PANAMA – ccNSO: Members Meeting Day 2 (3 of 4)
Wednesday, June 27, 2018 – 13:30 to 15:00 EST
ICANN62 | Panama City, Panama

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: Good afternoon. I know this session is a little bit difficult after lunch, but we need to do what we are supposed to do. This is the PTI session. Our first presenter will be Byron Holland for a CSC update. Thank you, Byron.

BYRON HOLLAND: Hi. Thanks, [inaudible]. My update will be fairly brief. We recently had the monthly CSC meeting and the good news was that, in terms of performance, PTI had met 100% of the performance metrics, so there was nothing to report on that.

The last piece of material work that the CSC has engaged in above and beyond the regularly monthly monitoring and reporting is around service level expectations and working through a process that will allow us to finetune or make small changes to the service level expectations not require a major process.

So, the issue is around really just finetuning some of the SLEs now that we have a couple of years of history and understanding under our belt. We want to be able to do that in a way that

doesn't trigger a full-blown process. So, that piece of work is ongoing, and in part we're working with ICANN Legal to make sure that doing small or recommending small changes won't run afoul of any bylaws. So, that will really be the final piece of substantive work that the CSC will be engaged in beyond its regular monthly monitoring and reporting. That process is ongoing. We should be able to bring that in for a landing by the time we get to Barcelona. Hopefully, much sooner, but certainly by then. I'm happy to answer any questions.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: Thank you, Byron. Any questions from participants? I can see they're still digesting lunch. Okay. Write down questions and you can still answer while the session is going on. Martin?

MARTIN BOYLE: Thank you. I have over the last two meetings reported back on progress with a review on the CSC charter. This was a requirement for the CSC that we reexamined the charter that the CSC was working on after a year. That process is now coming to an end.

Since last meeting, we have gone out for a comment period on the document we discussed at the last meeting. For this meeting, I will try and limit myself primarily to the things that

ICANN
POLICY FORUM 62
PANAMA CITY
25–28 June 2018

came out of that consultation, but I will, for newcomers, try and do a very quick overview of the main features of the report.

The purpose of this charter review was very, very limited. It was limited just looking at the charter. As you will have heard several times during this meeting, there are two further things that will impact on CSC with some sort of review. The IANA functions review will obviously need to look at CSC to some extent because that is a fundamental element of the IANA functions transition model and they have also got an efficiency review of their very own to look for.

So, this one just looked at the charter and we saw our role in looking at the charter to try and make sure that the charter was supporting the role of the CSC as we move forwards. We just heard from Byron about one area where they are looking very much to making sure that minor changes can be done easily and quickly. So, that was the …

I've just mentioned that the public comment period, we only had six comments come in and we've addressed all of those comments. There was an updated report and charter following that public comment period and we thought it was the final report, but in fact we have subsequently made a very minor modification to the report just to improve clarity. I believe that

that has gone online either yesterday or this morning. But, it's a very minor change.

The narrow mission and scope of responsibility of CSC should not be expanded. That I think was really quite clear. That was unanimous. That was a message we heard from everybody.

Quickly moving on. There was following the consultation period some light editing on the membership composition that was in response to a comment, but it just is a clarification of who the members are for a minimum composition and who the members might be in the case of a registry that is neither a ccTLD or a gTLD being included in the mix.

The diversity requirements, because otherwise there's been no change on the membership requirements, have not been changed. However, the report itself does include a reference to work stream two of the CCWG and when that is published, the appointing organizations will be requested to pay attention to the recommendations in that [report].

The last item with a change here was the clarification in the charter of the duration of the term to fill a vacancy. This would be – and it's not happened at all yet, but if somebody were to stand down during their mandate, the appointing organization needs to replace them and we are now clarifying that that

replacement would be for the remainder of the mandate and then the process would remain within its normal process.

Major findings, meetings and reporting. All the items on this slide are about trying to make sure that the CSC has got the flexibility to provide the service that it needs to provide, so reducing the number of face-to-face meetings from three a year to two a year – at least two a year – allows for or reflects the change in the ICANN meeting program organization.

One key one, this hasn't been changed since the last document, but the charter does include a provision for CSC to meet with the PTI board. This was something that we were unanimous about, that there was a real need for the CSC to have the opportunity to discuss with the PTI board to look forward rather than just responding to things that are happening, so there's a strategic element brought in through that.

The changing service levels and the remedial action process, as you see here, the first of those service levels, Byron has already mentioned it. This is simply something that brings the charter into line with the flexibility that the CSC needs just to be able to respond to fairly simple – Byron's words, finetuning.

At the same time, the CSC, as required in the charter, have been in discussion for a while with PTI about the remedial action procedures. That's now been agreed and we now believe that

ICANN 62
POLICY FORUM
PANAMA CITY
25–28 June 2018

that process is something that belongs to the CSC and that we no longer need to have a specific requirement on the CSC for the remedial action procedure. Again, a simplification that allows improved flexibility within the PTI.

