

ICANN Transcription - Marrakech
Commercial Stakeholder Group Meeting
Tuesday, 8 March 2016 0900 UTC

Note: The following is the output of transcribing from an audio recording. Although the transcription is largely accurate, in some cases it is incomplete or inaccurate due to inaudible passages or transcription errors. It is posted as an aid to understanding the proceedings at the meeting, but should not be treated as an authoritative record.

Also found on page: <http://gns0.icann.org/en/group-activities/calendar>

Chris Wilson: Okay welcome everyone. My name is Chris Wilson, Chair of the Business Constituency and your host if you will for today's Commercial Stakeholder Group open meeting. Thank you all for coming this morning. We've got a fairly full agenda and a relatively short timeframe and today obviously is a very busy day so we'll go ahead and get started.

So if you just look we'll for those that around the room and even in the chat room we have an agenda out there. Obviously we'll in just a minute or two we'll hear from both David Conrad and Ashwin Rangan to talk to us a little bit about technical issues and security issues affecting ICANN. And they're happy to, you know, take questions from folks. And then we'll go ahead and discuss our final board prep which will be momentarily or well we're prepping for moment - discussions with the board coming up soon and then perhaps spend a little time talking about CCWG accountability and sort of the state of play with that and then any other business folks may have.

So perhaps while we're getting - while we're setting up the screen here maybe we'll just quickly go around the table just to save time just quickly around the table everyone just quickly introduce themselves and then we'll go ahead and get started. Greg?

Greg Shatan: Thank you and good morning. I'm Greg Shatan. I'm the President of the Intellectual Property Constituency.

Angie Graves: Angie Graves, BC.

Marilyn Cade: Marilyn Cade, BC.

Jimson Olufuye: Jimson Olufuye, Vice Chair Finance and Operation BC.

(Akmud Latuf): (Akmud Latuf), BC.

Heather Forrest: Heather Forrest, IPC member of the GNSO Council and our Non-contracted Parties House and Vice Chair of the GNSO Council.

(Claudia Sela): (Claudia Sela), BC.

Cheryl Miller: Cheryl Miller, CSG representative BC.

Aparna Sridhar: Aparan Sridhar, BC.

Susan Kawaguchi: Susan Kawaguchi, BC GNSO counselor.

(Olivier Hon): (Olivier Hon), Orange and representing also the European Test Committees and Network Operators Association ISPCP.

(Ovender Owor): (Ovender Owor), IS PCP.

(Olivier Murel): (Olivier Murel), IS PCP.

Jonathan Zuck: Jonathan Zuck, Conscience of IPC.

Chris Wilson: Good or bad? You got a question?

Christian Burnett: Christian Burnett, IPC.

(Peter Renfort): (Peter Renfort), IPC.

Mark Trachtenberg: Mark Trachtenberg, IPC.

Steve Metalitz: Steve Metalitz, Vice Conscience of the IPC.

Malcolm Huty: Malcolm Huty, IS PCP I don't know whether I could claim to be the conscience or not.

Steve DelBianco: Steve DelBianco with the Business Constituency and Vice Chair for Policy.

Paul Mitchell: Paul Mitchell, BC.

Denise Michelle: Denise Michelle, BC.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: Wolf Ulrich Knoben. I'm not a president but I like that Greg. So we don't have one in the IS PCP. I'm a vice chair and we are going to think about how the main org chart accordingly.

(Frank): (Frank) and (Heather) Tech for ICANN.

Chris Wilson: Thank you. And quickly I'll just announce folks that are participating remotely I see Ellen Shankman, Lori Schulman Mark McFadden, (Maritsaka), (Peter Renforth) and Tony Holmes. And hopefully I've mentioned everyone that's participating at least remotely. And also Phil?

Phil Corwin: Yes Phil Corwin BC, BC Councilor and bad influence on the BC.

Chris Wilson: Thank you Phil. And also want to thank ICANN staff for their coordination, most certainly thank Chantelle Doerksen, the CSG Secretariat who is participating from Los Angeles and deserves a hearty round of applause because her schedule is completely thrown for a loop since she's eight hours behind us so thank you Chantelle for all your help.

So thank you all again for being here. Why don't we go ahead and turn to the David and Ashwin. And I know we've I think provided you a little insight into what we're interested in. Perhaps maybe you could spend a couple of minutes just talking about the work you all are doing and then maybe we can open up the floor. So thank you.

Man: (Unintelligible).

Chris Wilson: Yes I think quick Chantelle are you running the slide deck for Ashwin? I think we've got it coming up.

Chantelle Doerksen: Hi Chris. This is Chantelle. I am.

Chris Wilson: Can't hear. Thank you Chantelle.

Ashwin Rangan: Hello? Hello? Hi. Hello? Yes.

Chris Wilson: (Unintelligible) use one?

Man: No. It was that. They just turned the volume down.

Ashwin Rangan: Thank you for giving us the opportunity to present to you here. I appreciate it. Good morning. My name Ashwin Rangan. I have been with ICANN now for a couple of years. What I wanted to do this morning is to take you through a few slides to give your perspective of what's going on from an IT viewpoint.

David who serves as our CTO and does a lot of research on the evolution of the identifier systems will also be talking about some specific aspects. So with that I'm going to kick this off and then hand it over to David and then we can open it up to the floor for questions. Thank you. Next slide please.

As I said I onboard a couple of years back. The first year was really getting to know the constituencies that we were serving, the state of IT overall. In calendar '15 I got through the basics of hiring and planning and getting our act together and starting a series of things particularly in response to back then a series of security oriented events that have occurred with ICANN's assets which led to deep diving into very specific areas that needed to be shored up and specific platforms that were aged and therefore were not up to fielding the vulnerabilities and threat vectors but today are more prevalent.

The list of ten projects that you see there were all discussed at length both with the board and with the senior teams within ICANN so that we could get the correct resources lined up behind them. I particularly want to draw attention to two or three that are security oriented which I was told would be an area of potential interest to this group of people.

If you look at it in particularly Number 8 very quickly after I joined ICANN we started working on what's known as hardening of the IT infrastructure. Essentially from a physical perspective it's like craving perimeter defenses so that our fences are well guarded and they're tall enough to potentially prevent the bad guys from getting across and getting into our properties.

For the business oriented people the way I explained this is that the valuable that we actually have is data and the systems are the way through which we put the data into our storehouse and from where we remove the valuables. So just hardening the system itself is not good enough. We need to make sure that the storehouses that we have are well locked and that the keys are appropriately stored.

