



LACTLD Report on ICANN 63

Barcelona, Spain
20-25 October 2018



Rambla República de México 6125
Montevideo, Uruguay
+598 2 604 22 22

Contents

Introduction	3
Tech Day	3
Joint Meeting: ccNSO & GNSO Councils	3
ccNSO: Members Meeting Day 1	4
ccNSO Working Group Updates	4
Policy session	5
IANA Naming Function session	6
GDPR and growing impact of privacy issues on ccTLD registries	7
Joint Meeting: GAC and the ccNSO	7
ccNSO: Members Meeting Day 2	7
TLD-OPS Session	7
ccTLDs' financial contribution to ICANN	8
ccTLD News Session	8
Joint Meeting: ICANN Board and ccNSO	9

ICANN 63 Meeting Report

Introduction

The Report reviews the ccNSO main sessions at ICANN 63. Some of topics covered at these sessions were the GDPR and the impact of privacy issues on ccTLDs; the Disaster Recovery and Business Continuity processes; the ccTLDs' financial contribution to ICANN; the use of emoji as second-level domains; the ccNSO comments on the Initial Report of the New gTLD Subsequent Procedures Working Group; among others.

Additionally, the ccNSO held joint meeting with the different ICANN constituencies. At those joint meetings, the ccNSO members addressed a series of issues such as the ICANN's FY20 Budget process; the ICANN Five-Year Strategic Planning Process; the future of ICANN multistakeholder model; the IDN policy development process; and ICANN and ccTLDs involvement in Internet Governance.

Tech Day

During the Tech Day, there were two presentations on Anycast issues. Greg Wallace from NetActuate talked about Anycast, Peering & Sinkholes. He addressed NetActuate's Anycast best practices such as DDoS mitigation and global monitoring, among others. The second presentation was given by Brett Carr from Nominet who spoke about Anycast in the Cloud.

Privacy models and the GDPR were also discussed at the Tech Day. Pep Masoliver from .CAT described their privacy model legal framework and implementation. Additionally, Hilde Thunem from Norid presented the Norwegian privacy model. She explained the evaluation they had conducted on their previous model and the changes they have implemented. Also, she talked about the registration data directory services currently offered by Norid.

Other topics of interest covered at the Tech Day were IDN Homograph Attack; Open Source HSM; the Secure Home Gateway Project by CIRA; RDAP Implementation in the gTLD Space; Zone Poisoning.

[Presentations I](#)

[Presentations II](#)

Joint Meeting: ccNSO & GNSO Councils

At ICANN 63, the ccNSO and the GNSO Councils discussed different issues. Firstly, they addressed the progress made in the CSC Effectiveness Review and talked about the IANA Function Review team composition. With regards to the New gTLD Auction Proceeds CCWG Initial Report, both Councils agreed to encourage community participation during the public comment period. Especially, the Working Group is expecting comments from the community on the proposed mechanisms for the fund allocations. Another central issue is whether ICANN Org or the constituent parts of ICANN Org can themselves benefit from fund allocations. The inputs

received on these proposals will be taken into account by the Working Group and ICANN staff to take further steps on the final report.

The Councils' members also discussed the ICANN's FY20 Budget process and the upcoming Strategic Planning Process. In this regard, Giovanni Seppia from the ccNSO invited the GNSO members to work together on submitting the SOs' comments collaboratively as some of their priorities may be close or similar. The meeting continued with a discussion and exchange of views on the Specific Reviews & Operating Standards. It was emphasize the need to establish clearer channels of communication between the Board, the Review Team and the SOs and ACs. Another issue raised was the entity that should conduct the reviews (ICANN's constituencies volunteers or professional consultants) and how long these processes should take. In other words, how ICANN should balance the volunteers efforts with the outsourced services (taking into account costs and time).

Following, the ccNSO Council members presented a progress update on the ccNSO Emoji Study Group. The last topic discussed by the Councils was the evaluation criteria to address confusing similarity in IDN gTLDs and IDN ccTLDs. Giovanni Seppia from the ccNSO explained that there is an inconsistency in the principles used to assess confusing similarity in the gTLD space and in the ccTLD IDN space. Thus, he proposed creating a Study Group on this issue in order to collaborate between the two Supporting Organizations and coordinate their policies for IDN TLDs both gTLDs and ccTLDs.

