LACTLD's
ICANN 61 Meeting
Report

ICANN 61 Meeting Report

Introduction

The LACTLD's ICANN 61 Meeting Report reviews the ccNSO main sessions and some issues discussed during the GAC sessions. The topics that got most of the attention from the ccNSO and the GAC members at ICANN 61 were the GDPR compliance and the GDPR practical implementation for ccTLDs, the current progress status of the Work Track Five, some observations and concerns regarding the ICANN Draft FY19 Operating Plan and Budget, the risks associated with the use of emoji in domain names, among others.

ccNSO Sessions

Tech Day

During the Tech Day sessions, the ccTLD Tech community tackled a variety of issues such as the risks related to the use of emojis in domain names, the Universal Acceptance concept for all domain names and all email address. Other topics were the Local Root project developed by the Information Sciences Institute (ISI) from USC and the KSK Sentinel.

One of CIRA's presentations addressed the DNS as a National Defense Layer. CIRA's tech team conducted a cybersecurity challenge in Canada involving the DNS. The challenge results showed that the DNS service and its associated data are a valued resource that can be leveraged to improve national cybersecurity. Thereby, CIRA was elevated to a national Cybersecurity Role in Canada.

Merike Kaeo from Farsight Security offered a presentation on IDN Abuse. Specifically, the presentation exposed domain abuse via IDN Homographs. This IDN Homographs are composed of different letters or characters that might look alike. Indeed, characters from different alphabets or scripts may appear indistinguishable from one another to the human eye. Therefore, IDNs allow forgeries to be nearly undetectable by human judgement. Merike Kaeo concluded that while IDN related abuse domains are a fraction of the overall abuse domains, they do exist and are actively being exploited.

The Tech Day also included an update on Fred, the open source domain registry solution, by CZ.NIC and CIRA's presentation on the need for an IoT security framework.

ccNSO Members Day 1

ccNSO Working Group Updates

1) **Update by TLD-OPS**

TLD-OPS is a global technical incident response community for and by ccTLDs, open to all ccTLDs. Its main goal is to enable ccTLD operators to collaboratively detect and mitigate incidents that may affect the operational security and stability of ccTLD services and of the wider

Internet. At ICANN 61, TLD-OPS expounded it news related to the security alerts detected since ICANN 60. Also, TLD-OPS updated its members list and invited all ccTLDs to join its community.

TLD-OPS presentation

2) The Strategic and Operational Planning Committee (SOPC)

The purpose of the SOPC is to coordinate and organise participation of ccTLD managers in ICANN's Strategic and Operational planning processes. At ICANN 61, the Committee announced that it may submit a relevant Rejection Action Petition against the ICANN and IANA budgets, as well as their Strategic and Operating Plans as defined in the ICANN Bylaws. Some of the SOPC key comments involve the drafting and the narrative of ICANN's Plan as well as some observations related to ICANN's budget estimations.

SOPC presentation

3) The cross-community working group New gTLD Auction Proceeds (CCWG Auction Proceeds)

The new gTLD Program established auctions as a mechanism of last resort to resolve string contention. It has been recognized that significant funds could be accrued because of several auctions. Board, staff, and community are expected to be participating and working together in the design of the next steps addressing the use of new gTLD auction proceeds. The Working Group is expected to develop proposals on the mechanisms to allocate the new gTLD auction proceeds. They are planning to outline an initial report for public comments which, afterwards, will be developed into a final report for the Board consideration.

4) Guidelines Review Committee (GRC)

The ccNSO Guidelines Review Committee (GRC) seeks to review the current guidelines and to ascertain whether they reflect current practices and working methods, identify potential gaps, and based on this analysis propose changes to the current ccNSO guidelines to the Council. At ICANN 61, the Committee commented its advances since ICANN 60 Abu Dhabi. Also, the GRC described its pending tasks such as finishing the ccNSO Council Roles and Responsibilities Guideline and the ccNSO Travel Funding Guideline.

GRC presentation

The ccNSO as a decisional participant

In the first part of the session, the Empowered Community Administration (ECA) updated its upcoming activities. The ECA notified that once the Board votes the ICANN Draft FY19 Operating Plan and Budget and the Five-Year Operating Plan Update, the 21 day Rejection Action Petition Period will start. There is uncertainty about the submission of any Rejection Action Petition.

This session also reviewed the guidelines on the Approval Action and Rejection Action processes. The presentation included some key points such as the requirements for submission,

the process for review of submitted petitions, the define timelines, the core steps in the escalation process, among others.

