, which is in the proposal now.

I also find it very important to highlight that Sidley Austin is also the legal advisors of the accountability team, and that's important in order to ensure the coordination and the conditionalities between the two proposals.

The actual model is what you see here on the screen to the right. We call it the post-transition, and you can see to the left that's the current situation where NTIA holds the contract with ICANN. They have the

ICANN | 53
Buenos Aires

oversight of the IANA functions and also authorize all functions being carried out by IANA.

To the right, you can see that we proposed a new model where some of the issues that I mentioned on the prior slide are actually fulfilled. One of them was the separation of the policy body and the operations, and that's been done by suggesting to have a legal separation of the IANA function in an affiliate instead of within ICANN as it is today.

As you know, this is only a symbolic representation. We will get all the further details later from the panel who is here, but it's important to state that the IANA functions stays within ICANN. This was one of the premises that we got from the first public comment. People were very happy with the IANA functions; they like it to remain within ICANN. So we tried to meet the needs of having the possibility to separate at a later stage and keeping the IANA functions within ICANN. That has been done by having the IANA function as an affiliate.

The rationale for that legal separation is the enhanced structural separation, as I said, between policy and operation. It gives us a possibility to have a contract between ICANN and IANA. It's also a safeguard against ICANN bankruptcy. And as not the least important, it gives us a possibility to ringfence the IANA function, so if we want to separate it at a later stage, we don't need to fight about what's included. It's all ringfenced by the legal entity.

Furthermore, we have some accountability measures that's proposed, and one of them is the Customer Standing Committee. That's supposed to be composed of direct customers, it's supposed to

ICANN | 53
Buenos Aires

handle the day-to-day performance, and you will hear more about this from the others.

We also have an IANA functions review team. That's not standing. It's supposed to be composed and formed for the actual review. We envision the first review to take place after two years, and then a review will take place every five years.

You can see there is a mentioning of a special IANA functions review, and this is a possibility if we have any issues that cannot be solved by the Customer Standing Committee and needs to be escalated. There is a possibility to have a special review on specific issues. This is important because if we would have only five years, it would be impossible to take up issues and escalate them. Here, you have a possibility to raise issues that are not solved by the Customer Standing Committee or responded by the IANA function, or if the Board is not taking some issues seriously enough, it's possible to have this special review.

All this has the accountability mechanisms from the accountability team, and we will go more into those parts tomorrow. So I'm not going to go into this. I will just finish my presentation by handing it over to Eduardo. Thank you.

EDUARDO SANTOYO: Thank you very much. Another rule just for the next panelist – Lise was perfect on this – just to be sure that we are on time for the person we are going to use for our panelist these two colors. The green one is just

ICANN | 53
Buenos Aires

to alert that keep two minutes more remaining to their interventions, and the red one is that we need to go to the others.

So now, Allan, please let us know where the changes in there from the regional [wrap-up] to this one.

ALLAN MACGILLIVRAY: Thank you, Eduardo. Do we have that slide deck rolling up? While they're throwing this up on the screen, all I did was I went through this, well, I think everyone, some of us have already forgotten about the first proposal from last December and maybe that's just as well, but there was a first proposal.

What I did was to go through the final proposal, and just as a very high-level overview, try and point out the directionality and the major elements that had changed relative to the second proposal. So let's just roll that to the first slide.

Yes. Thank you. Here are the elements. I really don't want to entertain a discussion of them. I'm just trying to point out where the things have changed. Obviously, PTI was something that has changed quite a bit. We now have the Board controlled by ICANN as opposed to the independent just not being clarified before. In the second proposal, there was only a little bit on SLEs. In the final proposal, we have a set of principles on them.

Actually, the CSC, the Customer Standing Committee, is probably the only surviving element of the original first proposal, and actually the composition remained relatively stable. The main change is not what

is on the slide. I just noticed the error there. Oh. The slide suggests that the ROs will be consulted before the non-ccNSO members are appointed. That's incorrect and actually, Gabby, I sent you a revised deck, but you didn't get it yet.

What is in there is a requirement for the registries – that is to say, the registry stakeholder group and the ccNSO – to consult on the geographic diversity of the representative of the CSC.

Next slide, please. Again, in the second proposal, there wasn't a lot on the problem resolution and escalation process, and there was a lot more detail in the final proposal. Similarly, with the IFR, the IANA function review, there were two important changes as far as our community is concerned. There was an increase in the representation of the CC community in the composition of the IFR and the special IFR, so that gave us three from two.

This is where there's a requirement for consultation with the regional TLD organizations on the choice of the non-ccNSO ccTLD reps. Finally, on the separation process, there was practically nothing in the second proposal on this, there was much more detail on that, including the membership. You'll see that actually mirrors that for the IFRT. The requirement for geographic diversity to be sought is also contained in this element. If we just roll again, please, lady.

Finally, the main changes are, and certainly relative to what I took from the submissions that the ccTLD community made to the process, with one exception, most of them were seeking an ICANN-controlled PTI, and that is what the final proposal has.

They were looking for greater representation of the CC community on those review boards, and that is something that is there. And finally, there was much more detail and specificity in the proposal, which was a concern from the community based on the comments from the second proposal.

Overall, my sense of it is the second proposal certainly reflects a lot of the input and comments from our community and in a positive direction. So how was that, Eduardo?

EDUARDO SANTOYO: That was perfect. Great.

ALLAN MACGILLIVRAY: Alright. Then, if I just have one more minute.

EDUARDO SANTOYO: Yeah, of course.

ALLAN MACGILLIVRAY: Look. I'd just like to take a minute, if you can roll through that, Kristina. This is the final proposal. I'm not going to ask a show of hands who's read all the way up to page 122. But on page 122, is the so-called draft term sheet, which would form part of the contract between ICANN and PTI. There are a couple of key clauses that were in the original NTIA contract, which I know are very important to our community.

ICANN | 53
Buenos Aires

One is simply the requirement for – the wording on ccTLD del and redel that is in the existing NTIA agreement would be reproduced with such changes as required, to reference to the PTI, for example. Secondly, the clause that effectively says ICANN cannot insist on there being contracts with anybody as a condition to the use of IANA services, which again is something that we as a community sought as part of the 2011 consultation with NTIA, that's also there. So for those of you that don't get to page 122, be assured those are in there. Thank you very much. Am I still under, Eduardo?

EDUARDO SANTOYO: We have time. Okay. Thank you very much. Thank you very much, Allan. Now, we are going to start the tour through the proposal, through the main elements of this, and we are going to start with the authorization functions. We're going to have, here, Maarten Simon and Bernie talking about this.

So Maarten, please, the floor is yours.

MAARTEN SIMON: Yes. Let's go to the details. That's fun. The authorization function, or better known as the rubber stamping part of the NTIA's work. That's what the authorization is. It's every root change that goes to IANA, then goes to the NTIA that stamps that and says, "Okay, now it can go to the root zone manager, and it will be changed."

We, in the group, had a discussion about this. First of all, the question was, "What is exactly the NTIA doing?" We found out that, and I'll read

ICANN | 53
Buenos Aires

it out, they had a few steps they went through when they receive a request to change from IANA. They [ascertain] that the change was transmitted securely, so it's only about the way it was transmitted.

They're also [ascertain] that it include the standard set of information in the right format. Then, ICANN had to self-certify that it followed its processes, and ICANN has to ask formally for authorization. What we learned from that is that one thing that the NTIA does not is verify if IANA did follow up the request properly. They don't do any checks on that.

With that, we didn't see any use of copying this in the new proposal. And there's a second good reason, especially for our community with it, is if you would have the authorization function, who would do that? Who would have to do that? Especially, there will be a bit of tension if you would have that on delegation and redelegation to requests.

As we thought, they don't do error checking. It doesn't make sense. So it went out of the proposal. So there will be an entity doing any rubber stamping in the proposal.

EDUARDO SANTOYO: Thank you very much, Maarten. Bernie?

BERNIE TURCOTTE: Thank you. Hi. Just wanted to wake up a few people who are having problems after lunch. I know it's always a tough session. Yes. Alright. What I'll be discussing with you, or presenting, rather, are the other

EN

elements related to the relationship with the roots zone maintainer. Obviously, my colleague here has presented one of the key ones that affected every single one of us when submitting changes. That's the most obvious one, but it's not the only one.

If we carry on from that one, not to repeat anything. And just to be clear, I'm here because there was no CC representation in the subgroup that was considering it, so I was staff support and, therefore, I am the Sherpa presenting this. Otherwise, you would have had Alan Greenberg presenting this to you.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: Thank you, Bernie.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: Thank you. Second choice. Second choice again.

BERNIE TURCOTTE: Alright. Tone down. Okay. The next major point the group considered were changes to the root zone management architecture and operation. Basically, it's fine to say we're not going to approve changes to specific zones, but if we're changing the architecture of the root zone, what do we mean by that? As in the implementation of DNSSEC, obviously, it was very clear to everyone on that group that we need some sort of authorization mechanism to continue to replace the NTIA authorization of those things, which they did.

Basically, there could be no changes implemented into the root zone architecture and structure without approval by the NTIA first. The committee, the group came up with a post-transition strategy for this, which was debated over many weeks because it was a combination of we've got basically one change, which could technically affect the security and stability of the root for all of us. And so I think, as we were considering this, we wanted to create something, which was of the right level for that.