[Transcription](#)

ccNSO: Members Meeting Day 1

ccNSO Working Group Updates

- Update by the Study Group on the use of emoji as second-level domains ([emoji SG](#))

The study group was established by the ccNSO Council to provide a comprehensive overview of the issues associated with the use of emoji as second level domains, and the current practice of ccTLD managers that allow emoji as second level domains.

After reviewing its [Terms of Reference](#), the [SAC 095](#), and the technical background of the issues, the Study Group looked for the ccTLDs that allow emoji at the second level: .CF, .FM, .GA, .GG, .GQ, .JE, .LA, .ML, .MP, .ST, .TK, .TO, .TV, .UZ, .VG, .VU, .WS. There were no findings for IDN ccTLDs. The Study Group next steps will be collecting and understanding the registries policies on this matter.

The Study Group intends to submit its draft report at ICANN 64, Kobe.

- Update by the Cross-Community Working Group New gTLD Auction Proceeds ([CCWG Auction Proceeds](#))

The Working Group published its [Initial Report](#) for public comment on 8 October 2018. The report sets out the core issues that the CCWG addressed in carrying out its charter. It provides preliminary recommendations and draft implementation guidance on possible mechanisms to

distribute the auction proceeds. The report does not, nor is it intended to, make recommendations on specific projects or particular uses of proceeds. The public comments period will close on 27 November 2018.

Following the closing of the public comment forum, the CCWG will review the input received and update the report as needed in order to finalize it for submission to its Chartering Organizations.

While input is welcome on any aspect of the Initial Report, the CCWG is particularly interested in feedback through public comment on several issues:

- Fund allocation mechanisms
- Objectives of fund allocation
- Safeguards, conflict of interest provisions, and governance framework
- Grant allocation to ICANN or its constituent parts
- Developing economies and under represented groups

[CCWG Auction Proceeds presentation](#)

Policy session

- Update by the Empowered Community Administration (ECA)

The Empowered Community Administration is the administrative body through which the Empowered Community acts. During this session, there was an overview of the ECA activities since the Panama meeting. Also, the ccNSO appointed member to the ECA informed about the upcoming Board adoption of the FY20 Public Technical Identifiers (PTI) Operating Plan and Budget and of the FY20 IANA Operating Plan and Budget. Both adoptions will set off a “Rejection Action Petition Submission Period” expected by early next year. As a result, there will probably be a public forum at ICANN 64, Kobe.

- Update by the PDP Retirement WG ([PDP-ret](#))

The PDP Retirement Working Group updated its progress since the ICANN62 meeting. There was a series of agreed issues. In regards to whether the ccNSO membership of a ccTLD in retirement ends by definition, there was determined that this issue is beyond the remit of the Working Group. Therefore, the Working Group Chair will draft a letter to the ccNSO Council noting the Working Group’s concerns in this regard.

In terms of the applicability of ccNSO PDP, the Working Group holds that there is no existing policy to guide the orderly retirement of ccTLDs, and that the ccNSO is the appropriate body to develop such policy. Also, the Working Group reached consensus on the event that should trigger the ccTLD retirement process. It was agreed that the removal of the country code from the list of country names in ISO 3166-1 would be the trigger. The trigger event for the retirement of IDN ccTLDs and exceptionally reserved country codes will be discussed later by the Working Group.

Additionally, the Working Group determined that once a country code is removed from the ISO 3166-1 list, the ccTLD has to be removed from the DNS rootzone database.

The issues that remain under discussion are the process of removal and the duration of said process.

- New gTLD Subsequent Procedures PDP. WT1-4 topics, followed by Work Track 5: current state of affairs.

The regional organizations along with many ccTLDs have sent their comments ([LACTLD comments](#)) regarding the Initial Report on the New gTLD Subsequent Procedures Policy Development Process (Work Tracks 1-4). Likewise, the ccNSO Council also submitted a statement on the reservation of the of the 2-character strings at the top level consisting of one letter and one digit. The ccNSO Council comments were in line with the regional organizations and ccTLDs' position, namely, to maintain the current reservation.

The ccNSO Council statement addressed another issue related to IDN TLDs. The Council suggested that the ccNSO and the GNSO should establish a small working group to coordinate the ongoing discussions on the IDN policy development. The ccNSO has gained considerable experience on the IDNs confusing similarity from the IDN ccTLD Fast Track Process. Thereby, the GNSO could work with the ccNSO to define a common approach and a clear set of rules for assessing confusing similarity in both in IDN gTLDs and IDN ccTLDs strings.