Joint Meeting: ccNSO & ICANN Board

The joint meeting began with some questions from the Board to the ccNSO. The first one asked about the ccNSO annual goals. The ccNSO explained that its main tasks were the priority setting and management of their high workload. Additionally, the ccNSO expounded that the their ongoing PDPs are one of their most important assignments. Currently, the supporting organization is working in the drafting for the Rejection Actions Petition process guideline. Also, the ccNSO expressed that the organization is trying to enlarge its community participation and involvement.

During the meeting, the ICANN Board and the ccNSO agreed on establishing and adopting an uniform Board members integrity screening process for the ccNSO Board candidates. Additionally, the Board committed to develop a new communication process to contact and inform the ccNSO members on the Board's decisions, especially, when they affect the ccNSO workload and priorities.

The ccNSO expressed its concerns to the ICANN Board regarding the leveling of ICANN's funding on ICANN's priorities. In relation to this, the ccNSO members recommended the ICANN Board to be more prudent when it comes to the projections for the funding and growth estimates. The ccNSO members explained that they would like to see the rationale in the plan decisions and they would also like to understand better the link between the budgets cuts and the priorities in the ICANN Planning. Additionally, the ccNSO asked the ICANN Board to introduce a more user-friendly format for the FY19 Operating Plan and Budget.

The Board acknowledged that the ICANN funding is leveling. Consequently, they will have to adopt a prudent approach. Indeed, the Board is going to draft a strategic operating plan which is going to be composed of three components: a mission, a vision and strategic objectives. The Plan drafting is going to be an iterative process. Thereby, everyone involved will agree that the plan is affordable and that its priorities are set in the right way.

Finally, the ccNSO and the Board discussed the next steps for adoption of the IDN overall policy.

Joint Meeting: ccNSO & GAC

The joint meeting began addressing the Work Track Five current progress status. The GAC and the ccNSO discussed the working document, how it is being organized and how are they going to draft the initial report on the policy for geographic names at the top level.

The GAC and the ccNSO continued the meeting discussing the next step regarding the FAQ on delegation, transfer and revocation of ccTLDs. They also commented the glossary that was submitted by the ccNSO PDP Working Group.

Another topic that was addressed was the planning of a new ccNSO-GAC agenda committee. This committee is supposed to allow a direct flow of common concerns, common issues and

common topics to be discussed. The GAC members present at the joint meeting proposed a series of topics that could be addressed in the upcoming meetings.

The joint meeting continued with the discussion of the ccNSO Policy Development Process (PDP) on retirement of ccTLDs. Stephen Deerhake invited the GAC members to participate in the working group activities.

The meeting between the GAC and the ccNSO also considered and examined the ICANN FY19 draft budget.

Finally, there was a short discussion regarding the GDPR impact on ccTLDs registries. Peter Vergote from the ccNSO concluded that the change of mindset and the increased awareness in the regulation are the first steps for GDPR compliance.

For more information, content and presentations related to the ccNSO Members Day 1, you can visit the ccNSO official website.

ccNSO Members Day 2

Impact of natural disasters on ccTLDs, registrars and registrants, including mitigation of the impact

During this session, .PR and JPRS expounded their experiences dealing with natural disasters crises. Both ccTLDs discussed the issue involving the domain names renewals. Taking into account that people (registrants/registrars) in the disaster-affected area may not be able to renew their domain names, JPRS decided to automatically renew them with no charge. .PR implemented a similar approach. They extended the renewal dates and applied no renewal fees to their affected customers.

In the second part of the session, LACTLD along with the other regional organizations, APTLD, CENTR, AfTLD, presented the survey results addressing the disaster and emergency preparedness in ccTLDs Registries.

The survey results showed some key conclusions. First, half of ccTLDs globally have faced some sort of disaster/emergency. Most of these incidents were related to cybersecurity. The survey also demonstrated that 78% of ccTLDs (globally) consider their organization either prepared or very prepared for disaster/emergency, with an incidence response time of 6 hours. Finally, it was exposed that larger registries are better prepared than smaller ones.

Policy Session

The PDP Retirement Working Group updated its work progress since ICANN 60. There has been a considerable development in identifying Retirement scenarios. The Working Group next tasks will be the identification of process steps and the identification of all the stakeholders involved in the PDP Retirement.