What has been designed is the following. First, the final approval for actually implementing a change is recommended to be transferred to the ICANN Board. Basically, regardless, there are other processes I'm going to talk about shortly for a minute, but the final approval, where it's going to go before the switch actually gets flipped, is the ICANN Board.

Also subject to this is that there be a standing committee of people who represent the Board and elements of the community who will ensure that any proposal to change the architecture of the root is properly studied and consulted upon. We've got a standing committee whose job it is to make any recommendations to the ICANN Board for any such changes, but their second or primary mandate is to make sure that if any such changes are considered, all the right people will be asked to consider it properly, to evaluate it, to provide the scenarios, etc., until that standing committee is satisfied that the change is, A, required and, B, maintains the security and stability of the root.

ICANN | 53
Buenos Aires

Once that is achieved and they're satisfied, they kick it up to the ICANN Board with a recommendation for approval, and the ICANN Board can question it or whatever else. Part of the processes for that standing committee is also if they deem the change to be important enough to conduct their own public consultation on it so that everyone is aware of what's going on.

Anyway, it's described in quite a bit of detail in the document. I'm not going to bore you with the details. These are the highlights, but I think we've come up with a structure that mirrors quite well what the NTIA was doing in these cases.

There is one element in there, which refers to substantial changes. Basically, we get into the discussion of what is substantial. I mean, we didn't want to get into a situation where IANA was coming back or PTI was coming back for a really minor change to fix something. Did not see an added value for that for anyone. As far as substantive changes, we've basically said the committee should err on the side of caution, and that's the way we've left it for now.

There is another concern in here that was of great concern for the committee, which was we're really uncertain what's happening with the root zone maintainer. I mean, basically, in its announcement, NTIA said that there would be a separate process whereby the transition for the root zone maintainer, i.e. VeriSign right now, who actually implement the changes in the root zone, would be carried out. No one has seen it. No one understands it. I think it's a concern for the RSSAC

ICANN | 53
Buenos Aires

in their documents. It was certainly a concern in this group when considering the relationship between the PTI and the RSSAC. Yeah.

Ah, okay. I'm doing good. I'm doing good. Almost done anyway. There were some principles that resulted from the group's work. Transparency, transparency, transparency. Please, let's make sure that everything is out there, which is not currently the case with the NTIA. Currently, root zone management, as I was talking, is three parties. You've got IANA, you've got NTIA, and you've got the root zone maintainer, VeriSign. Post-transition NTIA will be removing itself from that triangle, so we will only have the two parties. But we're still uncertain what's happening with that second party. So definitely an issue to be considered.

Future changes to the root zone management process must be made with due consideration to the IANA function operators and root zone maintainer's abilities to process change requests expeditiously. There's always a concern about performance, quality, and transparency but also ensuring that, first of all, the primary concern is that security and stability concern. Thank you.

EDUARDO SANTOYO: Thank you. Thank you very much, Bernie. Sorry for showing the green card. Now we have Jay and Patricio talking about the service level expectations. The floor is yours.

PATRICIO POBLETE: Hello. The design team A was charged with researching and proposing service level expectations in this new environment. In that group, the ccTLD community members were Paul Kane, who couldn't be here today, Jay, and myself, Patricio Poblete. Can we look to the next slide? Yeah.

As I said, we had to start with understanding what the status quo was, what the current status of the performance of the IANA function was. We had to review and evaluate the current targets for performance set by the NTIA contract to try to have at least a broad understanding of how well IANA was performing with regards to those targets, and to work with IANA staff to capture, to understand the workflows involved and finally, from that, to develop and propose new SLEs. The next one, please.

The summary of the recommendations that we have so far, and I have to stress that it's so far because as it's been said before, we haven't yet reached the final stage in this work. The first conclusion was that the current standards were not adequate for this new stage, that new, more strict standards had to be developed, and that this was an appropriate time for the customers, for the community to work on the determining those minimally acceptable service levels and how IANA should report on those and what the breach levels should be.

One important thing to understand is that we did not try to redesign the way IANA works. We're basically taking that as it is. We're not recommending any changes to the process unless those changes come from implementing these new measures, perhaps something

would need to be changed for those measurements to be done. But otherwise, we take the current process.

We are recommending that some mechanisms would be put in place prior to the transition to obtain the data that's necessary to propose new service levels that would be consistent with what IANA is able to do and what the community would expect it to do. We also recommend additional reporting mechanisms so the whole process would be more transparent than it is now. Next, please.

What we have, so far, is a set of guiding principles. First one is that the measures should be attributed to whoever is responsible for them. What I mean is that not every delay that happens during the processing of some particular request is the responsibility of IANA. There is a back and forth, sometimes, between the customer requesting a change and IANA that requests that some additional information or that points out some error that was detected or whatnot. And sometimes, large delays come from actually the customer not responding in time. So we think that the measures that are taken should reflect whoever is responsible for them, and that is not always possible today, so that's one thing that needs to be changed.

Besides the specific metrics for particular requests, there should be overall metrics too that allows to draw conclusions about how in a general way the whole process is working. The metrics should be relevant for the target that we're trying to determine. Each one of these metrics should be clearly defined. There shouldn't be arguments

a posteriori about what we're trying to measure. That should be clear from the start. The next one, please.

There should be thresholds defined so it can be determined if there is a breach. There are two things that go hand in hand. One is that we aim for a certain deadline for a request to be processed, for instance, and we also set a certain percentage of the time that target should be met. Both things need to be set for the whole system to work.

There should be review processes. This could be an evolving system where it would be adapting to the changing needs and also to whatever the community thinks that should be happening. This would not be casting the stone. There should be reviews, and this is more of a starting point. And, finally, there should be regular reporting so we all know how this is working.

To describe what the process has been and what the next steps are, I'll give it to Jay.

JAY DALEY: Kristina, can you go to slide 11, please? 11. Okay. So we have started by analyzing the performance data of the IANA so far. This slide here shows root zone and ccTLD database changes using 323 separate requests for those things. Now, the IANA target for this in the current SLE is 21 days, but that's an end-to-end process, which includes the time it takes for any questions to be answered by the registry that requests it.

The chart here just shows the amount of time that it takes IANA to process that. That clearly shows two issues that we have here. One is that if you have an end-to-end process that doesn't just measure IANA performance, it measures the performance of the registry, then that's not useful to us. We need to know just the IANA component of it and set a target for that.

And secondly, that we have so many happening in such a short period of time that 21 days is inadequate. There's nobody I know who believes that they can wait 21 days, generally, for something such as a name server change in the root. Okay? Can we go back, Gabby, to slide six, please?

That's what we collected then. Sorry, Kristina, thank you. Paying attention. Right? The IANA is much better in SLEs. Now, however, it's become clear that even with the data that we have so far, we need much more data from IANA if we are to give accurate timings around each of the individual stages in those processes.

The data we have so far would let us know the end-to-end processing time, but there are elements within these that we need more data about. Next slide, please.

We anticipate having this done on time, but it is complicated because IANA need to make changes to their systems to be able to record the data that we need. They need two months' worth of recording of that data. From that, we can then specify the times that we believe ought to be there and negotiate those with IANA.

For IANA to do even the initial changes requires the NTIA's approval, and that may not necessarily be forthcoming. So there are a number of interdependencies here that are quite complicated. However, apart from those specific timings on things, we are relatively comfortable we have the structure of things in place. And we just need a plan for filling those last bits in. Okay.

EDUARDO SANTOYO: Thank you. Thank you very much, Jay. Yeah, of course. There is a set of charts just like the one that Jay showed that are in the slide deck that will be available for you. I think it's linked from the agenda, right? You can browse the data that was available so far.

Okay. Thank you very much, Patricio. And now, of course, we have to time out. Okay. Now we have is Martin Boyle talking about what is the Customer Standing Committee? What is this about?

MARTIN BOYLE: Thanks very much, Eduardo. I've got a slide set, and I'm going to talk to you about the Customer Standing Committee. Can we go into the second slide please? The Customer Standing Committee is the organization that is going to oversee the operation of the delivery of the service.

They are going to take the performance indicators, the expectations that Jay has just been talking about, and make sure that the post-transition IANA, the PTI, delivers against the contract.

Now, essentially, it is going to be taking the reporting requirements and breach levels, and month-by-month, we'll look at the reports and identify whether the service is maintaining, whether it's declining, whether there are particular issues, and try to identify whether there are things that are going wrong and seek to get an improvement when there is a deterioration of service.

In the proposal, there are a series of steps that seek to try and resolve the issues. It's not in the customer's interest for something to go wrong and for a big stick to be used. It's to see that if something is going wrong, we are trying to get a remedial action in place. If we can move on to the next slide, please.

For that work, the CSC was something that was described in the first proposal and got significant support and continued through into the second proposal. It was seen very much as a lightweight team representing the customers.

Two gTLD operators, two ccTLD operators, and, you'll see on this slide, I referred to a slate of candidates because, when we've got a committee in place, there is an expectation that we will try to get geographic diversity in the group. There is a fifth member that may be included, and that was originally thought of as being the place for the IAB to cover .arpa, but there are also a number of so-called gTLDs that are not really gTLDs, of which .edu. Then we ended up with, also, proposals for a series or a group of liaisons that may or may not be appointed.