This effort that we started Number 8 in 2014 it used a well-known globally recognized framework leveraging which we did a benchmark. The framework uses 20 different controls and measures each of these on a 10 point scale. And when we did the benchmarking our score was roughly 110. And we therefore set ourselves a task of getting to parity with some of the best institutions that also protect global public data such as global banks.

Those institutions typically have a score of 160 to 165. We set that as a target for ourselves. And between 2014 and 2015 we had a series of actions taken within ICANN. We did a re-up on the benchmark last year in the June timeframe and our score had improved markedly. We had gone from 110 to 135.

We have continued to put investments behind that. And our expectation this year we'll be doing yet another re-up in the June timeframe is that will be about 150. As we make more efforts this is a curve that doesn't scale linearly to the right but instead it takes more and more effort to get higher and higher up in the scale. We'll continue to make our efforts over the next few we years so that we achieve parity which is the kind of target that we set for ourselves if not to surpass the parity with banks themselves.

I also want to draw attention to the next project which is Number 9. Our software portfolio has been gathered over a period of 15 years ever since ICANN started operations. So the platforms that we have been using over those many years have varied because technologies do change with time. What we undertook last year was the systematic review of the software portfolio so that each program in every element of the portfolio was opened up by third parties who are recognized to be experts at discovering potential vulnerabilities in software.

They came back with lists of things that we needed to do so that we could fix potential vulnerabilities. We've been at it now for about a year and I'm pleased to tell you that the entire portfolio has been reviewed. All the high

and medium vulnerabilities have been completely taken care of. And the program has been put in place whereby on a continual revolving basis every program will be reviewed for new vulnerabilities moving forward by leveraging again third parties or experts at this particular game.

What we don't know is what new vectors come up as threats. But what we do know is that there are people who are experts at it who can be retained and whose services can be leveraged so that we understand what's coming towards us and we take action appropriately.

Next slide please. Chantelle next slide. All right so the result of this for us is, you know, we've liken this to flying many different planes and having to sort of land them in different sequences depending on what exactly it is that we're doing.

Nine or ten programs is a lot of programs from an IT viewpoint. Typically large companies when they undertake large IT initiatives tend to do it in groups of two or three rarely in groups of nine or ten because it's a lot of coordination and work not only on part of the technology function but more importantly on part of all the benefiting functions who then have to jump in and go through change and change management and making sure that the new becomes the norm as opposed to leaning back on the old. We've talked a lot about how to go about doing this given how far behind we were with our technology investments. And that recognition has led to an all hands to deck kind of an attitude so that I have the commitment of the senior management teams.

Communication and change management is becoming the norm in ICANN today which is a very different cadence compared with two years ago. It's as much about culture as it is about making changes to systems. It's about thinking about the data that we protect on behalf of the public that gives us the data. These are all new mindsets that we're creating with our staff so that there are new sensibilities in the organization. Next slide please.

So the teams that are working and focused on both change management and IT systems development we are increasingly using the terminology of the air traffic control towers. It's not about just flying these plans it's much more about landing each of them very safely.

We have the pleasure of listening to a pilot who said that good pilots land planes well. Great pilots make sure that the plane can take off again. So we're making sure that we're becoming great pilots as we move forward. Next slide please.

So it's a team approach as I said. We've set up very consistent governing structures and processes within ICANN. Change management and communication is the norm increasingly so than the exception now. We are looking at processes and services that we extend for the benefit of many different stakeholders as we go through this process with service optimization and process delivery optimization as the goal. We are not very good at introducing new services yet we are getting better at it. Technology delivery from an IT viewpoint is certainly on a track where more and more is being expected of us.

Our metrics tracking is taking on a decidedly outcomes bias as opposed to an activity bias so did we deliver to the value that we said we would as opposed to what did we do per se. So we're defining success upfront and working with multiple pieces of our organization to track the metrics and report back on it. You will continually see this in the form of service availability which is the one thing that you care about. And you will see that metric continually reflected on our outward facing Web site and reports out continually to the community to the board risk community and to the full board on a regular basis. Next slide please.

And with that I'll either take questions or hand it over to David Conrad.

Chris Wilson: Thank you Ashwin. Maybe David if you could go ahead and provide some remarks and then we can do a Q&A after all that.

David Conrad: Yes, happy to. Yes slides aren't coming up. Hi. I'm David Conrad, ICANN CTO. I've been with ICANN this time for about 18 months. I was previously at ICANN from 2005 to 2010 where I was a IANA general manager and then served in the role that Ashwin now holds. And I am forever grateful that he holds that role. Next slide please.

I was asked a number of questions in the email that invited me here. So these are the two questions at a high level. What are the major technical challenges with the IANA transition and what are the major SSR challenges going forward? Next slide please. On - in terms of technical challenges I actually broke this into two parts, the IANA transition and the non-IANA transition.

With respect to the IANA transition most of the technical challenges revolve around sort of migrating the existing software systems away from the current apartheid model in which change requests are received by the IANA function operator being ICANN authorized by the root zone administrator which is NTIA and implemented by the root zone maintainer VeriSign to a duopoly of ICANN and VeriSign or the IANA function operator and the root zone maintainer.

In order to do this we've had to modify our existing software systems that are used for root management to allow us to first verify that any of the changes that we're making in the software aren't breaking anything. To do that we have created a parallel testing system.

Doing that was required some amount of software development, nothing particularly exciting in terms of software development. But because the root management system is considered sort of a critical function we have to be exceptionally careful in how we do that software development.

The second sort of bit was removing NTIA from the loop. Currently the way root zone management is done is a request comes into IANA, it's validated. It's then set in parallel, conceptually in parallel to NTIA and to VeriSign. And then NTIA authorizes after verifying that ICANN followed its policies and processes. It essentially releases the request that's already sitting at VeriSign to be implemented into the root zone. How that actually works out in practice is there's a - there's a EPP communication between ICANN and VeriSign and then PGP signed email is sent to NTIA that includes the change that's being submitted and NTIA logs into a particular Web interface pressing a button on that interface to release the request to VeriSign.

Since VeriSign - since NTIA is going away assuming the transition moves forward we had to take them out of the loop. So there was some amount of again, relatively minor software modifications however the sort of concern there was just the timing of getting that done. We wanted to have that system in testing using parallel testing methodology that we developed as quickly as possible and that resulted in making things a little more interesting.