Annabeth Lange gave an update on the Work Track 5 developments. She informed that the Work Track 5 Initial Report will be sent out on late November to receive the inputs from the community. Additionally, she particularly encouraged the ccNSO participation during the public comments period.

[Presentations](#)

IANA Naming Function session

- Customer Standing Committee ([CSC](#)) update

The CSC monitors and reports on PTI compliance with the Naming Function Agreement including 'Service Level Agreement' (SLA) metrics. Since October 2017, PTI's overall performance score has ranged from 95.3 to 100%. The CSC assessment has determined that the PTI annual overall performance has been 'excellent'. There were some minor metrics missed, but there were no customer service impacts nor operational problems.

The whole process is working very well. The problem areas are being identified immediately and corrective measures being developed cooperatively (areas where SLA's implementation may need changes have been identified).

- Root Zone Evolution Review Committee ([RZERC](#)) update

At ICANN 63, the RZERC raised two issues: the Root Zone KSK Rollover; and the Root Zone Management Evolution Study.

- Public Technical Identifiers ([PTI](#)) update

The PTI team addressed their customer satisfaction task. Until now, they have been gauging customer satisfaction through annual surveys. The 2018 survey has just closed and its results are being compiled. However, the PTI will implement a new model that allows to measure service satisfaction shortly after the relevant transaction.

Regarding the KSK Rollover, the PTI informed that the preliminary data suggests there was minimal impact from the change. Also, they indicated that they still have to revoke the old key, and then safely destroy it.

The PTI Board also provided an update. In relation to the Board composition, Akram Attalah has left his position at ICANN. As the President of ICANN's Global Domains Division (GDD), he was one of the three ICANN appointed Board Directors. ICANN is intended to appoint a new Director as soon as possible.

In connection with the Budget FY20, PTI's Draft FY20 Operating Plan and Budget was developed from July through September 2018. Currently, it has been published for [public review and comment](#). The PTI's budget will be integrated in the ICANN budget FY20.

[Presentations](#)

GDPR and growing impact of privacy issues on ccTLD registries

This session included different presentations related to personal data and privacy issues. Brent Carey from Domain Name Commission expounded the case of unauthorized access by DomainTools to the .nz domain name space.

Jörg Schweiger from DENIC talked about the changes implemented in their registry policies and procedures since the GDPR come into force.

Peter Van Roste presented the survey conducted by CENTR from June to July 2018 on the [WHOIS status and the impacts of the GDPR](#) on the ccTLDs. The presentation covered a series of issues such as the type of data that is publicly available; the data verification; the problems associated with the data transfer by RARs; the protection of the data subject rights; the difference between private individuals and companies; among others.

[Presentations](#)

Joint Meeting: GAC and the ccNSO

The meeting agenda was mainly focused on ccNSO updates. Peter Van Roste talked about the CENTR survey on the [WHOIS status and the impacts of the GDPR](#) on the ccTLDs.

The joint meeting continued with an update by the ccNSO on its main priorities for 2019 and on the high-level priorities the ccNSO suggest to ICANN. Finally, the ccNSO representative expounded the ccNSO position and comments regarding the Initial Report on the New gTLD Subsequent Procedures PDP (Work Tracks 1-4). The ccNSO Council as well as the regional organizations ([LACTLD comments](#)) that participated in the comments period considered that two-letter codes are directly associated with ccTLDs. Also, the use of 2-character strings

consisting of one letter and one digit might cause user confusion, thereby, the ccNSO strongly believes that these strings should not be allowed.

[Transcription](#)

ccNSO: Members Meeting Day 2

TLD-OPS Session

The TLD-OPS is a global technical incident response community for and by ccTLDs, open to all ccTLDs (ASCII and IDN). The goal of the TLD-OPS community 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.

Since ICANN62, the TLD-OPS community has welcomed 6 new ccTLDs (three of them are LACTLD members: .MX, .PE, .SV.) The community now has 201 members which represent 69% of all ccTLDs.