In the report, we make a number of observations about things that are not specifically report charter related. The three things we identify here, the first we mentioned before and the first one I think everybody is now well and truly aware of the issue of multiple reviews taking place within a very short timescale, and therefore we are flagging that to the ccNSO and the GNSO.

Then, travel support. Again, that is more of a clarification. Bear in mind, the charter itself is not responsible for the process that the organizations follow to appoint members of the CSC.

The last of these was, in fact, new. Peter Koch will talk a little bit more about these. The point that arose is on issues. How do you address them? Where do you address them? There were two particular. And we thought that the comments that were made were particularly valuable.

We have not addressed the clarification of the scope on enhancing the provision of the IANA naming functions operational services because we believe that that is something that the CSC can do already. So, it can decide whether this

ICANN
POLICY FORUM 62
PANAMA CITY
25–28 June 2018

actually does fall within its operational mandate related to the provision of services.

The more important one, though, is about the gap analysis that is suggested, that there will be, and in fact are already, cases where there doesn't seem to be a home for addressing something within the panoply of different committee structure members throughout ICANN.

Our response to this was to make reference in the report, specifically addressed at, and as you can see here, to the ccNSO Council which I hope will allow some sort of dialogue on identifying how that, any issues that come up might be addressed.

So, the final report, as it says here, was published on the 19th of June. The final, final report was published either yesterday or early today, and that will go to the ccNSO and GNSO Councils at the end of the day and that will then be the end of the process.

So, happy to take any questions, should anybody have them.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: Thank you, Martin. Any questions for the review process? Just taking quite some time. I think participants are thinking of very hard questions. Let them write it down for you. Okay, as I said,

we can still ask questions anytime as you think through the [inaudible]. Peter, are you ready?

PETER KOCH: Yeah, thank you. So, in the interest of time, I will skip any additional information on the gap analysis. If anybody is interested, it's on file. I would like to thank the Review Team for taking this up. I believe that sending this to the CTO by the council is exactly the lightweight way to inspire this dialogue between the various parties involved in that.

A couple of you might remember that some of the ccTLDs in the room had wishes or difficulties around technical parameters, and while this is easily misunderstood as a technical problem that should be sent over [the wall] to the Tech Day or some technical working group, it's actually a question of policy and procedure and the boundary between these is of course always very crispy. And this dialogue and the involvement of the CTO should probably help and help resolve these issues. Thank you so much.

Now, for something completely different. The other update. Next slide, please. Oh, I'm sorry, I can do that myself. Wow, cool.

What is RZERC? Many of you, the brave ones that attend this session every time, have seen these slides in slightly different color or shape already.

RZERC has a long charter and I will not bother you with going through it. There is the unofficial very short definition and that is RZERC is taking up a tiny remaining function of the NTIA after the transition, which is the final approval of what is called in the charter architectural changes to the root zone and the root zone system, examples of which would have been the introduction of IPv6 or the introduction, more importantly probably, or the introduction of DNSSEC to the root zone. So, we're talking about things at this level.

The committee has been founded or inspired by the transition. It is not an ICANN bylaws committee, so you won't find RZERC in the bylaws in contrast to the CSC, for example. But, the usual SOs and ACs as well as the IETF, the ICANN board, and PTI, as well as the RZM (the Root Zone Maintainer) which is Verisign, are part of this group by sending an appointee per organization, which makes us nine people on the committee.

We are mostly dormant now. The final work last year in 2017, I think I report that in the previous meeting in Puerto Rico, was to have the final regular call after we finish the processes and procedures document and then we went dormant.

ICANN
POLICY FORUM 62
PANAMA CITY
25–28 June 2018

Until recently, we had to have another call in May and we had a session here in Panama earlier this week where we had two issues on the table that were brought forward by the ICANN board – the first one. And guess what? It was about the root zone KSK rollover. I hope everybody has heard about this so far, otherwise we're in trouble.

The ICANN board, as per the resolution that is quoted on the slide – and actually, I can't read from here, so I shouldn't drive a car today. That resolution asks both the SSAC (Security Stability Advisory Committee) and RZERC to provide comments on the current plans to resume the KSK rollover.

Now, RZERC consisting of nine members, as per the charter, is not supposed to be a technical committee that gives the advice itself. It is more of an overview and oversight function. So, in this particular case, the KSK rollover had started before RZERC existed, so before the transition finished. Now we're deliberating what we can provide in addition to all the outreach activities and so on and so forth. But, this is something the committee is now working on in terms of response and advice to the board. It appears, and you would be able to hear that in the recordings from our meeting from earlier this week, the only thing that seems to be pretty clear right now without preempting the final response is that the response will neither be a yes or a no, but some hopefully in-depth considerations.