And finally the while ICANN has worked under service level - a service agreement with the US government in the performance of the IANA functions with the removal of NTIA post transition there was a desire by the community to have a new set of service levels ones that were much more finely grained than the existing service levels that were defined by the US government.

The service level expectations as they're called required actually relatively nontrivial changes in the code again. This time to insert measurement points within the code to allow us to collect service - our performance data on this fine granular level. All of these again are not any rocket science type software development just were within our particular environment. They did provide - produce us some challenges.

The service level expectations in particular there was a desire by the community to have six months' worth of data collected. And because of the timing of when they completed the definition what the measurement points would be we actually ran into some challenges in meeting that deadline.

The code would be done quite quickly but then we'd have to actually collect the data for six months and that actually put us past the timeframe at which the transition would be possible.

The community also had indicated that the transition could not go forward unless the service level agreements were in place so that put us in a bit of a bind. Just this actually yesterday we had a meeting with members of the CWG in order to see if they would allow us a little flexibility in the data collection time frames since the CSC, the Customer Standing Committee was created specifically to adjust performance criteria for the IANA function operator. They agreed so we're only going to be required to collect three months of data and not allow those to actually move forward with the transition.

On the non-IANA transition side of things the technical challenges are actually at least from my perspective far more interesting. There are again sort of taking the top three, the first one and the one that is perhaps the most technically challenging is rolling the root DNS SAC key signing key. And rolling in this context means changing.

So when we signed the root in 2010 we created a trust anchor that allowed for validators DNS (SAC) revolvers that do DNS SAC validation to verify the data has not been modified in flight. Resolvers, validating resolvers since 2010 then included that configuration information usually as shipped from the - to the vendors.

We are in the process now of developing a plan actually change that key. An implication of that is that all of those resolvers will need to change their configuration. If they do not change their configuration validation will fail. The

application of validation failing is that domain names are not looked up. You get a serve fail response.

So one of the challenges of my team is to actually come up with a plan that minimizes the amount of breakage on the Internet when we actually do roll the key that - when we signed the root in 2010 we made an assertion that the root key would be changed after five years. We signed it in 2010. It's been after five years so we have to initiate the process of signing - rolling the key.

That process will take some amount of time. It's because of the way the system works it should take about 18 months to actually roll the key. During that time there will be some interesting problems that will potentially be experienced mostly caused by an increase in the size of the DNS response for signed zones.

The second technical challenge is a project that we've initiated called Internet - I'm sorry identifier technologies health indicators. The basic concept behind this project is to try to establish a baseline of the health of the Internet. Obviously we need to define what health of the Internet actually means and - sorry identifier technologies and to track the changes to those indicators over time to determine whether or not the health of the identifier technologies is improving or degrading based on activities that ICANN performs.

This is a bit challenging for a number of reasons, one even defining what health of identifier technologies actually is but also then specifying those indicators in a way that allow for subjective measurement sorry, objective measurement instead of subjective measurement.

That project is being headed up by one of my team members Alain Durand. And we are actually having a session on that on Wednesday afternoon after the Technical Experts Group meeting in which we'll put forth basically some strawmen and are definitely looking for input from the community as to what appropriate indicators for identifier technology health would be.

Finally the - with relation to the non-IANA transition we are in the process of developing metrics to try to identify changes in how the DNS is being abused. As many of you know there are a large number of domain names that are being used for nefarious purposes.

We are working with a number of security organizations, anti-abuse organizations to collect various data feeds to try to identify this DNS abuse and in the process of trying to establish metrics to allow us to measure how the abuse is either getting better or worse. This sort of corresponds with the healthy domain initiative. They weren't coordinated in any way but it is a project that we initiated before we were even aware of the DNA's healthy domain initiative. Next slide.

I was asked about the definition SSR, Security Stability and Resiliency for ICANN. This is actually documented in the SSR framework which you can see from that URL down below. On Page 5 the definition of SSR for ICANN is within our technical mission. ICANN's SSR, Security Stability Resiliency role encompasses three categories of responsibilities. Operational responsibilities which actually fortunately largely fall in Ashwin's house which include the L root operations. DNS SEC key sign actually falls in and the IANA functions but fall within GDD under the IANA functions contract currently and future through the community empowerment mechanisms.

New TLD operations also fall under the GDD time zone database management which is a non-contractual IANA function is a function performed by IANA staff that aren't under the IANA functions contract.

The second sort of category of responsibilities we act as a coordinator, collaborator and facilitator with a global community in both policy and technical matters related to the Internet's unique identifier system. What this largely means is that we work with a wide variety of folks to try to help identify issues, identify areas in which the identifier system is evolving.

And in general just try to facilitate the improvement of the identifier system across the Internet. And we also engage with others in the global Internet ecosystem. The others in this context are folks like the IETF, the RIRs, network operation groups, anti-abuse organizations, law enforcement governments those sorts of things. Next slide please.

I was asked what ICANN role in larger SSR challenges are. And simply within the scope of how ICANN views security, stability and resiliency we collaborate, coordinate and facilitate with various stakeholder groups to try to identify and offer potential remediation and mitigations of threats that could impact the health of the identifier system.

Typically in this context we're talking about domain name type abuse and threats to the domain name system but we also do play some role in IP addressing. We usually refer any issues off to the RARs because they're much better placed to deal with those issues. And in the case of DNS related issues we typically refer off to the registries and registrars.

And finally I was asked about - so our data gathering and analysis. So the key here is identification. We tried to identify the threats and the unique identifier security stability and resiliency.

We use data wherever we can find it. We have - we collect data feeds from a wide variety of the anti-abuse organizations but we also have ability to collect our own data. One of the projects that we're currently undertaking is to analyze data that's coming into the L root server.

We have started a pilot project that looks at data that's coming into ns.icann.org the name server that we run for ICANN domains that also happens to be the name server for .int, .ug, and Uganda and .museum for reasons that I'm sure make sense historically. But it has provided us with an interesting set of data to explore. For example we discovered that in the case

of Uganda a very large number of queries going to .ug are like when I say large on the order of 90% to 95% of the queries for domain names in .ug are actually queries for domain generation algorithm generated domain names that are caused by malware.