The Work Track Five also updated its current work status. At present, the Work Track Five is discussing three main issues related to the geographic names that received specific treatment in the 2012 round:

a) Is it a valid geographic term for the purposes of new gTLDs?
b) What were the positive impact/merits based on the treatment applied to the term in the AGB?
c) What were the negative impact/opportunities lost based on the treatment applied to the term in the AGB?

The Work Track Five timeframe goals involve the drafting of an initial report by the end of the summer 2018 (North Hemisphere) and the drafting of a final report by the end of Q1 2019.

The Security and Stability Advisory Committee (SSAC) presented its Advisory on the Use of Emoji in Domain Names. The SSAC recommendation to the ICANN Board was to reject any TLD that includes emoji.

Some of the reasons given by the SSAC argue that emoji are disallowed by the IDNA standard and they are not required by design or convention to be visually uniform or visually distinguishable. Also, the SSAC remarked that when two domain names are identical in appearance except for ordinary typographic style variations but have different underlying code points, they identify two different DNS domains.

Therefore, the SSAC strongly discourages the registration of any domain name that includes emoji in any of its labels. The SSAC also advises registrants of domain names with emoji that such domains may no function consistently or may not be universally accessible as expected.

ccTLD News Session

Afilias opened the ccTLD News Session giving a presentation on the Five Pillars of a Successful Registry. According to Afilias, those pillars are: transparency, reach, unhindered, security and technology. The sum of these five values would result in the trust in the registry.

The Afilias presentation also looked into the registries current pressures in the legal, technical, security and competition related areas. They concluded that the DNS industry has a big communications/marketing challenge involving the registries global reach.

During this session, the .FO presented its strategy to increase the .fo domain name registrations and to strengthen the efficiency and security of their ccTLD.

The .za presentation focussed on their particular approach to domain name registration. Currently, the .za Domain Name Authority (.ZADNA) offers domain name registration on the same platform used for company registration. Thereby, the Intellectual Property Commission (CIPC) in collaboration with the .ZADNA allows companies to register their own domain names before, during or after company registration process. One of the benefits of this approach is that companies are able to defensively register domain names to protect their brand. Also, .ZADNA is able to led a decent namespace growth and a comprehensive .za namespace development through inclusive economic growth.

The ccTLD News Session continued with a [presentation given by .RU](#) addressing their experience in increasing the price for domain name registration. The last presentation of this session involved the [.US last Awareness and Outreach campaign](#).

Legal Session: GDPR, and practical implementation for ccTLDs

DNS Belgium presentation provided a general overview on the most critical GDPR issues. The presentation proposed a to do list for ccTLDs. Some of the main tasks were:

- Register of processing activities.
- Make a privacy policy and publish it.
- Implement privacy by design/default.
- Prepare for a data breach.
- Be responsive for request of data subjects.

The presentation conclusion highlighted that having a view and a attitude oriented to the protection of personal information is more important than 100% compliance focus.

The Legal Session also included a [GDPR presentation by .AS Domain Registry](#) and a [presentation by .CO](#).

For more information, content and presentations related to the ccNSO Members Day 2, you can visit the [ccNSO official website](#).

GAC Sessions

The GAC Comuniqué summarizes the GAC's main resolutions and recommendations on the issues discussed at the ICANN meetings.

GAC's advices regarding the New gTLD Policies on Geographic Names and the GDPR compliance were included in the ICANN 61 GAC Comuniqué.

With regards to New gTLD Policies on Geographic Names, the GAC committed to provide coordinated input to the Work Track before finalization of any initial period. GAC members also expressed their concerns regarding the challenging Work Track's current timeline.

In connection with the GDPR compliance, the GAC reiterates its previous advice to maintain, to the greatest extent possible, the current structure of the WHOIS, while ensuring full and timely compliance with GDPR.

Also, the GAC advises the ICANN Board to instruct the ICANN Organization to:

- Ensure that the proposed interim model maintains current WHOIS requirements to the fullest extent possible;
- Provide a detailed rationale for the choices made in the interim model, explaining their necessity and proportionality in relation to the legitimate purposes identified;
- Distinguish between legal and natural persons, allowing for public access to WHOIS data of legal entities, which are not in the remit of the GDPR;

According to the GAC Comuniqué, ICANN's new interim proposal suggests significant changes to the WHOIS system, including masking several categories of previously public information. The GAC is concerned that the interim model may not maintain the current WHOIS system to the fullest extent possible and that these changes are not supported by the necessary analysis and supporting rationale which poses the question whether the choices reflected in the current proposal are required by the law.