The second one was brought to the committee by the office of the CTO and kind of also inspired or preempted by the CWG proposal, which suggests that after a certain amount of time, a review or a study should be conducted regarding root zone management and potential risks that might have arisen by the fact that the NTIA is no longer approving changes to the root zone database. Again, RZERC's function is not to do that. It's the other tiny part of the NTIA work only, and this was given to the committee because any potential output of the study, any recommendation that would come out of the study, would probably have an effect on or could have an effect on the architecture of the root zone management, and therefore we were invited to give input to the study, maybe additional questions or rephrasing. We are working on a response there as well. The draft study is in the archives of RZERC and the archives are publicly available so we can actually share the link to the archive and send that to the ccTLD community list and the ccNSO after the meeting.

That should bring me to the end. Now, any questions? Any opinions about KSK rollover? Not even that. I guess I can pass the bucket and assume that you are all writing your contributions and submit them after the panel. Thank you.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE:	Thank you. I think we have been so clear so far. I expected questions on the KSK because we carried out a study in Kenya. Our CTO is there. I think he did it. The results were not very inspiring. Over 90% of the respondents were not aware. So, yeah, we are now planning to have at least an awareness campaign so that we're not all thrown out of.
	I think now we get PTI update from Kim. Thank you.
KIM DAVIES:	Thank you very much. I'm going to give you the update on what the activities within the IANA team have been over the past few months and what our priorities are in the coming months. At the end, I will be imploring you to think about what strategically we should be focusing on for fiscal year 20. So, keep that in the back of your mind as I go through, because I'm looking for feedback. Not today, but over the coming month as to what our areas of focus should be as we devise our next year budget.
	Firstly, this is our team. The one change since we last met was that we have hired a new Director of Technical Services. His name is David Prangnell. He's actually not a stranger to the broader ICANN team. He's worked in IT operation within ICANN for almost ten years, but we're very happy to have him on board within IANA. He actually officially starts on July 1st, but he will hit

ICANN
POLICY FORUM 62
PANAMA CITY
25–28 June 2018

the ground running with excellent experience with our systems and processes. I think he will be a great addition to the team.

Root zone management system, development of this system, is a key development focus for us right now. This is the [inaudible] we need to face we have with you as TLD managers to manage root zone change requests.

We're currently doing a major redevelopment of the system. In essence, rewriting almost every aspect of it to make it more modern and to address some underlying architectural concerns. Whilst we're doing this, we're also adding additional functionality that is responsive to the areas of focus that the community and our customers have expressed to us.

One particular item is a new technical check implementation. This is essentially decoupling the way we do technical checks from RZMS itself and turning it into a standalone system.

The reason we're doing this is many. Firstly, we need to make architectural changes to make that system more performant. One area of ongoing discussion with the Customer Standing Committee is that technical checks are variable in terms of how quickly they're performed and in the least ideal scenario take longer than we would like.

So, with that in mind, we're seeking to further optimize the way the technical checks are performed. Architecturally, it's very difficult to do that with our current system, our current code base, and our current libraries. So, engineers have studied the problem in quite depth and had recommended that we needed sort of an architectural change to be able to make that work faster.

Separate to that, we also have feedback over the years that the technical checks response are cryptic. When you get a technical check issue reported back to you, that the response is either too terse or is otherwise not sufficient to give actionable details to you to remedy the problem.

Generally, what happens in that case, is that the customer will write to us and we'll have a discussion and one of our team will explain in detail what that error means and ways it might be remediated.

What we'd like to do is have much more meaningful output from the technical check module, explain the issue a little more, possibly provide remediation advice in band, so you don't necessarily have to reach out to us if you don't want to. We'll have documentation around those areas, so you can read that.

Lastly, we also want to provide for debugging. This means that we would provide really detailed raw logging of what our test

ICANN
POLICY FORUM 62
PANAMA CITY
25–28 June 2018

did and what they produced. For those of our customers that are expert and wish to drill down to the details, perhaps do some kind of network diagnostics to trace down an error, in order to trace down that error, you typically need things like the network parts that were used, the exact timestamp, possibly down to the second or millisecond, that kind of thing. So, producing these [inaudible] logs that your engineers can use is the third aspect to this technical check implementation.

Another aspect is a customer API. This is really to allow TLDs to automate against root zone management system. This is a particular ask for registry service providers that have larger portfolios. it will enable things like automation when you do a key rollover. A registry service provider, for example, might roll their keys on schedule, maybe once a year. If they manage 50-100 TLDs or more, that's a fairly complicated process to communicate all those new trust anchor DS records to us to insert in the root zone.

By producing API, we believe that will make that process much more efficient and it will also provide us other opportunities to provide things like bulk updates that will alleviate other areas of where there's essentially too much manual intervention and too much hard work to do something that should be fairly simple.

New security options. Providing multi-[inaudible] authentication. Mandatory authentication for authorizing change requests. No more clicking a link and then that link basically is your gateway to approving a change. You'll be issued with a username and password. You need to log in in order to authenticate a change request. Audit logging, so that you can go back and see how your account was used when. So, if you want to look for unauthorized usage of your account, you'll have the tools available to look back at the log of what has happened in the system. And a variety of other security improvements as well.