There appears to be a particular version of malware the name of which I have forgotten that has chosen .ug domains to serve for their command and control connections. We anticipate seeing similar data when we are able to extract information from the root zone, the root server queries and that kind of data is some of the things that we're looking at. We also as I mentioned collect fees from folks like Spam House, and Charter Server and those to help us identify areas in which domain name abuse is occurring to work with various folks to try to mitigate that. And that's an area that we are expending significant effort at this point in time. And with next slide please. And with that if there are any questions I or Ashwin will be able - will undoubtedly be happy to answer.

Chris Wilson: So the queue is forming. So let me I see - yes hold on. So I asked - there's also the question in the chat room. I know Mark McFadden offered one. So why don't we maybe I'll quickly start with Mark just because he's in there. And then I see Denise, Steve, Tony, Jimson and Angie. Okay we'll work our way around that way. So let me quickly pull this up. So Mark McFadden from the IS PCP asked in the recent past ICANN and the CTO have sponsored research by other organizations on resolution data related to the new gTLD program.

It's very welcome to work in the ISP community, hope it continues. However we hope that there's an opportunity to expand the metrics that are being researched and that the surveys continue on a routine basis. For instance it would be very welcome to have some measurement of how successful the resolution of IDNs are. It will also be interesting to have some reliable data of how real the concern that new gTLDs are a greater source of quote, abuse of

certain kinds. Again (unintelligible) CTO confirm that ICANN will continue to sponsor such research and that it will expand the metrics examined.

David Conrad: Thank you Mark. Yes so that actually falls directly into the identifier technologies health indicators. We recognize that, you know, collecting data on a one-off basis is interesting but it doesn't allow us to identify trends over time. We have worked for example with AP NIC to collect data regarding the deployment and use of IDNs and see where they are being filtered. We are - have already initiated a follow-on to that. We plan on doing that on a quarterly basis as long as AP NIC is willing to continue to play with us.

We're also looking at a whole series of other identifiers sorry, metrics for the health of the identifier system. But we would be extremely happy to get input particularly from this community about the areas in which they believe the health of the identifier technology system is being impacted so that we can identify indicators and track those over time. I think that was - I hope that answers your question.

Chris Wilson: Thank you David. So let's go ahead and start the queue. Denise go ahead.

Denise Michelle: Thank you, Denise Michelle with Facebook. Thank you so much both of you for those presentations. So much information in so little time. So I have a couple of requests and then I'll just list a few things that I'd like that I think we'd really like additional information on. And so maybe that's a takeaway and we could follow up on email.

I'd like to make a request that your staff David email the constituencies represented here as they move forward with the health identifier technologies indicators as well as the DNS abuse efforts. I think those are critically important and I know Facebook I think and other companies would really like to work with your team and contribute more. I think particularly on the DNS abuse the announcement I think was not on very many people's radar. I don't

know what kind of response you got but we really would like another bite of the apple on providing additional input for that.

So a few questions. So when you find that 95% in the Uganda ccTLD is essentially malware what do you do with that information? Second question is how does the health of identifier technology indicators relate to the marketplace index efforts that are going on? What is your team's involvement? I'm just going to - now I'm just going to throw out questions. You could email because there's no way we have time but I've got you captive.

So what's your team's involvement in the Spec 11 security framework drafting team for registry operators? When will we expect to see another SSR, gain updated SSR framework published? I'd be interested in the trends on your budget over the next - last couple of years given this very expanding portfolio. Also interested in more details on the threat preparedness efforts that your team is undertaking and also efforts to better understand the health and well-being and threats to the DNS ecosystem, also would like some more information on the capacity building on SSR that you're doing with the ccTLD community as well as the public safety communities.

And finally an update on what's is happening with the technical experts group would also I think be useful. And given so much activities that's occurring in this space I think it would be really useful if we could have an intersessional perhaps conference call or audio to get more information and updates on this very packed and quick moving portfolio of yours. Thank you.

David Conrad: That was a few questions yes. So very briefly in the case of Uganda we attempt to get in contact with the TLD manager to offer them whatever services we can. Typically it's basically is providing referrals to other organizations to help them, you know, work to try to mitigate the - any problems that they might have. In this particular case the problem is actually related to the - how easy it is to spin up Botnets and Zombies on the Internet.

Uganda is more the target of the problem as opposed to the generator of the problem. Part of the issue is that it relates to the registration policies within Uganda. It seemed to whoever came up with the malware that it was easier to register in Uganda. But with that said that I believe that malware targets eight or nine different top level domains for the command and control domains. So it, you know, it just happened that Uganda was the lucky one on that particular occasion.

The relationship between the identifier technologies health indicators in the marketplace indicators we view the market indicators as a subset of the identifier technologies. You know, the health of the marketplace is relevant to the health of the identifier technologies as a whole but it's not the sole metric in our view. So we have a superset of indicators for the health of the system, not just the market.

My team has been actively engaged in Spec 113B work. I've actually taken a personal interest in that work because I believe it is important for the health of the new gTLD program itself if the registries are able to find ways to sort of be proactive in addressing the abuse that's occurring particularly within the new gTLDs but sorry TLDs in general.

Because if they don't they're I believe a personal opinion that there is a risk that the new gTLDs will be classified as garbage and filtered out at resolvers and other places. So I'm trying to work with both the CSWG of the GAC and the registries to try to ensure that there is sort of a mutual agreement on forward motion in this area so that we can begin to address the abuse in a way that minimizes the potential risk to the program and the DNS as a whole.

The SSR framework I actually don't know that off the top of my head. I'll have to talk with John who, John Crain who's the Chief Security Stability Resiliency Officer who's in charge of work coming out with a new version of the framework. I believe it's - we're working on it now.

Trends in the budget, let's see my as opposed to many of the other teams within ICANN, my FY '17 preliminary FY '17 obviously up for community review budget actually went up. So I'm very pleased about that. Of course I want more. But, you know, given the fiscal realities the ICANN works under I'm happy with small increase that I did get.

Threat preparedness is something that we are definitely working on. You know, one of the key goals of the SSR team is to try to just identify the emerging threats and to make that information available to whoever wants it. One of the challenges that we've had in the past is sort of a lack of mechanisms by which we can communicate effectively with the various constituencies within ICANN.

One of the reasons that I'm so happy to be speaking here is that I definitely want to remedy that. So when we identify threats I will undoubtedly be spewing way too much information to you all so that you can be aware when those threats are coming and what they actually might mean. Similarly threats to the DNS we see, you know, in our role particularly both on the research side and the SSR side we tend to see things. And we're happy to try to relay that information. We've just not had a really good mechanism by which to do that.