Now, I would go back and say that one of the significant roles for the members of this committee is outreach to their communities. We are the customers. We would expect the two ccTLD operator members to keep us informed of what was happening.

The same thing would, then, also apply for the liaisons, making sure that the people that they were nominated by are also aware of the performance issues associated with the PTI, and then, it would be a renewable post but that you would get a certain amount of rotation of members.

Now I would actually point out that this job is a job that requires people to know about the IANA. People who are going to be willing to spend time and able to spend time every month looking at the reports, and talking to the IANA team to make sure that they are resolving any problems and issues. If we can move on to the next slide, please. Yeah. Thanks.

As I said, there was a lot of support for the CSC, and over recent months, there has been the development of a draft charter. I think we are pretty well ready to go with implementing this particular aspect. There are certain things that will need to be done. We think it will probably need to be incorporated into ICANN bylaws. And, obviously, the committee itself, when it's created, will need to define its own rules of procedures.

There is a question mark in our mind whether the ccNSO and the GNSO bylaws would need to be amended because the role of the CSC starts to bring in a certain operational role for the ccNSO and the

ICANN | 53
Buenos Aires

GNSO. Now, by operational role, if there is something that goes wrong and the CSC cannot resolve it and cannot get the PTI to resolve it, they report this to the ccNSO and the GNSO, and the ccNSO and GNSO could, then, decide to launch the next step of the process, the special review.

And last point, I think, I'd make on the things that we – no, two points, actually. There is an obligation on the CSC to give regular updates to the direct customers. The number three here is fairly obvious because of the three opportunities for the members to get together that the ICANN meeting gives. This is actually a bit of a continuation of an obligation on the IANA team at the moment to report to the community at ICANN meetings. I wonder exactly how many of us ever turn up to those briefings.

There are expectations on the members and the liaisons to attend meetings, attend the calls every month. That goes back to my point about this is not a sinecure for people who volunteer for doing the job. You need to be on the call month after month, and you're allowed to miss one in two. If you miss the second one, you'll be referred back to the ccNSO.

That, I think, is all I want to say about it. Thank you.

EDUARDO SANTOYO: Thank you very much, Martin. Now, of course, we're going to go to the escalation mechanisms that are in the proposal. Stephen, please.

STEPHEN DEERHAKE: Thank you. Let's see if we have the slides prepared, as well. We usually talk about escalation mechanisms, and that indicates some kind of problems, but that's not really the case in this. This is a much wider approach than is within the term of escalation.

What happens if the future IANA can't deliver services to your registry? Hopefully, the same thing will happen that happens today. So in 95%-99% of the cases, someone will lift a phone in your registry, call IANA operator, and have the issues resolved. That's the best case and hopefully the most cases, as well.

But the escalation mechanisms are quite focused on what happens if there is not consensus on what should happen and if there are an attempt to regulate future power. The focus on the escalation mechanisms has diminished since the CCWG group entered the stage and made it a huge issue, so it's been a development in this area. Could we have the next picture, please?

In the proposal, there are four sources for what should happen, and there are three processes. If you look at this list, this bullet point, you see the first one relates to the Customer Standing Committee, as Maarten just described. By mere design of this organization, it is done to actually include the resolution of conflicts.

The charter for the Customer Standing Committee is designed for this, and if you look at the annex G in the proposal, you'll find it there more in detail. But I'll walk you through these four bullet points, and hopefully, you'll note in there that this change isn't that dramatic, actually.

If you look at the second bullet point, you see the root zone emergency process, which, as the name indicates, it's quite a fast process. It's in real emergencies where you talk about minutes. Annex K describes this very well.

In customer service complaints resolution process, that's a long name for a process that is also apparent today in almost the same design as it's perceived to be in the future that is described in annex I of the proposal.

And the new kid on the block, the IANA problem resolution process, is a change from before and after transition. It's described in annex J. Could we please take the next picture?

The mere design of the Customer Standing Committee has part of making this process as smooth as possible, or these processes. CC is designed to have an operational function. It is minimal in composition, as Maarten just described, and it should provide an insulation between operational and policymaking responsibilities.

In most cases, CSC will have very defensive role, but in some cases, it will actually determine if all ordinary or remedial actions are exhausted. If we tried all we can to have a remedial action of the conflicts. And if so, CSC is mandated to escalate issues to the PTI board. Can we have the next picture, please?

The root zone, as I mentioned initially, there are four bullet points and this is the second one. The root zone emergency process is based on what is routine already today within the IANA. So this is not a dramatic

change. The future IANA functions operator will provide TLD managers with a 24/7 emergency contact number. If there is a problem, it will trigger predefined emergency reviews, etc., that are already in place today. Next picture, please.

This is a map just showing you that there are defined process already at hand for handling the emergency processes. Next, please.

This is the set of routines. I don't expect you to read that, but that is just to show you that they are already invented. And by that, not very dramatic. Next, please. Okay.

Second process is also based on current processes already used today. It's called the Customer Service Complaints resolution process. This is quite similar to development today, so I will ask you to go, sorry. I'll stay within this. Okay. Please, next step. Next slide. Yeah.

But what is new in all of these processes is the customer service complaints resolution process where there are two phases. Phase one indicates what should happen before the Customer Standing Committee is even involved in the process. This quite detailed describes how, by whom, and in what order things should be done. It indicates in this by bullet points what should happen. Could we have the next, please?

This was phase one but in phase two, there is a limitation on what is actually allowed to be let to be escalated in the process. In the phase two, we're only taking the IANA naming services. First, at this stage, the CSC is notified if there are persistent performance issues and a

problem with them or not. If that is the case, the complainant, the one that has a problem, may initiate an independent review process.

My point on taking you through all these pictures is a way of indicating that there are several steps before issues even reach the Customer Standing Committee. Most issues will be handled already before then. There is a wide variety of remedial actions to handle conflicting interests, both in short and long term, both when we talk about emergencies or when we talk about persistent performance issues or even possible systematic problems. Could we have the next, please?

This is yet another way of mapping the process, who should go where, and in what order, just to show you that this is thought through in quite a good way. If we could take next picture again, please.

Then, as a final and third process, there is the IANA problem resolution process. I have quite briefly shown you this already, and you see in this picture or if we took the time to read it, you could see what step are about to be taken to handle this. Next picture, please.

This is, again, one of the pictures showing the process that is supposed to take place. If we could have the last picture, please.

To sum up, there are four sources, there are three parallel processes to handle if there is a need for remedial actions or even if there is a need for an escalation process. They are regulated in four places in the proposal, and just one of them is actually new: the IANA problem resolution process. The two other are quite similar to what happened before the transition. Thank you.

EDUARDO SANTOYO: Thank you very much, Stephen. And Allan, again, as usual as you're so efficient with the time, you have five minutes for this new section talking about the appeal process and the redelegation process, too. Thank you.

ALLAN MACGILLIVRAY: Thanks again, Eduardo. I'm going to talk about something that's not in the proposal, so maybe some people will be relieved about that. If we go back to Los Angeles – you're loading that up, Kristina? If we go back to Los Angeles, you may remember. I remember sitting in the room and seeing a sea of hands up on the question of whether there should be some form of appeal as part of the CWG transition.

Therefore, when the first proposal came out in December, there was a proposal for an appeal mechanism that would apply "to all changes to the root zone," which would of course include therefore by definition a ccTLD delegation and a redelegation.

Now, the commentary from the community on that aspect was to say many and varied. It proved a bit controversial. I note a consistency in the need for an appeal mechanism, but when you looked at some of the comments, there was a real lack of consistency in terms of the scope of such an appeal, who would have standing, etc.

That was reinforced in a survey that the CWG itself undertook of the members of the CWG. It basically reinforced that pattern. High level of agreement on an appeal, low level of consensus on the parameters of

that. I undertook to lead a small design team to try and see if we could bring some clarity on this issue. Can you roll it, Kristina, please?

With my colleague, Maarten, Paul Schindler, and there was a GAC observer, what we decided to do was to undertake a survey of the whole ccTLD community. If you just roll to survey findings, please, Kristina.

Fundamentally, what happened is there was a very, very low response rate to the survey. Replies on behalf of just 28 ccTLDs were received, and as you know, out of the base of 248. It was my judgment and the judgment of the design team that's really not enough to move forward on such a controversial issue. Alright?

That was really the fundamental conclusion. While acknowledging that you shouldn't draw anything from a survey with such a low response rate, nevertheless, the responses that we did get tend to reinforce what we already knew. Could you roll the slide, Kristina, please?

Only just over half thought an appeal mechanism should be part of the CWG proposal. The fact that this was even being considered as part of the IANA transition was itself controversial, and there were debates around that point. There was a high degree of acceptance that it's not something that should delay the transition, and it's something that should maybe perhaps be better done after the transition.

So-called design team B's full report can be found around page 100 of the document in here. All of the survey and the survey results are all

ICANN | 53
Buenos Aires

there. If we have any questions. How was that? See? I didn't get a red card; I could play football.

EDUARDO SANTOYO: Absolutely. Thank you very much for all the panelists. Now the floor is yours, the panel, is open the floor for you for questions. We can use a little bit more from these guys and this time, his time or knowledge. Please. If you have any question, you're welcome.