One thing I have discussed at previous meetings that is being built is our next-generation authorization model. Without going into details at this meeting, in a nutshell, this is separating the ccTLD managers role in approving change requests from the role of being listed in the WHOIS as a contact point. Though, up until today, generally speaking, if you wanted to authorize changes to your TLD, you or your job title will be listed in the WHOIS as either an administrative or technical contact. At the heart of this process is separating those two. So, you can list as your admin and tech contacts people that are appropriate for you to be points of contact for customer service, people that might reach out to you on the broader Internet with general inquiries about your TLD. Then separately from that, you can manage who on

your staff are trusted to do certain kinds of change requests and who are trusted to authorize change requests.

So, this is under active development right now. We're currently building out the functionality. It's a very active project at the moment. Rollouts of this functionality is expected throughout the following year.

Another area of focus for us is label generation rule sets. This is the new terminology for IDN tables. We today publish what we call the IDN Table Repository or the LGR repository. What this repository does is list all of the LGRs that TLDs use to assess which code points are allowed at the second level or within registerable spaces within their registry operations.

Now, this project started very small. It started as an informal knowledge sharing activity. From the very first edition of the IDN guidelines, it was just recommended that TLDs use this resource to share what they're doing, so others could learn from them. But, over time, that has evolved. In particular, the latest round, the new gTLD round that is active now, it's compulsory for those TLD operators to use this. And as a consequence, we have really high volumes of traffic to this registry that we didn't envisage when it was first created.

So, with that in mind, we're reevaluating how we're doing it, looking how to build tools and systems to make it more efficient, to promote self-service.

Also, the CSC has raised with us that, given its increased importance over the years, that it should be something that is in scope for metrics.

So, as devised by the IANA transition, this particular service was not under the NTIA contract, therefore particular service was not tracked in the post-transition deliverables. By recognizing that the times are changing, the CSC requested that we start monitoring this and that is something that we've built out.

So, now, today, if you go to our SLA dashboard on our website, there is now a new section called label generation rule sets. Here you can find information about our processing of those particular kinds of requests.

A few things of note. Very unusual processing patterns here. Unlike almost everything else we do where there's a fairly constant [inaudible] of changes, [inaudible] spikes at certain times, here we have a situation where one request might involve one table and the next request involves 936 tables. Obviously, it's a fairly linear amount of effort to process these, so there's a lot of variability in the way the times taken to process them.

ICANN
POLICY FORUM 62
PANAMA CITY
25–28 June 2018

But, this is data that we're now publishing and the CSC is going to look at that over the coming months, analyze it, and work out what appropriate SLAs will be for that data.

In addition to our dashboard, just a reminder that we produce monthly reports. These are delivered to the Customer Standing Committee and it's part of a discussion that we have every month with them on our performance. Here we have dozens and dozens of metrics that we collect automatically and are available to [inaudible] monthly analysis and report form.

We've concluded our audit program for 2017. We passed both of our audits without exception, so we're quite happy with that. The audit that we passed for the registry services, these are the tools and the systems that we use to manage registry data, including RZMS, including our ticketing system. This was the first time that the numbering services was actually in scope. That's one of the derivatives of the transition process. So, the scope was a little larger this time, but it passed with flying colors.

Of note, we've been using PricewaterhouseCoopers as our auditor since 2010. We put in an RFP last year, and as a consequence of the RFP starting this year, we're now using a new firm, RSM. They've been on-site to our offices many times already this year and they will continue to work on auditing us for the 2018 year.

GDPR. [inaudible] the story for GDPR for IANA is a pretty straightforward one. It's not as complicated and as torturous as I think it is for the rest of the industry. The highlights are we have implemented some measures associated with GDPR compliance. The primary mediation is not entirely internal. We have published a new privacy policy in terms of service for the IANA services. Really, these hinge on what we're doing with your data and how we're doing it.

When we were going through this exercise over the last six months, we were deciding between having a custom PTI only privacy policy in terms of service or whether to harmonize with the broader privacy policy in terms of service for all of the ICANN organization. After analysis, we decided that the PTI one wouldn't actually look a lot different from the ICANN one, so we settled on harmonizing the two.

In fact, our privacy policy in terms of service is identical. It is the same documents as the ones used by ICANN.

In essence, I will say that after comprehensive analysis of all the data we collect and when, we really don't collect superfluous data that we don't need. A lot of our business processes are very lightweight. We ask exactly what we need from you and nothing more. So, it's not like there was a lot to pare down or trim going through this exercise on data collection. We found that the data

that we collect was needed in order to do our business activity. So, it's not that we've changed our data collection practices in any way. This is really just documenting what we have been doing for years and what we plan to continue doing.

Lastly, I did mention the authorization model earlier. That model gives you even more flexibility, as I mentioned, in configuring your contacts and what data that you give to us. I think this works nicely with the philosophy of GDPR and the principles [inaudible]. That should [inaudible] even more flexibility as to what you list and what you don't.