On the TEG we are in the process of bringing in a contractor to help facilitate the Technical experts Group. We're - we actually have a Web page that has been developed that has not yet been made public because we just ran out of time. There will be a TEG meeting here and it's an open meeting, people are invited. It's on Wednesday from 3:30 to 5:00. I forget the room. And we actually are planning on expanding the, sort of the scope of the TEG to help me in figuring out what the right areas of research should be for my research team.

And with regard to an intersessional I would be more than happy to participate in any sort of intersessional calls that you might want. As mentioned I have an interest in trying to improve communications. And if there are any questions that you have I am happy to answer them at any time or if you would like me to participate in your meetings feel free to contact me and I will be happy to attend.

Chris Wilson: Thank you David and I'm certain that the CSG can think about brainstorming maybe an opportunity in the near future for that type of interaction. Steve DelBianco?

Steve DelBianco: Thanks, Steve DelBianco. Thank you David and Ashwin. I know that you're aware that the community will consider approval of the transition accountability proposal this week. But you may not be aware the buried in that proposal in the annex on stress tests is three stress tests are specifically targeted at your department. I'm seeing some level of acknowledgment but let me quickly point them out to you.

Stress test one and two that were suggested almost a year ago by the community were the failure of either the change or delegation authority in the root zone. And in the stress testing it didn't suggest how to solve and stop the problem. Instead it asked do the new accountability mechanisms give the community the opportunity to challenge the corporation on its decision and to hold the corporation accountable for its actions or inactions in the face of these scenarios and stress tests.

So one and two as I said were change or change in delegation failures and in that respect the stress tests were solved. That's the good news for you through escalation procedures, the IANA functions review, potential separation. And in Workstream 2 which we'll start next week there was a notion of adding security audits or certifications to the root zone management functions that you handle.

And then Stress Test 11 which doesn't get talked about very much was a compromise of security credentials. Someone in the community suggested that it was shortly after we had a security breach through social engineering of an employee or contractor. And under that one it said that the community could launch an independent review for the inaction of the corporation, the inaction to protect security stability and resiliency or to enforce your stated procedures for contractors and employees in terms of credentialing.

And then finally an IRP could challenge the board's rejection if the security stability and resiliency review made recommendations supported by the community but the board rejected a particular SSR review team recommendation. And in that respect the community would then have an ICANN funded IRP challenge the ICANN was not respecting the bottom-up process.

So please be aware of those. If the report gets approved this week it will be handed over to the board. The board will send it to NTIA and the world will see Stress Test 1, 2, and 11. Since you're implicated make sure it's on your radar. Thank you.

Chris Wilson: Thank you Steve. Okay moving down the queue Tony I believe you're next. Yes, Tony Harris.

Tony Harris: Yes Tony Harris for the record, so just a slight divergence from the subject matter. Could I see your last slide, the one the previous to the close? Now when you say identification of things that could significantly impact the overall health of the Internet would you consider the deployment of IPv6 to be one of these? Because I'm having a lot of trouble in my part of the world which is South America in convincing hundreds of ISPs that this is important they should maybe upgrade to IPv6.

Unfortunately we have Cisco with the NAT system which enables them to survive without IPv4 addresses but we have Internet of Things coming down

the pipeline. Could you comment on that briefly? I'm sorry to get off the other subject.

David Conrad: No actually think that is a relevant subject, one of the identifiers - one of the identified technology health indicators. Sorry, keep messing up that term. We initially call that Internet health indicators that we're looking at is the deployment of IPv6. Because we do view for sort of the long term health of the Internet that it does have to migrate over to IPv6.

It is an acknowledged challenge particularly in areas which infrastructure costs outweigh the ability to pay for the changes to get IPv6 deployed.

My personal view and I believe the view of most of the technologists who are involved is that IPv4 over time will grow increasingly expensive either in obtaining address space over the free market or from just the operational costs of the Carrier Grade NAT that is being used as a way of mitigating the need to migrate to IPv6. In all cases we have recommended that, you know, if at all possible one should deploy IPv6 at least in parallel with IPv4 if even if you have to deploy CG NAT having IPv6 in parallel will allow you a reasonable future path that you can grow into.

We are happy to, you know, work with anyone to expand on sort of the themes of the need for IPv6 deployment. I know we've had interactions Internet Society and the RIRs on this topic.

We generally try to refer off to the RIRs in cases where, you know, there's some regional components or there is a need for direct involvement and to obtain IPv4 or IPv6 addresses. But we definitely we will work with those partners to try to provide the necessary information to encourage people to accept the cost, the near term cost of redeploying infrastructure to implement IPv6 because the long term costs we believe will be significantly less.

Chris Wilson: So I think we have Jimson I believe is next and then Angie and then any - is there anyone else that may have a question because we should probably close the queue at least we were halfway through our meeting. So okay great then Jimson and Angie then we'll wrap-up.

Jimson Olufuye: Thank you Ashwin and this is Jimson Olufuye speaking. Two quick questions or three. First to Ashwin directly I want to ask is ICANN is on cloud or is using a public cloud or commercial cloud? Two, you did mention a framework for IT infrastructure security assurance so how does that compare to ISO 701 27,000 security certification? Those (two) specifically that certification is required in Workstream 2 so I was thinking like we should part of what we have already.

So then to David what are the major risk issues you are facing now and are you addressing them? And lastly that major malware since you mentioned the malware issue the (ransom), you know, so yes what is your approach to mitigating that? Maybe that will have some. Thank you.

Ashwin Rangan: Thank you. Your first question was with regard to the cloud. We use a combination of clouds. We have a private cloud of our own and we have access to public clouds like the salesforce.com cloud for instance. And we use services that use both components. So we have a strategy called the Hybrid Cloud Strategy. Our intended migration is increasingly to secure clouds regardless of private or public. We will assess the security of the cloud and make our determination. We won't make cost the fundamental determinant of where we put our services. At the end of the day we look at ourselves as an institution of global public interest and but data security is paramount to us more and more so now.

With regard to certification we have multiple, you know, the security world is full of certifications. There are numerous frameworks that are used depending on the specific aspect of security. ISO 27,001 is one of them. The CSC20 framework that I referred to is globally accepted particularly by defense

contractors globally. We tend to look at them as some of the highest security required kind of frameworks. So we're looking at what makes sense and where.

So for instance when we look at IANA we have a different way of looking at IANA services and different certification process that we go through periodically regularly. So we will use multiple different frameworks and as we do we will declare it like I did which framework we used so that if there is interest in probing the framework there is the ability to do that.