[ROLAF]: First of all, I would like to thank the members of the panel for their presentations. I'm afraid that you have lost us a bit, because it was quite long. I have a question, which goes back, I think, about one hour and 45 minutes when Lise was talking. No, but seriously, it's a very important subject, and I'm a bit worried about the process that we are using to make sure that everybody grasps those items that are of prime importance.

My question is, Lise, you said two things, which I felt to be a bit contradictory when you were talking about the post-IANA model, where you said IANA stays within ICANN and IANA becomes an affiliate of ICANN. I think the idea is to have this kind of legal, well, it was even in your drawing, there was a legal separation line. My understanding is that the IANA function does not stay within the present ICANN corporation. It becomes an affiliate, but it's separate.

ICANN | 53
Buenos Aires

LISE FUHR: Thank you for the question, [Rolaf].

[ROLAF]:   You're welcome. Thank you for allowing me to ask it.

LISE FUHR: It's an affiliate, and it's an affiliate with an internal board. Because it's an internal board, they have the full control of the affiliate. That's why you call it a legal separation because the actual power of the IANA function stays within ICANN as it is in this model.

                               If we were to have this legal separation with a board that were with external directors, we would not have the same power balance. Because of this internal board, it stays within. That's how we call it "stays within ICANN."

[ROLAF]:   Yeah. I think it will be clearer if you would not say the first, that it stays within ICANN. I think the whole idea is that it does not stay ICANN the corporation. It's a daughter. There's a mother company and a daughter, or you call it an affiliate. But the idea is to prepare for a possible separation, which is very difficult if IANA stays within ICANN, which is easier if it is an affiliate. Okay.

                               My other question is more of, yeah, I don't know how I should call it. I can imagine that one of the most difficult things for the NTIA to accept is exactly this. I'm wondering if the CWG has any feeling about what will happen if your whole proposal will be accepted by the NTIA except

for this bit. I don't know if you ever pondered on this theoretical scenario.

LISE FUHR: As I recognize it, it's a yes or no. it's not you have to alter these pieces of the proposal. We have some requirements from NTIA, and if those are met, I don't see how they would turn it down. One of those is, of course, we have consensus from the whole ICANN community. If we have consensus regarding this and we have insured – because part of the problem with having this legal separation or future separation possibility is do we ensure the stability of the IANA function or do we jeopardize this?

But having all these accountability measures, an actual separation would be an ultimate tool in case of an extreme, we are actually doing the checks and balances in ensuring a stable operation of IANA. I think having had those stress tests of the model, I'm not so afraid of the NTIA rejecting the model as it stands now.

EDUARDO SANTOYO: Thank you. More questions? Okay, if not, I'm going to thanks again to our panelists. I guess that, yes, they gave us a nice overview what is the proposal about. How was it structured? What does it contain? What are the main elements? Now we're very prepared to continue our meetings and to continue our discussions in order to support our ccNSO council at the discussion they are going to have tomorrow afternoon. Okay. Thank you very much, all.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: Okay. We are running a bit behind, so let's say we reconvene in ten minutes.

[break]

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: Okay. Hello. Please take your seats so we can begin this session on ICANN updates. First, Keith Davidson will put us up to date about the new ICANN meeting strategy. So Keith, please.

KEITH DAVIDSON: Thank you, and could I ask someone at the back, could you please close the door? Could someone at the back of the room please close the door? Thank you. Okay. This is a session about the new meeting strategy that is due to be in place for the first meeting in 2016.

There was a meeting strategy working group established by ICANN, and Margarita and I were your two ccNSO reps on that working group. At that time, the IANA transition was not on the agenda. So we were looking at what work lay ahead for the ccTLD community, given that we were coming to the end of a whole lot of work, including the funding model, the framework of interpretation, the IDN process, and so on.

The information that we gained from you was done by a survey, and ccTLDs indicated that they wanted exactly 2.5 ICANN meetings per

ICANN | 53
Buenos Aires
21-25 JUNE 2015

year. We took that information forwards, and we looked at various formats for the way the meetings should happen.

Now, in theory, from the first meeting next year, there will be this new meeting process and practice. I think it will probably be delayed for a year while the IANA transition completes. But there are decisions for you as a community to make amongst yourselves, and it very much reflects on Katrina and what she will do in terms of the program committee and putting together programs for the future.

Up on the screen, you'll see the first meeting of the year. This will be the March meeting, meeting A. It's being put together in much the same format as the current ICANN meetings. So six days, probably the only real changes is to have a bit of public forum on the Monday before everybody's been through constituency day, and then a bit more on the final Thursday, as we currently do. So probably not a lot to concern us there. That's pretty much our business as usual model.

But the big change, then, magic fingers. The big change occurs in meeting B, the midyear meeting in June. The intention from ICANN is to abbreviate this to a four-day format. For us, it would look like what you see on the screen now, with the Monday being primarily an outreach day and then days two and three and four all being intercommunity work.

It would be working group meetings, both ccNSO working groups or cross-community working groups and so on. Looking at this agenda, you would not have any time, necessarily, for a ccNSO members meeting such as this. It would be working groups and working across

the community. You might need to think about that quite a lot. Is there and will there be enough work to do, as a community, if you had ccNSO members meetings in that midyear meeting?

That worked for me. The third meeting in the year, which is essentially October or November normally, turns into a bigger meeting. So it's a full seven days starting on the Saturday, finishing on the Friday. The main motive in having the extended time is to allow for a much more substantial outreach program.

Some of the asides in having the change would be that the middle meeting of the year, being smaller and perhaps not attracting the same numbers of people if there aren't going to be things like ccNSO members meetings, would be that that meeting could be held in a much smaller location due to the lesser numbers of people. It would allow ICANN to outreach more to countries that possibly couldn't hold an ICANN meeting currently, given that there are 3,000-odd people attending each ICANN meeting.

I think the meeting A and meeting C can fully accommodate two days of ccNSO members meetings, much as we do now, if you choose that option. But the difficulty that might need a lot more discussion is this meeting B and the four-day aspect of it.

I think while we don't want to get into a lengthy discussion on that here, I think what you need to think about in your own minds is does this look right for the sort work that we have ahead of us? Does it feel appropriate? Does it reflect the reality, particularly if you can picture

ICANN | 53
Buenos Aires

ICANN after the IANA transition, for the sort of work that we'll have ahead of us?

With that, I don't think I really want to go any further other than to alert you to this and the fact that we'll have a much more fulsome discussion on this in Dublin in the next ICANN meeting. It's really to get you prepared and get you thinking about it. But if there are any questions, I guess we could take them now since I haven't taken a full 15 minutes, but I'm aware we're running behind time.

EDUARDO SANTOYO: Are there any questions? Okay. When does this kick in? Which is the first meeting of this new format?

KEITH DAVIDSON: It's expected to be from, or the recommendation was, that it would start in 2016. The first meeting next year. But I think the reality is that until the IANA transition is over, it may not fully apply. I imagine the ICANN meeting team would not be contemplating a small meeting in the middle of next year, for example. But in theory, we're supposed to be abiding by this new format from 2016.

EDUARDO SANTOYO: Any other question? No? Well, thanks, Keith.

KEITH DAVIDSON: My pleasure.

EDUARDO SANTOYO: Kristina?

ANNEBETH LANGE: Kristina, do you have my presentation there?

EDUARDO SANTOYO: Okay. Yeah. Sure. Thank you. Now there is a presentation by Annebeth postponed from this morning. An update on the country and territories working group.

ANNEBETH LANGE: Thank you. Just a little before it comes up on the screen, but this this working group is a cross-community working group, and it's a follow-up from the study group we had a ccNSO working group on the use of country and territory names in future rounds of gTLDs. It's almost there? Okay.

The reason it was not this morning was that the GAC had put their discussion on geographical names at the exact same time, and I had to be there to hear what they were saying and to try to get overview in their meeting. We were allowed to speak at the floor, so they have heard what we need or the results from this working group. I think I'll just start with my own presentation, and then they see when it comes.

This cross-community working group is limited to country and territory names only, and as TLDs, not second-level. We start with the

ISO 3166 ISO code. The names and the countries and territory names on that list is the starting point. What we have done in this group, it's consisting of two co-chairs from us, it's Paul Schindler and myself, and then two from GNSO, Heather Forest or Carlos Gutierrez from Costa Rica.

We have reviewed the currently policies and typology identified by this study group, and this is used as the basis of our work. So what we tried to do is we reviewed the visibility of the framework, what we use today, in all the papers that's out there and RFC 5091, etc. And, of course, the ATB and Application Guide Book Module 2, 2.2.1.4, that was the protection given to the country and territory names in this round that's out there now.

And since it's now a discussion on if this should be the result for the next round, as well, the GNSO is already long into changing and trying to get new rules for the next round. In the working group, we tried to develop a framework we all can agree on, but the question is, is that possible at all? It's a really difficult task, but we try. So we have face-to-face meetings, teleconferences every other week, and we met here on Monday. Next, please.

The methodology we used is that we have identification of categories of representations of country and territory names that could be used as TLDs in the future, and is it possible to explore and find a definitional framework for all SOs and ACs. And the thing we are discussing is country codes, two letters and three letters, and names in full.

We have already agreed on some definitions for these country and territory names, but some are still undefined. It's not easy to find a definition that both the GNSO or Gs and CCs will agree on. So if you have good suggestions, please come on.