Okay. FY20 budget. And I know what you're thinking, which is that it's only 2018. But, we have bylaws and the bylaws say at least nine months prior to the commencement of each fiscal year, the corporation shall submit to the PTI board and the board of directors of ICANN proposed annual operating budget and budget for the corporation's next fiscal year.

ICANN's fiscal year runs, and PTI's for that matter, runs from 1st of July to 30th of June. So, our 2020 fiscal year will begin 1st of July 2019, which means that we have to have a draft budget completed by – let me do that math – end of September of this year, which is coming up fast.

Then, during the annual budget development process, and prior to approval of the annual budget by the PTI board, corporation

ICANN
POLICY FORUM 62
PANAMA CITY
25–28 June 2018

shall consult with the supporting organizations and advisory committees, as well as the Registry Stakeholder Group, IAB, and RIRs.

What this means – and I'll show you a timeline in a moment – is that this is the first of several opportunities to provide input and feedback into this process and I'm looking forward to you either confirming my assumptions or perhaps challenging them, so that we can use that input to feed into project work and so forth that we might plan for FY20.

So, here's the quick timeline. So, the first line preliminary priority discussions. That's what we're doing this month and next month. Also, starting following this meeting is we'll go back to ICANN headquarters. As you might know, a large part of the PTI budget is actually shared services from ICANN. So, ICANN provides us with a lot of support, whether it's IT operations, legal, HR, all the bits and pieces and organization we might need. They charge us for that, so that's in the budget. So, we need to go to all the department heads throughout the organization, sit down with them, analyze what they're doing, work out what might be changing for them to support PTI, capture all that information and put that into the draft budget for consideration also.

Following these two tracks of internal and external outreach, we'll then take that feedback into a draft budget and then go through internal management reviews throughout August.

In early September, the pre-review version will be sent to the PTI board and the ICANN Board Finance Committee for review. Then, in mid-September you get another bite of the cherry and you will see the draft budget for formal public comment period. That will be open for until the end of October coming up to the Barcelona meeting and beyond.

We will then take that feedback we receive on the public comment period. We will then revise it based on that feedback. We'll go for another round of review and then for formal adoption by the PTI Board and ICANN Board Finance Committee. The ICANN board will then review it and adopt it. The empowered community will then be able to review it. Then, all of this, what does not show and feed into the broader ICANN budget, which is funded from ICANN – PTI budget being funded by ICANN.

Then, all the way over to July, the far right, we actually get to start using the results of that process. Clear?

So, here are some of the assumptions that's gone into planning the budget. Firstly, our assumption is, in general, our customers are happy and that, as a result, we're not planning any real

fundamental changes to our service. Obviously, as with every other year, we have constant refinement going on, evolution of our systems and tools. We implement policies that the community comes up with and so forth, but this is all part of our day-to-day. It's nothing fundamentally that means we need to really plan to make a significant adjustment to how we fund our operations.

New areas that may involve either adapting or expanding our existing processes and systems. TLD variance. That project is sort of targeting becoming a production process around 2020. That means we need to start building the concept of variance into our systems and tools. Obviously, this is subject to some approvals, but the way that that stream of work is going, we have to make forward estimates, if that's roughly on track and according to schedule as is currently planned by that team, that IANA will start having work to be done in fiscal year 20.

The other activity that may happen in 2020, certainly may not – not making any particular predictions there – is the next round of new gTLD applications. That being said, there really is no impact on our budget as it's going to be drafted, simply because our expectation is that all costs associated with processing new gTLDs will come from that program itself, much like in the 2012 round. So, we flag that for awareness, but not because we think that there will be a material impact on our budget.

Beyond that, in line with our service, generally speaking, we expect to have a stable head count and stable funding for that fiscal year as well.

So, here are the priority projects based on those assumptions that we think will have significant fiscal impact. One is continuing ongoing development and maintenance of the root zone management system. This is to support you as our naming customers.

Continue development and production rollout of a protocol parameter management system. So, what this is is basically a large part of our development resources now and we expect to continue to FY20, is building a comprehensive system to manage the 3,000 or so registries that we maintain on behalf of the IETF.

Right now, the way we do it for the IETF is highly manual, and as we've seen with RZMS in the context of the root zone, there's a lot of opportunity for increased productivity, increased service. It's less error prone to have automated systems to manage those protocol parameter registries. So, that is an ongoing project that we expect to continue with the actual production rollout likely to be 2019 to 2020.

We continue to plan to reenvisage web tools and focus on specific business areas. A lot of this work, there is a provision for this in FY19, but we expect it will continue in FY20. I mentioned

ICANN
POLICY FORUM 62
PANAMA CITY
25–28 June 2018

the LGR repository earlier, but there's a lot of other parts of our business that will benefit from tools and services, like our key management.