The danger in going with a singular framework is that aspects of security may not be comprehended in the framework. We could check the box but not be secure and that would not be good.

Jimson Olufuye: Thank you.

David Conrad: So with regards to the risks the ones that sort of my team is currently primarily focused on is essentially the DNS abuse risks that we're seeing right now, the sort of the proliferation of malware Botnets, phishing and farming many of which are driven by spam sort of the generics spam sort of the generic problems that we see on the Internet today. Our particular interest in those risks are, you know, how the DNS is being used as a mechanism, a vector for proliferation.

As some of you may have seen Cisco did a report, I believe their annual security report which indicated something like I don't remember the statistics off the top of my head but like 80% or 90%, maybe it's 93% of all malware that they had investigated made use of the DNS as a mechanism either for command and control or for propagation. So we're looking at that trying to work with a variety of players both public and private to attempt to come up with solutions and mitigation approaches.

The one that's sort of the highest priority in that right now is that we're collecting abuse statistics in what our called the GAC four types of abuse which are the malware phishing, farming and Botnet into a series of indicators of metrics that we are going to be working with the registry and registrar communities to try to facilitate an industry sort of self-regulation approach to help the industry sort of mitigate those problems themselves similar as I said to the healthy domain initiative coming out of the DNA.

In terms of Ransomware that's largely outside of the scope of ICANN technical remit. Where it does touch us is again in the use of the DNS for mitigation for command and control and propagation. We as mentioned are - where we sit in the Internet infrastructure operationally with running a root server we are able to at least in theory see when malware particularly the ransom-ware like CryptoLocker are propagating. And when we do see that we can work with law enforcement and anti-abuse organizations to try to help mitigate the propagation of that malware.

Jimson Olufuye: So it may be just quick follow-up this is quite very important to my constituency in Africa because there's a lot of abuse going to as you mentioned Uganda, going through the process. So we - capacity is usually important in this regard. There is a lot of requests for means to tackle that. So we'll be having a summit towards the end of the year so maybe pass from your office we can get some people to come speak to them in (Armebia).

David Conrad: Yes we'd be more than happy. Feel free to contact me directly and I will ensure that there will be somebody there.

Chris Wilson: Angie and then we'll close the conversation.

Angie Graves: Yes. And this is Angie Graves from the BC. Thanks for - you covered quite a bit of information in a short amount of time. It was a nice presentation. Thank you for that. And I did just do a search on IPv6 after Tony mentioned it. And

there is quite a bit of information on the IPN site advocating for IPv6 and that's nice to see.

Just a few questions, will we know that SLOs that make up the SLAs will we have any visibility into that when that's determined? Also with respect to the KSK key links I know you had a lot to cover but the impact is very high and we need communication to the entire community. I'd like to know about your plans to address that.

And then with respect to you covered some of these, the identifier technology health. You've covered that. The last thing is we have a currently open public comment period on the DNS abuse draft report. You might want to mention that.

Man: (Unintelligible).

Angie Graves: If you haven't. You may have and I missed it. Thank you.

David Conrad: So sure. On the SLEs one of the requirements from the community was that all of the information, all of these metrics that are being collected for the performance of the root management function will be made public. And this will allow third parties to take the information and verify it themselves. So all of that information will be made public.

Initially it will be anonymized because this is new information and we did not want to sort of create policy on the fly here with regards to making information, potentially identifying information for TLD changes to be made public without the community sort of encouraging - indicating, well demanding we do that.

So initially that'll be anonymized but if the community would like the ability to identify the requesters and the TLD change requests then presumably there'd be a cross community working group. Everything else the thresholds, the

SLAs themselves, all of that information will be made public and actually will be approved by the CWG before they allow the transition to move forward.

On the topic of the KSK rollover and the key length yes that is a very significant issue. One of the reasons it has taken a number of years to develop the KSK rollover plan is simply because of the sensitivity of changing the root trust anchor and the implications that that would have for the resolution as a whole. We have begun the development of a communications plan. We've actually hired Edelman, a PR agency to help us develop a worldwide highly intensive communication plan targeting initially the vendors and distributors of DNS software but then eventually targeting the folks who run resolvers who have to make the changes as well as the general public about the fact that the key role is coming and the implications of the key role and who to contact if they notice any problems.

We anticipate that communication plan to actually take some amount of time to implement because we do need to make sure that there is as much awareness of this as we can make. And so that's a - an ongoing topic.

And with regard to the public comment on the DNS abuse yes I am aware of it and it is a topic of significant interest within my team. Thank you.

Chris Wilson: Thank you David and thank you Ashwin for much this presentation. I know that we went a little long but I think it's been helpful dialogue and discussion. And I know we look forward to continue to talk with you both and your teams going forward so thank you very much.

Ashwin Rangan: Thank you very much.

Chris Wilson: So we have 35 minutes left in our meeting and I know we've got a few more items but I don't think we need a - too much time, at least the time allotted for those discussions. But perhaps we quickly can turn to the final board prep,

maybe spend just a couple of minutes on that just to sort of if we need to close the loop on any discussions.

But, you know, I know when we had early this week we had our CSG meeting and went over sort of topics from each constituency. As far as the order of operations is concerned I believe the IPC is - kicks off the discussion, is that correct?

Man: Yes.

Chris Wilson: Yes. And then the IS PCP and then the BC will come in third. I had sent around a list or the BC met yesterday. We slightly revised our focus. I shouldn't say focus but certainly revised our list of topics and we'll still continue to discuss the RSEP data gathering issue. We'll also as the board for its input and sort of point of view on generally speaking on the healthy domains initiative. And then if time allows we'll perhaps ask for their - for us to make a statement of inquiring about board recognition of public comments that are filed by the BC and other constituencies and making sure that they actually read them because they can carry a lot of weight and value.

And then if possible if time allows we'll simply flag for the board the importance of a cogent response to US senators letter to the board with regard to ICANN's interaction with China simply just making it - making them aware that it's an important issue. We hope that they can take it seriously and do so in a timely fashion.

So those are from the BC's point of view those are sort of the general focal points for us in our 30 minutes. And so happy to turn it over maybe Greg if you want to provide a little insight further insight on IPC and then I can turn it to Wolf-Ulrich and or Tony -- whoever else.