At ICANN 63, the TLD-OPS held a Disaster Recovery Workshop. The attendees had the opportunity to share and gather information, experiences, and best practices. They identified the need to develop a playbook with the basic concepts of Disaster Recovery and Business Continuity (DR/BCP) and Business Impact Assessment (BIA) processes. Additionally, they established the need to develop ccTLD specific action plan procedures focused on the registry and DNS operations. The delivery of the first DR/BCP draft playbook was set as an objective for the ICANN 64 meeting.

[TLD-OPS presentation](#)

ccTLDs' financial contribution to ICANN

During this session, there was a revision of how the ccTLDs' financial contributions have evolved since the ICANN foundation. Currently, the ccTLDs provide their contributions according to the [2013 guideline](#) developed by the ccNSO Financial Working Group. This current guideline uses a value exchange model between ICANN and the ccTLDs based on three conceptual value categories: specific benefits, shared benefits, and global benefits. From the calculations of these value categories, there was established a model based on voluntary fee bands determined by the numbers of domains under management.

Since the guideline was adopted, the contributions made by the ccTLDs have not covered the costs amounts calculated by the model. There have also been issues related to the billing process that may have set difficulties for the ccTLDs' contributions collection.

At the session, the attendees exchanged their views on the matter. Some of the points made by the ccNSO members were:

- The ccNSO Council may reach out the registries that according to the fee bands model could increase their contributions to ICANN.
- The ccNSO should organise a future session to further discuss the ccTLDs' contributions and to clarify what are the ccTLDs bringing to ICANN and what are they getting from it.

- In this line, the ccTLDs should revisit the calculation of the value they receive by ICANN in relation to their financial contributions.

Further sessions on this topic are expected.

[Presentations](#)

ccTLD News Session

The ccTLD news session included a presentation by Neustar on their marketing efforts for the .CO and .US TLDs. The presentation covered the communication strategies for both TLDs, the local and global branding efforts and some examples of the concrete marketing actions carried out.

Also, during the session, Margarita Valdés expounded NIC Chile's Legal Assistance initiative for domain names users. This project is oriented to improve the end users conditions under the domain name dispute-resolution system. Specifically, NIC Chile's initiative seeks to provide legal assistance to the users through the Chilean law schools when they have to face a conflict over a domain name. In addition to protecting the users rights, the project attempts to foster the academic interest of the Chilean law schools: the law students will have the opportunity to learn about the local dispute resolution system.

Other ccNSO members also offered their presentations. NiRA addressed their strategies for creating domestic visibility on .ng brand. Cameron Boardman from auDA explained and described the .au registry transformation project and governance reform. Giovanni Seppia from EURid talked about the Brexit impact on the .eu registrations from UK residents. Additionally, he presented the updates on the .eu Regulation driven by the European Commission new regulatory framework proposal.

[Presentations](#)

Joint Meeting: ICANN Board and ccNSO

At the joint meeting, the ICANN Board and the ccNSO exchanged questions, answers and viewpoints on a series of issues. One of the first topics covered at the meeting referred to how the ICANN's multistakeholder model should evolve to balance the increasing need for inclusivity, accountability, and transparency, with the imperative of getting the work done and the policies developed in a more effective and timely manner. The ICANN Board and the ccNSO Council agreed that the ICANN multistakeholder model has reached a point of maturity so it has to be adapted and improved in order to respond in a more effective and timely manner to the increasing needs of the community. For this purpose, the Board has been reaching out the community to understand their views on the matter.

In this line, Giovanni Seppia from the ccNSO considered the need to optimize resources and to conduct regular assessments of the actions and objectives that will be established in the Five-Year Strategic Planning Process. Regarding this Planning Process, the Board commented the five strategic areas identified through the community inputs: security, governance, the unique identifier system, geopolitics, and financials. Also, the Board highlighted that this Five-Year

Strategic Plan will be the first one to be backed by a fully costed Five-Year Implementation Plan (or Operating Plan). The Board invited the ccTLD community to provide its input and to define the role ccTLDs want to play in this Plan and in the broader ICANN community.

Another issue discussed at the joint meeting was the ICANN role and participation at the Internet Governance instances and events. In other words, how ICANN can get involve and coordinate its participation efforts with the members of its community at the Internet Governance events. The ccNSO representatives suggested that the ccTLDs that have an active participation in the Internet Governance instances may work together with the ICANN community or ICANN regional counterparts in order to coordinate their participation efforts.

Finally, the ccNSO Council and the Board talked about the ccNSO priorities for 2019.

[Transcription](#)