Implementing those systems and business processes to support [inaudible] TLDs. The fifth bullet point is refining our shared services cost and account for new community funding. We just heard earlier in the session that travel for funding for the CSC has been recommended, so that will be an IANA-associated cost that we would account for in our budget.

Also, we're thinking even more forward. What are the next big technical challenges that we might need to do preparatory work for? The one that we've identified is the next key rollover, which has a reasonable probability of being what we call an algorithm roll. Changing the DNSSEC algorithm is a different kind of technical problem to just changing the key. So, without knowing when that might happen, preliminary work needs to be done to study this issue.

Now, when we started the KSK rollover project, that theoretically will happen, will conclude sometime this year. Way back when, five or even more years ago, we convened a design team of the community. They met. They designed their fundamental parameters around this. Could well be that a

ICANN
POLICY FORUM 62
PANAMA CITY
25–28 June 2018

similar process happens with an algorithm roll, and that obviously needs to be funded and costed.

So, that's a lot to take in, but my takeaway for you is that any kind of feedback that you might have on priorities or areas of focus for FY20 is very welcome. If it's just confirming what we've said, that they seem to be the right areas of priority, that's really useful feedback. If you disagree, if there's something that you think should be changed or if there's something we just completely missed, that's useful to hear as well.

As I showed you on the timeline, this will be folded into a more tangible budget document that you can then review. Feedback at this phase where we're getting the priorities is most useful by July 20th. So, I'm certainly not expecting everyone to have ideas right now, but if you could convey any thoughts you have between now and July 20th, that would be very useful for me to formulate that draft budget, with participation with my colleagues within ICANN, particularly Becky Nash who is somewhere in the room over there, who is PTI's treasurer and does a lot of the heavy lifting here.

So, feel free to, if you have comments now or come approach me during the meeting or send me an e-mail after the meeting. That would be great. With that, Patricio.

PATRICIO POBLETE:	Patricio Poblete, NIC Chile. About GDPR. It doesn't seem to have made any changes in the way you publish information through whois.iana.org. Do you plan on redacting any of that thing?
PETER KOCH:	We have no plans to do that. You can opt out of publishing personal data by not listing it in the WHOIS. We need to have points of contacts and our assessment is those points of contact are justified by business need. So, our advice and our strategy at the moment is not to change the approach there.
PETER VERGOTE:	Peter Vergote, dot-BE. Just a question. I don't have a technical background, so it's not in any way an indication that it's lacking in your budget priorities for 2020. But, it strikes me that security is very high on the radar, that the number of attacks keeps climbing, so this definitely should be on everyone's agenda. I'm just wondering is this a specific focus point for IANA staff as well? And have you considered whether there is need for special action for IANA to look into that and could this potentially have a budgetary impact for you guys?
PETER KOCH:	That's an excellent question. It is an area of priority. Make no mistake that security is high on our mind. I don't think it is

necessarily a budget impact for FY20 for one simple reason is that we already have a provision for security funding in this year's budget, in next year's budget. We do regular penetration testing, code reviews. We do table top exercises. So, this is part of our day-to-day already and we're seeking to obviously continue to evolve that to match the threats.

In addition, we currently have one open head count that's already budgeted for, for essentially a security practitioner within the team. In addition, we also have security services provided by the broader ICANN. ICANN has a cybersecurity team and they also monitor, as part of the broader ICANN assets, IANA specifically.

So, from those different angles, I think we have it covered. I mean, we need to continue to monitor and evolve, but there's nothing specific in mind that would suggest we need to materially change the funding required for those activities in FY20, at this time at least.

PETER VERGOTE: Okay, thanks.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: Anymore questions? Thank you. Move over to the PTI Board updates by Lise.

LISE FUHR:	Thank you. You know I like to have my presentation half lesson and half presentation of what the PTI board does. I do this both to raise a bit of the attention span after a long day of meetings where we sit and listen to very interesting presentations, but we also kind of drift away in our minds.

But, to start with the art lessons first, this is an artist called [inaudible] in Danish. It's a Danish guy. Translated, his name means "Remember My Name", so it's an anonymous artist. He started like [Banksey] doing street art and now he's selling art big time in Denmark, making a living of this. So, his art, it still, has an underlying, like [Banksey] also, a political message, in some of the pictures, not all of them. And many of them are quite humorous and actually they depict our everyday lives. But, this is actually from before he got famous, so it's an illegal graffiti painting where he is in the picture himself in the corner.

So, let's get back to the PTI Board business. The agenda for this presentation is I'm going to give you an update on roles and responsibilities. We have established a work plan. I'm not going to go very deeply into the budget because Kim gave an excellent presentation on how we are going to deal with the budget. Talk a little bit about strategic plan and operational issues. That's

ICANN
POLICY FORUM 62
PANAMA CITY
25–28 June 2018

more I'm going to just show you our agenda from we had a meeting this Sunday.

Roles and responsibilities. Actually, this says, "Say not to war." And he says yes, this guy. It's, again, one of the graffiti pieces he made before he started as an established artist.