Greg Shatan: Sure. Thank you Chris. Greg Shatan IPC for the record. Our topics, you know, first is the implementation of Thick Whois or the lack thereof and its

relationship to the potential re-signing of the VeriSign contract for .com without any recognition of the issue apparently or whether there'll be recognition of the issue in that contract. And secondly also a comment on public comment period issues. And depending upon what the BC wants to do with your list we could also we could roll your issue into our discussion as well.

I found that in the past that if you go past two issues of substance you actually can - you run out of time so you just a word to the wise so maybe make more sense to us to kind of raise the substance issue as well as the process issue. In having participated in a number of public comment from the working group side can see where there are issues that arise and even the best good faith efforts to try to analyze public comments in a meaningful way.

So we've assembled a team to come to the table with the board. And we - of course we also have two questions the board has asked us to make things interesting, one on diversity and the other on our reaction to the CCWG Accountability report which kind of rolls into the next topic on our screen so I'll save our comment on that if any for that point. Thanks.

Chris Wilson: Thanks Greg. This is Chris. Yes I'm happy if you want to raise the macro issue of public comment and we can certainly just second that emotion when it comes around. I think for us that was a case if there was time allowed we would mention it. But I think it perhaps make sense for that and we can echo your comments when the time comes.

Let me go ahead maybe Wolf-Ulrich if you wanted to make any comment on the ISPCs focus with the board and then I can turn it to the queue.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: Yes, thank you. Good morning, Wolf-Ulrich speaking. So we have actually two topics to cover. The first one is related to GNSO review. The main message to the board should be - shall be the first our concern with the

GNSO review which the independent evaluator has been doing so far without touching on the structure of the GNSO.

On the other hand also well to convey to the board that they are happy that they have been invited by the board - oh this is structural committee or the new name I don't know, to express our views on our structure on these structure ideas and in this context also outlining that we are first time doing something together on the house level so we are in the first steps in establishing a combined effort towards the new structure for ideas of the structure.

And one of the main messages shall be as well that in this context we are of the opinion that the - this - a - in the future the board should be more aware about distinct and the diverse structure within that house and within these stakeholder groups themselves. But in order to be aware if it comes to a new structural review that one goal should be that the diverse, the distinct aspects of this house should be may - more and better reflected in the structure. So this is that what we're doing about the structural review.

And we have a second item or question that I'm going to relate to refer to Malcolm here with regards to the future of the IANA transition and accountability. Malcolm?

Malcolm Hutty: Thank you. Yes the question that we were going to raise relate specifically on the accountability reforms. We are anticipating and hoping that by the end of this week all the charting organizations would have been able to - have communicated that they had accept the support the proposed reforms in the CCWG. But in consequence the CCWG will be transmitting the report onto the board on behalf of the community.

At that stage the next steps then bifurcate slightly. There's an implementation and the CCWG and others have work to do in developing the implementation phase for those reforms. But there is also the transmission of the reports

along with the transition proposal by the board onto NTIA which will then look at it. And in that phase it moves outside the ICANN community and into a more political phase.

And that be looked at by NTIA. And Mr. Strickling said in the GAC meeting earlier this week that it will also help get keen attention from the US Congress which raises the question that we do not strictly know precisely what will happen during that accountability phase.

It is possible that there is - we hope that that will go smoothly but it is possible the for political reasons there will be some unforeseen delay? And that raises the question that we would like to ask to the board. In the event of an unforeseen delay at a political level will the board nonetheless commit to proceeding with the implementation of the reforms that the community has asked for or does the board think that such a delay would be the occasion to suspend the implementation of those and while that delay is resolved?

We hope that the boards will recognize that these are reforms that the community has asked for generally. And we were looking for a commitment from the boards to continue implementation. But in particular we would like to see where the board stands on that and we hope that they can answer that point.

Chris Wilson: So I know that a good segue to our next topic on the agenda but Marilyn had - you had a question and then yes.

Marilyn Cade: Make it quick. On the issue on the topic that the board ask us about diversity the board is responding to concerns expressed about geographic diversity and other issues. But I just want to remind everybody that today is International Women's Day and there's also a diversity issue, just a sensitivity issue to point out. There's also perhaps a diversity issue that you may hear from a couple of the board members having to do with gender diversity. Let me flag that for everyone so it's your aware that - of the notice.

And also, you know, I hope that we can make a point and perhaps Jimson who has been leading so much of the work that the BC has been doing or someone else could respond to what we need from the board and staff is more direct support to our outreach to improve our diversity.

Right now what we're getting is a lot of staff driven work. I don't want to be critical I just want to give the message that what we need and are asking for and we'll work on separately on is how they support us to do the growth and diversification.

Chris Wilson: Agree...

Marilyn Cade: Including more women.

Chris Wilson: This is Chris. I think there's agreement in the room on that front. Any final thoughts, questions, concerns about board prep?

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: Thank you, Wolf Ulrich speaking. Just to Marilyn's last point while the board, you know, conveyed this question to us if you remember quite because during that meeting we had a discussion on GNSO with the board on the GNSO together with the board on Sunday morning about that the board was asking each community so we could pick up that.

So I'm wondering where we should - I was thinking about if I should take that into the context of the GNSO review such a review just to highlight this point if I may?

Marilyn Cade: So real quickly, it's Marilyn again. There's also an ongoing conversation between the NPOC who are engaged in outreach and some of us who are engaged in outreach about actually proposing some interim changes in outreach to address this diversity issue including with budget implications and then moving into even something which I was going to save until later but

even something like a Cross Community Working Group on outreach, et cetera. That's too big to talk about now and we haven't talked about it. But I think if you take it up Wolf in that context if you could still make the point that it is - it's not a GNSO Council issue. It is a constituency issue.

Chris Wilson: Phil?

Phil Corwin: Yes. I just have a quick question for Greg. On the Thick Whois for a com I thought that was already being implemented. Gut I'm just trying to...

Greg Shatan: Well...

Phil Corwin: ...figure out the basis for the question so...

Greg Shatan: Have you done a Whois search on .com lately?

Phil Corwin: Not recently, no.

Greg Shatan: No well, in two years you will - you may have Thick Whois which will be four years after the board adopted the consensus policy. That's the pace at which it's moving so that's the focus of the comment.

Phil Corwin: Okay thanks.

Chris Wilson: Any other questions, concerns thoughts on board prep? Okay great. Well then let's maybe turn in the final 20 minutes or so to accountability update implementation. Perhaps maybe I'll turn to maybe our GNSO counselors quickly just to get - for those that don't already know get a state of play where the GNSO is in its consideration and then we can go around and talk also at the constituency level of about where and perhaps where we stand on that if that makes sense for folks. Anyone? Okay Phil?