The first step is the two-letter codes, and we discussed that now on Monday, and we hope to finish before Dublin. The next step will be three-letter codes. Next, please.

So what we did with the two-letter codes so far: a lot of options in what we can do with the two-letter codes in the future was discussed, and we tried to find the benefits and the risks with these different solutions. And these five suggestions that come in is that the first one, all two-letter strings reserved for use as ccTLDs only and ineligible for use as gTLDs. We're talking about ASCII here.

And that means all two-letter strings, not only those in the ISO list today, but also two-letter combinations that might be used for a country in the future. We are not in the business of deciding countries, and it might be new countries in the future that will need a two-letter code as long as the two-letter system for CCs remain.

Next solution or option is the two-letter strings eligible for use as gTLDs, if nothing conflicts with ISO 3166-1 and/or other standard lists.

Unrestricted use of two-letter strings, if nothing conflicts with an existing TLD or an applicable string similarity rules.

Future two-letter strings reserved for use as IDN ccTLDs only, ineligible for use as gTLD in IDN.

The last option that was discussed was an unrestricted use of two-letter strings, if nothing conflict with an existing TLD or an applicable string, similarity rules, etc. Next.

Benefits and risks of two-letter codes. We have asked the working group for input on these benefits and risk, and it's come in quite a lot of suggestions. I just use a few here. If you're interested to read this, you can have the [inaudible] report.

Risks for taking two-letter codes into the zone as gTLDs is increased user confusion, discrimination on new countries, depreciation of the two-letter code as a brand for countries.

Benefits that has been mentioned: full commercial potential; brand owners like, for example, VW could have their brand; and equal treatment with IDN two-character strings because we know that an IDN can look like a two-letter string, even if it's not actually because it's a sign. It's not a letter in the same way.

For me, it's really useful if I could get the views of the ccTLDs. We in this working group, could not sit there and decide what to do. The main thing, now, is to get all the options on the table, and it's really important that you send us, the working group, what you think about this, and especially on the two-letter codes because that is important for ccTLDs.

I had hoped that this was quite easy to discuss, but it's not. Because we have Gs on one side and CCs on the other side, and we have different opinions so far, but we hope we can land this.

Is it important for you that two-letter codes remain ccTLDs? If a two-letter code in the future will be both, what is the risk? What will it do to the system today?

And what about three-letter codes? That's the next step? Do they need protection or non-objection? Should they follow the system we have a compromise in the applicant guidebook today? That's some of from capitals and downwards have support or non-objection from the authority in the country. Is that a solution?

Or should all be gTLDs or is it possible to find another system that's something in between? And is it a distinction between those on the ISO list and those not? As it is today, the three-letter codes on the ISO list is protected, but we all know that it's a lot of three-letter codes out there that's been used already, or three-letter, not codes in that way in the ISO list, but other combinations. Even one that's on ISO list because that's dot com. Comoros, that's the dot com. But since it started for so long time ago, we didn't think that it was a country representation at all.

I attended the GAC working group on geographical names, and it's been important for our group to tell them that we need, also, the authorities' input on this part of geographical names. Only the country and territory names, what they do with all the other geographical names is not into the mandate of this working group.

Now they know, and we try every time we meet them to repeat that, and we have now a GAC [inaudible] observer in this working group, and we try to make them more active in the future. We do not want to

have a result in the end that we, in our working group, come with one recommendation and then the GAC come with another. That's not good for anyone. I think that was all. Kristina, is it one more? Yeah?

Future. Three-letter codes discussed from now on to Dublin, and if we can agree, we go on to country names. Please, let me know if you have views on this. If you want to join the working group, please tell me. We need all active persons that we can get. Thank you.

EDUARDO SANTOYO: Thank you. Questions? No questions. Opinions? Oh, please.

PETER VERGOTE: Thank you, Annebeth, for an excellent presentation. You walked us through five different options. What I missed was indications on in which of these options we are now focusing. I know it's not a proposal, but in the group, is there any indication or direction? You have a list of questions for the CC group. Maybe now we can start waving flags. I don't have a flag.

ANNEBETH LANGE: Yeah. No. Not really. What we have is that under these five groups is a lot of listing on risks and benefits coming in from CCs and coming in from Gs. So far, I feel that the Gs are in the different part of the world that we are. Because my feeling is that they want more, if they can, and they look for an explanation why we should keep the system. The CCs' view is why should we change it? Two-letter codes have always

ICANN | 53
Buenos Aires

been for the CCs, and in my view, it should be a really, really good reason to change that. The G side is very interested in finding some good reason why we should keep it, and that's where we stand now.

PETER VERGOTE: Isn't it a really simple and good reason to keep that we would otherwise deprive future countries from their country codes?

ANNEBETH LANGE: Yes. That's one of my really...

PETER VERGOTE: What is the response to that argument?

ANNEBETH LANGE: No, but it's not that many countries and, yeah. We don't know.

PETER VERGOTE: I'm living in a country that might need three country codes in five years from now. So, I think it's an important point.

ANNEBETH LANGE: Yeah, I agree. I think that is the best argument.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: As a member of the group, this is [inaudible] from .kr. I would just like to add to Annebeth's comments about some of the reasons that were

given during the meeting as to why we should leave the two-letter codes to CCs. One of it was that we began with exactly what Peter just mentioned, that we may need new country codes, but then there were other more principled arguments.

One was very technical. There was a principle. Two-letter codes for ISO 3166 list, and that's it. Nothing else. So that's just the basic principle. There was a more, I guess, philosophical principle of the sovereignty of countries and that the two-letter codes, although it may be just one domain, it is a country that has sovereignty.

The reason behind that was, what is the reason for not leaving the two-letter codes to the CCs? Why? I mean, is there any good reason? I don't think there were any good reasons given for that. And so that was that.

The other one was Gs have not, I mean, besides the two-letter codes, they have four, five, six, seven, eight. I mean, they have all the space they need, and I think there was one person that came up with the permutations about the two-letter codes having, I guess, a couple hundred, and the three-letter codes have a couple tens of thousands. Right? And so they have a much larger space and so there is a basic distinction between the Gs and the Cs

My basic feeling was that, I mean, we may have five options, but there was much, much stronger support for the first option. Just leave the CC space alone. Thanks.

[ANDREAS]: [Andreas] from [DNIC]. I have a question. I participated in the meeting yesterday, and I was wondering why, because I had some chats with some registries for the new TLDs afterwards, and nobody was really in favor to discuss this two. So I'm wondering why the discussion comes from, even from the GNSO or whatever. This was my first question.

Second, if we did ever poll who was in favor or that we can take these five options, say who is in favor for option one, two, three, four, five. Did you had a poll for that so far?

ANNEBETH LANGE: No. We've not come to that point yet. I'm not sure if we should do that, either, if it's inside of our mandate. We should show what can be done. And why it's come up at all is that in the applicant guidebook that we are working after now, all country and territory names are ineligible for GLDs after a long time of work to get it out of the application round, because we didn't know how that functioned, especially the combination with the ASCII letters on the one side and the IDN on the other side. Then we could end up with some countries being an IDN, ccTLD, and another country being a gTLD because they didn't have non-ASCII letter.

So there was a lot of confusion around that. So what we ended up with was that all country and territory names from the two-letter code and downwards were taken out of this round. And then, what we know is that gTLDs want to discuss this again, and then it's important for us to be part of that. It should not be like last time, when the discussion in the GNSO had come far away before we really understood what was

going on. So now we are in there from the beginning, and we will advocate our view and what we think is right.

[ANDREAS]: Thank you. One more point and I want to add to Peter's comment. And basically, for future countries, it's so important. Basically, the [jurisdiction], they are behind all the things. It must be, otherwise they can't really follow certain regulations, everything. So I think this is a point we really have to consider in the whole process. Thank you.

ANNEBETH LANGE: I agree that was one of my main points as a risk, so I absolutely agree. But what they also do is that they say that, for example, .tv and .as, well, they are going commercially and then they actually are gTLD. But in my view, that is a totally other discussion. What you use it for, as long as the local Internet community in that country that decides over the resource they have been given, and they should have their representation.

[ANDREAS]: And it probably follows certain regulations, and that's okay.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: This is one of those areas where it seems clear to me that the way the ICANN process works in such silos of a CC and a G community doesn't actually work, and we need to have better cross-silo discussions about these things. But just going to the point at hand. One of the important

things to think about here are IDNs and the IDN names chosen by many countries.

Because there is no standard about those, there is no way, when you look at those, you can know just from the length or anything like that what is the way forward, which is a country and which is a G. The question is, are we likely to get any new countries come along that need in this alphabet a two-letter country code, or would it because of the alphabet that they use be entirely happy with an IDN top-level domain and not need one of these?

Another question is if we start to think about three-letter codes, then there are some countries that would potentially prefer a three-letter code because there is a much more crowded two-letter space, and it's less representative of a country. And so if we then allowed three-letter codes, we become the ones that blur the boundary because we now have three letters that are dot com, dot org, and as well as the CCs. And so it's then very difficult for us to say, "We need to protect twos," if we then started on the threes, as well.

I suspect the way forward here is to lose the rules on this entirely, that the rules have not really – they've done well so far, but in future, I think we just allow people to take whatever is available that they need available for the usage, and see how that goes.