But, we still have a dialogue ongoing on these documents. They're actually two documents. One is about the PTI Board role and responsibilities in relation to other parts of ICANN, both the ICANN board, the PTI president, ICANN as an organization as such. The PTI officers but also the other communities like the CSC, the RIRs, and RSSAC, etc.

The other one is also a very interesting document that's a document about how ICANN [inaudible] and PTI, what our interfaces are, and what areas where the ICANN CEO can actually transfer some of his responsibilities to the PTI board. We're still working on this, so we don't have anything detailed for you yet on this.

On the work plan, Kim has actually created an 18-month work plan for the PTI board and we're going to publish this. It will be published on the website. It's extremely important for us because it gives us an overview of what it is we need to do throughout the year. And as you heard, we have the budget that starts pretty early, but we also have an IANA functions review

coming up which will somehow influence the work of the PTI board.

Every year, we have the control audit and customer service, etc. So, we have some reoccurring tasks we have to do every year, but we also have some like the IANA functions review, which will only occur every five years.

This is actually now after the first three years, but that's because that was meant to start earlier because of the transition.

We will look at this work plan at every board meeting. And as I said, it will be published on the website, so if you are interested, you can review it there.

For the budget, I'm not going to talk very much about that because Kim spoke in detail to this. What I think would be good to mention is actually that the financial year, FY18, which is ending by the 13th of June looks excellent. We actually have spent less money than we thought, $2.6 million spent less. This doesn't mean that this money goes to PTI or IANA. This means that ICANN has $2.6 surplus in their budget because the budget is not a traditional budget. It's per spending. So, we only get what we spend.

From first of June, we'll actually start the new financial year 19 with a budget of $10.1 million. We'll see how that's going to …

How much we'll spend here because part of the reason why FY18 had less spending than we thought was also we had less hires. They have been hired now. We also used the shared function less than we thought. So, we'll see how to make corrections for this.

On the strategic and operational plan, we have not established a strategic plan yet. We'll start the discussion internally within the PTI board. This will be in close coordination with ICANN. Of course, ICANN strategic plan, which is about to be created hopefully next year and are in the process now, will have some issues that will make or give us some direction. So, we'll be a part of the ICANN strategic plan, so we need to work very closely together with ICANN in coordinating our strategies. We're still dependent on whatever ends up in the ICANN strategic plan. Plus, we might have our own issues that we will deal with.

Also, we will work on how to include the different communities because your input on the strategy is equally important for us.

So, we had the board meeting last Sunday. We did some updates. The financial update is the one I told you. The finances look good. Now we start actually preparing for the new budget, FY20 even though we haven't started FY19 yet. But, that's because of the consultations.

On the operations update, everything looks good. So far, we have not had any of the communities complaining about the

services of PTI or IANA, so it's a quiet period. Well, it's not a quiet period. It has actually been quite good for a long time with IANA, so nothing new there. Kim presented you for the new hires, so that's also taken care of.

We discussed the roles and responsibilities and the strategic and work plans for the future.

So, that was a brief overview of what we do within the PTI board. Thank you for listening and I don't know if anyone as any questions. The other NomCom board member and I are happy to respond to any questions you might have.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: Any questions? Okay, I think the team here has done a good job. Should we give them a round of applause, please? We have 25 minutes. Yes? Okay. We are free to leave. Okay, we have been told to leave.

KATRINA SATAKI: Thank you very much. The guys finished earlier than we anticipated. Nevertheless, before we break, I will give you a short introduction for the next session and that's about the volunteers, how to get more volunteers on board.

You may remember that in San Juan we already started discussions on that. We asked two questions. One of the questions was why do you participate? Sorry. Why do you not participate? People came up with a list of different obstacles and barriers to their participation. For example, the budget does not allow them to travel to face-to-face meetings or their registries are not that big and they cannot allow people to actively and meaningfully contribute to the work of ccNSO.

Sometimes people lack confidence and they think that my views are not so important, which is not true. All views are important. Everybody has something, to share something, to contribute to the process.

Sometimes they're active in other groups and they do not have time to participate in other activities. We also came up with different ideas how to increase participation, what to do to make sure that everybody can participate in the work.

So, one of the ideas was to create some onboarding materials not only for the ccNSO, which we have now actually, thanks a lot to Alejandra and Elena, but also for each of our working groups, to make sure that all the newcomers can read an essence of the working group, to understand what they're doing and how to move forward, how to join them and how to contribute.

We also thought that we'd need to give an estimate of time requirements, how much time people need to, if they want to participate in a particular working group. Also, one of the ideas was to make this more personal, so that people who already are on working groups, if they think of somebody else from another registry or maybe from their own registry, who could meaningfully contribute to the work of the working group, just to invite them and personally take them, grab their hand and lead them to the working group.

So, that was the outcome from our meeting in Puerto Rico. We decided that we need to continue discussions on these topics.