Because, as you said, we get into this question of .ws. What does that mean anymore to us? Is that still a country code or not? I think we're potentially still regulating and trying to regulate a problem that we've lost control of sometime ago.

PATRICIO POBLETE: Thank you very much. I suppose this is a matter where you could use some guidance from the community and some service that you could do. Yeah.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: Yeah, get back to that.

PATRICIO POBLETE: Okay. Thank you. And next, we have the IANA report by Kim Davies.

KIM DAVIES: Thanks, Patricio. I will wait for the slides because I don't know what I'm going to say otherwise. Thank you very much. This is the customary IANA update where we tell you what we're thinking about and what we think is most relevant to you to think about.

                       First thing I'm going to talk about is RDAP. For those that aren't familiar with RDAP, Registration Data Access Protocol, this is a next generation WHOIS protocol that was recently standardized by the IETF. As part of our obligations to the IETF, we're responsible for managing what's called the quote unquote "bootstrap registry." This is how software that implements RDAP finds RDAP service.

                       One of the problems with WHOIS service today is that you actually need to know the location of a WHOIS server to do a lookup. So one of the problems RDAP tries to solve is it has a registration scheme so you

can say, "All the domains under .xyz are located on this RDAP server." We maintain this bootstrap registry, and so there's automatic discovery of where the RDAP servers are.

As of today, there's empty bootstrap registries posted. This will change very shortly. Recently, we invited RARs to post entries relating to IP numbers and AS numbers for the bootstrap registry. It also supports those, as well. We actually, just a few days ago, got our first request to do so, so the first actual entry in those bootstrap registries will be there soon.

With respect to what you care about, which is how to list your RDAP server in the bootstrap registry, we're currently adding new functionality to the root zone management system that will allow you to log in to your interface, provide your RDAP registrations in there. It will go through the normal root zone management process from there just as if you're updating the WHOIS entry in the IANA database today.

That's active work right now, and I know our development teams are literally working on it this week. Once that's finished tested internally, we're going to go through our approval process with NTIA to seek to have it deployed. But my estimation is that that will be available to you in the next month or two.

Second to the bootstrap registry is actually IANA implementing RDAP itself. We will provide an interface so you can use RDAP to look up all the resource records we manage. So if you want to find out the admin contact for .de, you'll be able to use RDAP to look in our records to find that out. Similarly, for all the other resources we maintain, .en

registrations, special use IP address blocks, and so on and so on. So that's RDAP.

Framework of interpretation. I'm not sure if this has been touched on in the agenda so far here, but we expect the ICANN Board to approve the framework of interpretation this week and that the resolution will direct staff to plan for implementation. In tandem with this, the ccNSO is expected, or maybe already has, appointed some advisors that will help us as staff get the details right.

We have the recommendation, the final reports from the team. I was an observer on the team, so I'm quite familiar with the discussion that happened over the years. But there's some specifics that went unsaid. What we're doing is we're already working on an implementation plan internally, how we think you want us to put that framework into action. And so we're writing out here's exactly how it's going to play out.

We're then going to get those ccNSO appointees to take a crack at it, have a look, see if they it accords with what you want. Some of this stuff, honestly, we don't know. There's a few question marks in the document right now. So there's some of the stuff where we're just not quite sure how the community would want to implement it. We're going to get those experts to help us define that process.

Once we go through that process, we're going to have a final draft implementation plan. We'll then use the customary ICANN public comment period so that everyone in the community gets a shot at

commenting on it, providing any additional feedback. Once we get that, we'll finalize it, and we'll put it into practice.

Some of the things to be mindful that will have a practical impact on the way we do things. Terminology changes. There's quite a few areas in the recommendations where the way we describe things will change. No more sponsoring organization. No more redelegation. So we're going to have to go through all of our documentation to update that. And, obviously, we have systems that use documentation, too, so we're going to need to update those systems and software, as well.

There are certain process changes relating to admin and tech contacts as they pertain to redelegation, so we need to work that out. One of the key themes is when we're asking for consent from people to do a redelegation, or as it's now called a transfer, we're required to get the party to acknowledge a certain number of things. So the way we're intending to address this is to make more use of pro formas.

Today, a lot of the requirements we have, we provide no structure to the applicant. We just say, "It needs to meet these criteria, but just send us what you got." Instead, we're going to move more towards templates and pro formas. So you fill out a survey or a questionnaire on certain aspects. When it comes to consent, you fill out a form and you sign on the dotted line, that kind of thing.

Okay. So that's framework of interpretation, and I know everyone is tired, so I'll be quick.

Transition-related work. We've been supporting a number of the design teams. And based on the findings so far, I mean, we watch things as they're progressing. We're internally making plans based on what we anticipate the changes to be. Obviously, they can't be finalized until everything is dry, but we understand the direction a lot of the stuff is going, so we want to on top of it as much as possible.

One thing in particular that I've been working on just in the last probably three or four weeks intensively is service level expectations. I understand this was a topic of presentation at the last session, so I'm not going to actually go through much of my comments. Suffice it to say, we're working with the community to come with an agreeable set of measurements that we think our systems either can collect today or can be modified to collect in the future.

We're going to put those in place. We're then going to have a period of data collection. We'll then come back to the community with those measurements. You can look at them and that will form the process of setting the final thresholds. These are the things where if ICANN just slips over this line, ICANN is just not doing a good job. I think our take is we want real world data to be able to make those assessments and come to an agreement about where those red lines should be.

I know you saw that, so I'm going to skip right over it. Lastly today, just some other service enhancements that I think are noteworthy to share with you. I presented to the tech day earlier this week and also I presented to the CENTR jamboree a few weeks ago on this.

It has been almost ten years since we looked at how we do technical checking for root zone changes. There's been enough movement in the industry that it's probably a good time to reevaluate whether those tests are really the most appropriate ones to be doing in today's environment.

So we started that early consultation with the community, doing some presentations. My expectation is we'll probably start a public comment period relatively soon, although one piece of feedback we got in the tech day was that maybe there should be a community-driven effort. But nonetheless, start the dialogue in the community about do we need to refine or change our approach there.

Some of the issues that we've seen are more recently, and this is particularly driven by new gTLDs: issues relating to how we assess network diversity, issues associated with how we list DS records for DNSSEC, and issues associated with SOA coherency. And what that means is basically some registries update their data so frequently that some of our tests fail. Because by the time we finish our testing, everything's changed, so we have to go back and test again. So without going to detail, that's a recurring problem.

Another idea is self-skipable tests. Some of the tests we know that, for some TLDs, they're just not applicable. Providing you with the tools that rather than e-mailing us and saying, "Hey, this doesn't apply to me," one of our staff reads that, we go in and manually override the system. Providing you the ability to log in and do it yourself.

In tandem with that, one of the other things also related to technical checks is we acknowledge that the way the technical checks are done right now, the way we report the results is not very clear. There are technical reasons behind that. But suffice it to say, we're re-implementing the whole infrastructure of the system of how it does them.

This will enable much clearer results to be provided back to you when you get issues. So provide, for example, the ability that it will give you a comprehensive log. You can give that to your engineers. Your engineers will have all the information in that log they will need to diagnose the problem that we saw.

Right now, if you want to diagnose something, your engineer has to write us an e-mail and we start chatting with each other and so on. That will still happen in some cases, but for the most part, again, it's all about trying to give you as many tools as possible so you can do self-service and limit your interaction with us, if you desire. I mean, you're always welcome to talk to us if you like, we're not trying to shut that down.

Lastly, right now, the process of giving you usernames and passwords for the system is manual. We're refactoring the systems so as soon as a new contact is added for your domain, the whole process of them getting a username and password is all fully automated. So that's it.

PATRICIO POBLETE: So questions. Please.

PETER VAN ROSTE: I'm Peter Van Roste from CENTR. Kim, on your previous updates, you mentioned that you were making progress on the publication of all delegation requests. Was that the previous or the one before? And that point in time, I signaled that some CCs had concerns on reputation damage if frivolous requests would have been published. And I think we got a confirmation, then, from IANA that there would be an outreach to the CC community to follow up on how we can solve that problem. Is there any progress on that?

KIM DAVIES: Being perfectly honest, that's one of the projects that's kind of on the shelf at the moment. Obviously, the transition is taking a lot of resources. That feedback is definitely noted. We're aware of the sensitivity. I will flag, now that you raise it, that's actually one of the things the design team is grappling with, as well, in the context of what data needs to be published to be able to reconcile the statistics we give.

I think one of the starting propositions in the discussion we had is, well, you should not only disclose completed requests but pending requests. And implicit in that is pending ccTLD redelegation. So they're somewhat intermingled. I have no news on that front, but I agree that's something we need to have buy-in from the community if the current model was to change.

ICANN | 53
Buenos Aires

PETER VAN ROSTE: But I don't think you will find any ccTLDs unreasonably unhappy if that project would linger a bit longer on the shelf, so no hurry there, I think.

KIM DAVIES: Thanks.

PATRICIO POBLETE: Okay. Well, thank you. I see Francisco Arias. Please come, and later, I will have Dusan Stojicevic and Sarmad Hussain. Are they in the room? Please come, so you're ready to present afterwards. So Francisco Arias from ICANN will update us on name collision mitigation.

FRANCISCO ARIAS: Okay. Well, while the presentation is being loaded, I would like to note the strange occurrence that my title is the Director of Technical Services, just like Kim, before and I'm here to talk about name collisions. But anyway.

                     So thank you for having me here. I'm Francisco Arias, the Director of Technical Services with GDD. And I used to work in a ccTLD. I was a CTO of .mx for a few years, so I used to come to the ccNSO meetings some years ago.

                     So this update is on there have been a couple of more resolutions on the topic of name collisions. This started as a topic within the new gTLD program. But while we were doing the development of the work there, some people pointed out that this issue is not unique to new

ICANN | 53
Buenos Aires

gTLDs and this will also appear in any delegation of a new TLD in the root zone. Oh, here it is, excellent. Thank you. Next slide.

So here is agenda. Next slide.

The basics of name collision, you have a user that is using a domain name within a private name space, within a private DNS configuration, let's say. And next slide, please.

And then if you have a case in which – it's not working. There you go. Thanks.

One of the typical cases of name collisions is when you have more [inaudible] users. You are within a corporate network, and you are using that name that is in the private DNS, but you go outside and you go, for example, to a coffee house and public network and you try the same name. Then you are probably going to have a different result.

But if that name has not been delegated in the public DNS, the only difference you're going to have is when you are in your corporate network, you're going to get a positive response, and you're going to get to whatever the website you were trying to go. And when you are in the public network, you are going to get a response in the name does not exist. So far, there's not exactly too much damage. Next slide, please.

But then, when – previous one. The previous one. There you go. Thanks.

Then, once the TLD of that name that was being used in a private context gets delegated, that's when problem start because then the previous response that a roaming user, let's say, was getting, say, the name does not exist, then it will change to this name exists, and then the person will be directed to a place where he or she may not have been trying to go. So this is the basic of what a name collision is. Next slide, please.

There has been two resolutions in the context of the new gTLD program. The first one in October 2013. Commission of a study to develop a name collision recording management framework as it was called and then to direct the implementation to each of the new gTLDs. Next slide, please.

Then the framework was adopted by the [eTLD] program committee within the ICANN Board in 30 July, 2014. And besides adopting this framework, if you look at number four there, the resolution call for ICANN staff to share information and best practices with ccTLDs, and that's the reason why I'm here. Next slide, please.

In this context is that we develop some recommendations for new ccTLD managers. This is simply mimicking what was requested for gTLDs and, of course, in this context, for ccTLDs. It's a mere recommendation, and it's up to each ccTLD manager to implement it in the way we are suggesting or to not implement anything.

This set of recommendations we have been providing to every new ccTLD that has been delegated since the time of the passing of the resolution. I believe there have been three maybe five ccTLDs that

ICANN|53
Buenos Aires
21-25 JUNE 2015

have been delegated in that time, and they all received this recommendations. Next slide, please.

The recommendations are divided like this. The first is to implement what we call our controlled interruption period. This is a period of at least 90 days from the time the TLD is delegated in which a set of special or specific records are inserted in the zone file of the TLD and no other names are activated. So there are no registration of names in this period of time, or at least the names are erased that are not activated. Next slide, please.

This is called a DNS zone file we'll look for. So a TLD that is in controlled interruption. What this does is if someone is querying a name, any name, because there is a use of workers so already it will cover any under the TLD. Then if they're querying, for example, for an A record, that's the query for the perhaps the most typical query for an IP address, they're going to get this IP address, 127.0.53.53, which is an IP address in the lookback block IP address, meaning any communication to this IP address will never be forwarded to a network. It will remain within the host – the laptop, the phone, a computer that is trying to connect. It will never get to the network, therefore, protecting any possibility for sensitive information to be disclosed.

And similarly to that, there are series of the most typical records that you will find in DNS MX, that's for e-mail. SRV for any service. And TXT record, that's just merely informational in case someone is making

ICANN | 53
Buenos Aires

queries. So that's the set of records that are being suggested to be included in a TLD that is in controlled interruption. Next slide, please.

The second thing that we are recommending to be implemented is name collision reporting mechanism to provide a mechanism for people that are affected or that could be affected by these name collisions to report to you, the ccTLD manager, that this happened so that you can implement temporary measures that, for example, could include their removal of the wildcard records so that the affected party has time to affect changes in the network.

Remember that if they are having a name collision, it's probably because they have some misconfiguration in their network, and they will have to do something to fix it. That is on them to fix, so this temporary measure is only to help them have time to fix it now that they have realized they have an issue.

And in extreme cases, when we're talking about dotless name, the collision is caused by the numeric systems of the TLD in the root, then the removal of the TLD from the root is the only measure available, but this is, of course, a very extreme case.

And the other thing I should mention is that for gTLDs, the way it was implemented is these measures will only be executed in case of severe harm. The way it was defined is clear and present danger to human life. So it's a very high bar, and otherwise, there is no requirement in the case of the gTLDs to affect any change. Here, of course, it will be up to each ccTLD manager to define what the bar should be. Next slide, please.

As part of the name collision project, we also developed a set of informational materials that you are free to use. You can find the links there. Particularly, the first link there is a guide for IT professionals on how to mitigate, how to handle the risk of a name collision in the networks. The second link will be the set of recommendations that are summarized in this presentation. And there are a few more information that you can find in the name collision page. That is the last link. Next slide, please. There you go. Thank you.

PATRICIO POBLETE: Okay. Thank you, Francisco. We have time for a quick question. Okay. Well, thank you. The next presentation, please. Universal Acceptance. Okay. Our next speaker, Dusan Stojicevic. Did I get it right?

DUSAN STOJICEVIC: Dusan Stojicevic.

PATRICIO POBLETE: At least I tried. Universal Acceptance and ccTLDs.

DUSAN STOJICEVIC: Okay. I'm Dusan Stojicevic. I'm coming from Serbian registry, but here I am in different role. While we have presentations. So first of all, my role is to explain what universal acceptance is. Next slide, please.

Universal acceptance is where all domain names are accepted and treated equally in all situations. This include addresses, e-mails, and

other universal resource locators. I think that many of you running IDNs, you know the issues that you have with IDN e-mails or something similar.

You have, for example, many e-mail addresses with IDNs or with long TLDs. They are rejected by the application is invalid. Sometimes the browser will interpret an address as a search term and not as a URL. Sometimes the domain name will not be displayed correctly or at all. And often, e-mail to any IDN e-mail will not work, just fails.

Solving those issues requires that all applications that accept, validate, store, process, or even display domain names must be reviewed. E-mail is a big issue, but almost any application that uses Internet may also be affected. Next slide.

Basically, at the ICANN meeting in Singapore, the formation of Universal Acceptance Steering Group was started. It now has a chapter of four working groups, project coordinators, and a small number of active participants. The issue, which has been around for many years, is now well understood. There are still some areas where work is needed, particularly these IDN e-mails.

But most importantly, I don't see this group like a usual work group. I see this group as a taskforce, because our task is to reach out to the thousands of software developers and users all around the world to get them to be aware of the changing domain name landscape and to get them to adapt their systems to support it. Next slide, please.

I already told you this is about IDNs. This is also about new Gs. This is also about any problem that any domain name or any e-mail address or anything have with on Internet. So it's related to our ccTLD world. It's an issue for IDN ccTLDs and ccTLDs with IDN on the second level. And it's an opportunity for a ccTLD to reach out to their local Internet community so we can, together, solve those problems. Next slide, please.

As a group, we need you. We need participants. We cannot do it alone. So here are the mailing lists where you can sign and do the participation in this group. I think that this group is, as I said earlier, as a taskforce, not group, is the only one place that will solve your problems with IDNs or with new Gs or with long domain names. So basically, I invite you to participate in our work. That's all.

PATRICIO POBLETE: Thank you. Any question? No? Well, if not, please do consider joining one of these tasks and helping with this effort. Thank you very much.

DUSAN STOJICEVIC: Thanks.

PATRICIO POBLETE: And our final speaker for this afternoon from ICANN, Sarmad Hussain, will provide an update on the IDN program.

SARMAD HUSSAIN: Thank you. We're just waiting for the presentation. Okay. While the presentation is being uploaded, let me start. I'm here to give you a brief update on the IDN program, its activities over the past few months since we provided the update at Singapore, and some of the projects we are going to continue working on in next few months until Dublin.

The IDN program work can be divided into multiple projects, and the projects work at two levels. We have a few projects. Let me see. Can we go to next slide? Okay.

We have a few projects, which are focused on top-level domains. Primarily, the IDN TLD program, which is looking towards developing root zone label generation ruleset and tools to allow community to use that rule set, and eventually that work will lead into IDN variant TLD implementation, as well.

Then the second major project, which we undertake at the top level, is the implementation of the IDN ccTLD process, which has been devised by ccNSO. We also have a couple of projects at second level, which include the IDN implementation guidelines and IDN tables. I'll talk about some of these in the presentation. In addition to these projects, we also do regular community outreach to inform and involve the community in the work.

The IDN TLD program is basically geared towards determining or collecting data from different scripts to allow a mechanism to determine what is a valid TLD label, top-level domain label in a

particular script, and also for valid TLD labels, what are the variant top-level domains for a particular label.

There has been a lot of work in this area led by the community over the past many years. Currently, we are in the implementation phase of this project, where we have multiple script communities which have come together and they're defining these rules for their own scripts. In addition, we also have a project, which is now we're developing tools, which will allow end user communities to use these label generation tools once they have been developed by the communities themselves.