One of the things that we worked on, outcome from our meeting in Puerto Rico is we decided to come up with some template for working group info, so to speak. So, something that our working groups could fill in, so that we give it to the community, so that we can help with onboarding.

So, currently – and we have some print-outs here. So, before we break, we go to grab some coffee, you can get the print-outs so that you can read in preparation for our discussion after the coffee break.

But, here, briefly, I'll just explain it to you. So, working group name, the goal of the working group, why this particular working group has been created, a link to their Wiki space, if there is any,

of course. Deliverables to date, what has been an outcome of their work. What are they working on at the moment? Some working methods. For example, e-mails, face-to-face meetings, or something else, teleconferences, something else. Meeting frequency – how often do they meet?

Some additional background information, relevant documents. And how to join, what to do if you want to join. For most working groups, it's really very simple. You just send an e-mail to the secretariat. And desired expertise. Well, desired in terms of it's not necessary. You don't have to be an economist to participate in the SOP Working Group. But, of course it will be helpful, but it's just desired expertise.

As an example for the description of working group, how we intend to, propose to use this template, we also have … We tried to fill it in for the Guidelines Review Committee. That's another print-out that Kim has got here.

Here is an empty template. We also have a template that has already been filled in for a particular group, which is Guidelines Review Committee. So, please feel free to get it from Kim, and just read before we start our discussion. So, that's about the prep work, intro.

ICANN
POLICY FORUM 62
PANAMA CITY
25–28 June 2018

The proposal is we break. After the coffee break, we break into four groups. You have flipcharts here. Each group will try to brainstorm and answer these two questions.

Last time we discussed why people do not participate. So, this time, we wanted to reverse the question and make it to some more positive and ask why do people participate and contribute? Are they just crazy or have they nothing else to do? Or maybe there's something else. Where do they see the value of participation? Particularly, you here, you come to ccNSO meetings. You ask questions. You participate in working groups. You do a lot of heavy lifting, a lot of work. The question is: why? Why do you do it?

I do not mean that you ask yourself, "Why on Earth do I do it?" and you just turn around and go away and never come back. No. On the contrary. Where do you see the value? When you realize that that is the value, you can share these values with others.

Another thing is what other information would you like to know about working groups assuming that you are new to this community? Definitely are new to some working groups. So, before you come to a final decision, yes, I want to be a part of this working group, what would you like to know about this working group to make this decision? These are two questions that I would invite you to think about. I propose that we have as

facilitators for each of these four groups, we have people who already chair working groups or in some other way actively participate in the work of the ccNSO. Maybe there are some volunteers. I definitely see a volunteer here, Alejandra one group. Stephen, I'm sure you will be happy to facilitate the discussions in another group. Okay, two more. Byron, I see you want to volunteer, but are a little bit shy. Good. So, group number three. One more? Peter, don't try to hide. I see you. You're a councilor. You're very active. I'm sure you would like to. Yes, yes, you, Peter. Okay, good. We have four volunteers.

Maybe somebody has a question. Yes, sure, please. Back to the template.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: I looked at this one you sent through to the Guidelines Review Committee e-mail, and I'm sorry I didn't come back to you with some ideas before you published it. I don't know if it's final, but one of the things that I would like to see, because I have to explain allocation of time to particular projects is how long you think it's going to go on for?

We heard Thomas Rickert today say, oh, my God, he's been doing this for about a thousand years and ten thousand hours and whatever. It would be really helpful if we could constrain the expectation of what a working group or a PDP did. I know it's

going to be a big box or whatever, but it's useful to be able to describe to others at home why you're doing something and for how long because it has budget implications or it has time implications or it has focus implications.

KATRINA SATAKI: Yeah, absolutely. That's a great thing to have. I have to tell you that for Guidelines Review Committee, it did not work. We never expected the Guidelines Review Committee to work forever, but it looks like we won't finish our work anytime soon. Same with SOP Working Group. They started as a working group. Now they're a committee. They have been promoted to a committee because this is something ongoing. They review at each and every budget an operating plan. But, yes, for some working groups, we can definitely see [inaudible] to them. That's a good addition, but probably it won't work for all of them.

Anything else? Any other questions or suggestions? This is definitely not the final version. That's why we're having the discussion, and as you see, the second question. What else needs to be added to this template? Yes?

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: Hello. Just regarding the time of the working group and how long it will be, it will be also nice to add the terms of the

ICANN
POLICY FORUM 62
PANAMA CITY
25–28 June 2018

member. How long is one term, for example, for each member and how many times can they be renewed?

KATRINA SATAKI: For some working groups, there is such a limitation. For some working groups, there are no limitations for terms. [inaudible] ideas, but you can still think about something else and how you want it to be presented, what other information would be really useful to be added to the template.

So, this time we try to think in positive terms and come up with … Everybody should come up with at least one motivational, why to participate.

With that, let's break and reconvene in 25 minutes, quarter past 3:00. And please grab a copy of the template and a filled-in description about Guidelines Review Committee.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]