As far as the label generation rules are concerned, the starting point for the script communities is what we call the maximal starting repertoire. The procedure, which was developed by the community to develop label generation rules required that we define the starting point, based on which the communities will then devise the rules for their own scripts.

MSR-2, which is a second version of the maximal starting repertoire, was released on 27th April this year and now includes 28 scripts, 6 additional scripts were added. This repertoire contains, now, more than 33,000 code points from Unicode shortlisted from more than 97,000 candidate code points. And these shortlisted code points are what script communities can choose from to allow for top-level domain names.

This second release of MSR now completes the script coverage, which is, at this time, at least anticipated. However, we will keep adding more scripts based on demand from relevant script communities.

In addition to the MSR, as the script communities are now working together or gathering and working towards developing their proposals, we are also developing very detailed documents guidelines to help and assist the process. These guidelines come at two different levels. There are some high-level guidelines on the process, and then there are some detailed documents on the technical details of the work, as well. These are now available online. They were published earlier this year after a public comment.

This is a status of where we are as far as label generation rules are concerned. I'm happy to share that Arabic and Armenian script communities have completed their proposals, and those proposals are now being finalized to be handed over to ICANN for release for public comments. Once the public comments are incorporated, they will be formally evaluated and then going forward will be the first version of the label generation rules. LGR is expected to come for public comment for the community in the third quarter of this year.

It will contain Armenian and Arabic scripts, so that's the target. In addition, we have Chinese, Japanese, and Korean communities, which are fairly active in themselves as well as in coordination because they share a common script, so they have to coordinate with each other in finalizing their individual work.

We recently also seated a Neo-Brahmi generation panel, which is a single panel looking after nine different scripts from South Asia. Also recently we reached out to communities in Cambodia, Laos, and

Myanmar, and those communities have also organized in starting their working.

There are other communities, which still need to organize and finish their work, which include Ethiopic, Georgian, Hebrew, Latin, and Thaana. We've already made some progress with Thai, Greek, and Sinhala.

In addition to the linguistic data which is being generated by the script communities, we are also developing tools which will eventually parse. This will first of all allow us to store this data in a machine-parseable format and then also allow community end users to use this data to determine what a valid top-level domain name is and also what the variants of those top-level domain names are.

We are currently in the process of developing this tool. The first version of this tool, which will support the use case to create LGRs, is anticipated to be out within this year. We will have the complete tool available for registries as well as for ICANN's use early next year.

IDN ccTLD fast track process is one of the main focuses of IDN programs. We implement the process as guided by ccNSO's final implementation plan. Currently, through that process, 47 labels or top-level domains from 37 different countries and territories have been successfully evaluated. These included 18 scripts from 27 languages, and of them, 37 IDN ccTLDs have been delegated representing 29 countries and territories.

The IDN ccTLD fast track process undergoes an annual review, and it is currently in that process where initial public comment was announced. Some significant comments were received on second similarity review and its process, and we are now taking those comments forward for further actions, based on direction which is going to be provided to us by the Board.

So those are the top-level domain programs, which we execute. We have two programs or projects which are focused on second-level implementations. One of the first ones is the IDN implementation guidelines. These are guidelines which the new gTLDs follow, and these are also recommendations for ccTLDs to consider. The third version, which is currently in practice, was last updated in 2011, which has been some time ago. So GNSO community has requested to review and so currently, we are now formulating a working group to review these guidelines.

Normally, the working group has included members from both the GNSO and ccNSO. So we would ask or request the ccNSO community to kindly volunteer for this effort, if you would like to have, sorry, if you have the expertise in the context of IDNs at a second level.

Another program which we are starting is development of IDN tables for the second level. The need for this came due to the requirement of predelegation testing of IDN tables to be used as second level for the new gTLDs. There was no reference available to test the tables, which were being submitted, so we are now in the process of developing language tables for different languages, which are required for PDT.

ICANN | 53
Buenos Aires

The process for developing these tables for released for public comment recently. The public comment closed. And based on the process finalized, we have now released an RFP to produce these tables.

The first version of these tables will, again, become available later this year, which we will be releasing for public comment, and based on feedback, we will be finalizing these tables. And once these tables are finalized, they will be used as reference tables for predelegation testing, but we will also release tables publicly for everybody's use.

We've been involved in different outreach activities, especially to reach out to communities to get them involved in the generation panel work to develop their label generation rules. In addition, we've also been reaching out to the community to tell them about what the IDN program has been doing through various outreach efforts, which include IDN program update sessions, which are on Wednesdays at ICANN meetings. So we have two sessions tomorrow. If you want to learn more about the IDN program, please come and attend those sessions.

We are still looking for some volunteers for some of the script communities. So please, if you are involved in those, if you use those scripts or you know people who may be interested in participating, please pass on the message and volunteer for the generation panels, which still need the community to come together to formulate. We will also be releasing language tables and some other documents for public review. If you're interested, please do review them, send us

ICANN | 53
Buenos Aires

feedback to improve the data and the processes, which we intend to eventually implement. It would be great to have more involvement from the ccNSO community.

So thank you very much for giving us the opportunity to share the progress, and I'm happy to take any questions now.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: Thank you, Sarmad, for the useful update. I have some questions regarding the IDN fast track, which for the .uk, has been quite a sensitive topic for now six years. That's the number of years we are celebrating this year.

The first point is that, to the best of my memory and the best of the memory of the ccNSO, the ccNSO was requested to create a working group to help ICANN staff with the review of the IDN fast track process. This working group was created in January and was formed, and I started to coordinate the working group waiting for some direction and guidance and the expectations from ICANN but I never received any guidance. We never received any guidance from ICANN.

I'd like to understand when and if this working group is going to be involved in this review process. That's the first question.

SARMAD HUSSAIN: Okay. So I think what we discussed internally, the feedback received on the second similarity review process was very significant. Therefore, we've gone to senior management and Board to basically

engage with ccNSO to get guidance on how to incorporate that feedback and update the second similarity review process.

So that particular consideration is with the Board in this meeting, and therefore, we will know next steps probably on Thursday, I guess at the Board meeting, at the Board discussion.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: Okay. Thank you for this answer, which partially, however, addressed my question, because the question was that this working group was told that we would have started to work in Q1 this year, and we are the end of Q2. So the comment period on the fast track ended in February, and in March, the responses to the comments were posted by ICANN staff.

And there's been quite a lot of correspondence between several authorities and ICANN staff regarding the chance to have a more precise timeframe for the next steps. And this is quite important in the big picture of the accountability discussions that are ongoing because the community has received the answer that when and if time comes, we will inform you.

And honestly, I don't think this is something acceptable for a community to receive an answer that says when and if time comes. So we would appreciate in the future at least, I'm speaking for this working group, more precise timeframes. Because, again, we were called. We volunteered with pleasure, but then we were completely forgotten now four months.

The last point is that I like to understand why in the previous rounds for reviewing the fast track process the Board was called to ratify the proposed amendments, and now the Board is requested to have a say before the amendments are drafted.

I mean, the previous round when the linguist panel was introduced, there was a two-layer approval process was introduced. The Board intervened to approve the amendments because it's part of the fast track to a regular review process. Now the Board is, let's say to the best of my understanding, the Board is now intervening to give the green light to amend the process.

SARMAD HUSSAIN: My understanding is that at this time, the consideration in front of the Board to decide how to move forward is to actually involve ccNSO to basically use the feedback which has been provided and recommend how the second similarity review process should be amended.

Based on that amendment, I think, at that point, this working group will probably get involved, as well. This working group would probably send the changes back to the Board and then the Board will then decide how to take that forward.

As staff, we obviously follow the process which is handed to us, so we are in implementation. We are focused on implementation. Changing that particular plan, the final implementation plan, especially after significant feedback from the community is not something we can do on our side.

So what we are going to perhaps wait for is for the direction from the Board on how to proceed with this. If you have any, I'm happy to get, if you can send the question to me in more detail or in e-mail, I can get those details back to you about what the process steps are, and why those process steps are being taken.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: I think that euRID and the European Commission have both sent at this stage countless communications without receiving satisfactory information from ICANN and ICANN Board. The only courtesy I'm asking you at this stage is if this working group, which was created by this constituency, the ccNSO is one day expected to do something, if that is told now, because, again, we have been living four months in a sort of limbo. And I think it's a matter of courtesy to community members who volunteer to tell them if and when they're expected to work. Thank you.

SARMAD HUSSAIN: Certainly. As I said, there is a consideration in front of the Board this time to request the ccNSO to look at or review the second similarity process and other aspects of fast track in light of the comments, which have been received. So on Thursday when the Board meets, we will know what the next steps are.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: Thank you.

PATRICIO POBLETE: Thank you for your presentation. Now, we've come to the end of the first day or not exactly the end, if I can find this. Okay. So I know this is the main reason why you're all here: the ccNSO cocktail. This is to remind you that the cocktail is going to be at the Hotel Sofitel, which is not very far from here. According to Google Maps, it's 11 minutes' walk. So you can go there directly, and if you want to go walk with the group, they will be meeting in the lobby, I guess, at 6:45.

The cocktail will begin at 7:00. So 6:45, you can be at the lobby if you want to walk with the group. See you there.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]