Phil Corwin: Yes state of play and there's some emails if there's an informal council meeting at 6:00 to 7:00 tonight the councilors are being asked to indicate by that time on behalf of those they represent one whether they intend to ask for roll call votes in any of the 12 recommendations. And now is Keith Drazek has requested and James Bladel has said it's a good idea to also ask counselors whether any - to indicate whether any of them plan to vote no on the final vote which is the package vote on all 12 recommendations.

But as of now no one has indicated they want to vote on any of the 12 recommendations but that can change. You know, the deadline is 6:00 tonight so we'll know more later today.

Chris Wilson: Great. Perhaps maybe then it - just I think we get a sense of the room from the constituency level where we maybe - maybe we could just talk about where we are, our perspectives on the proposal. I think we have a general good idea but maybe I'll turn to Steve DelBianco quickly to speak on the behalf of the BC and then if you want to turn to the others we can do that.

Steve DelBianco: Yes thank you. The BC prepared detailed comments on each of the recommendations in the third draft, that was the November draft. And our analysis of the final draft indicates that all or nearly all of the changes we requested were implemented in the final draft. So barring some shocking surprises the BC constituency meeting today the BC will be in support of the proposal and I hope that's the level of detail you needed.

Chris Wilson: I think that'd be - Greg are you willing to say a few words?

Greg Shatan: Sure I'll say a few words. Greg Shatan for the IPC. We had - we discussed this and while we have a number of concerns and not just with substance but with the process and the way the process allowed or didn't allow us to review and fully understand the substance given the complexity and breadth of the proposals and some of the very truncated periods and inconvenient periods especially for those who for instance celebrate any winter holiday.

Nonetheless of all those concerns, you know, do not evaporate and not rise to the level either of not supporting the proposal. So we will be supporting the proposal. However we are preparing statements which are likely to be submitted along with our votes kind of a yes and/or yes but on some of the items.

Our analysis was similar to Steve's in that we also submitted detailed comments in the third draft public comment period. And our batting average may be a little bit lower than the BC's. But overall the - most of the comments and concerns that we raised were adopted or dealt with. And the couple that were not - none of them were considered to be those that you would die in a ditch over as Bart Boswinkel likes to say. And it sounds better with a Dutch accent. And if you're 6 foot five and bald it sounds even better. And I'm none of the above.

And so I think that that is basically where we stand, you know, subject to any kind of sort of groundswell of a difference of opinion coming up either in the opening meeting on the list. We not fully closed our list. And while there's, you know, we're not sitting around and dancing a jig over every last piece of the accountability proposal overall if any one group was completely satisfied there'd be some problem with the consensus process so perhaps that's a good sign. Thank you.

Chris Wilson: This is Chris. Thanks Greg, I appreciate that. And maybe I'll turn to Wolf-Ulrich or Malcolm either of you just provide a quick point of view from the IS PCP, yes.

Marilyn Cade: Well we will be having our meeting after lunch and so that will conclude this issue for us. But my strong expectation is that we will be supporting the package as a whole. We will not be encouraging individual votes, (well call) votes although if they have to happen they have to happen. But our preference is to have a simple and clear statement to support for the package

as a package. Whether or not we would attach any comments to go alongside that or not is something that we will consider at the meeting. I don't have anything to offer for you on that. But we will be wanting to give a clear message that regardless of any the sorts of comments that Greg was just relating referring to the IS PCP supports is going that is my strong expectation.

Chris Wilson: Yes thank you, Wolf-Ulrich, fully support that's really how we are dealing with it. However so okay as a counselor member sort of speaking here so I think it's very likely that they're going to vote on the - on some of the recommendations, you know, because, you know, the past is very clear, you know, how it's structured as a positive right now.

And the question here is to me while it is - it's a (unintelligible) process. If until today I think is it - no tomorrow's meeting, tomorrow's side - no it's today. Today is Tuesday really. So until this afternoon if there is any requirement for voting on some of the recommendations separately so we have either go that way first on council. And if one recommendation fails then we are going to vote on the package. So this is the process. So that has been decided.

The process itself has been decided although it has been fixed to go that way. So it just depends on what is going to until this afternoon. So and we are going to follow that as we said here on the IS PCP. We were also in favor of voting on a package so we have expressed our view on that several times during the GNSO discussion but we also are in line with that process.
Thanks.

Chris Wilson: Thank you Wolf-Ulrich. Phil?

Phil Corwin: And just too quickly add to that, Phil Corwin for the record. I haven't heard anything to indicate that either of the contracted parties would ask for separate votes. I think if there's any request for separate votes on other recommendations it will come from the Non-Contracted Stakeholders Group.

I don't know if they are or not but we did get word that they're not going to be bound so they'll be free to vote as they want. And I think they may not get, because of that they probably won't get - we won't face a situation of a possible majority against any of the recommendations but that's a best guess as of now.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: Just a quick comment, Wolf Ulrich speaking. When we go into the board meeting right now, just one hour from now so what I think so what I'm going to do as well because the board asks as well what is our specific position on the proposal so that it's open to each constituency vote to tell them at this meeting we are in line with that. So what is our thinking about that so that they have got a view and we made it public in front here of that meeting. Thanks.

Chris Wilson: Thank you. Marilyn do you have a question?

Marilyn Cade: I do have a question but perhaps it can wait until after the answer. I'll just pose my question. If we could just quickly take any feedback that we got from our conversation with the GAC members at our tables we have a little feedback from on the table I was at before we...

Chris Wilson: Well that's if you have feedback just to offer that'd be great.

Marilyn Cade: Okay so Thailand in Sweden were at my table. I also got to talk to Paraguay and to a few of the other governments. And generally the feedback I'm getting is there's general optimism. I also got to talk to Argentina about the ELAC countries and the minority statement.

So what I'm getting and I - that's why I'm interested in hearing what others heard is that they're optimistic. They'll have a hard day of work but they're optimistic that - and they are some of the governments who have a more detailed understanding of the approach of the NCUC are somewhat amused

and hopeful that we are going to show we, the rest of the community, the business community are going to show support for moving forward.

Chris Wilson: Thank you Marilyn. Questions, thoughts on where we are? I will say this Chris, I will say with regard to implementation going forward I know the BC doesn't ask for a formal discussion on this I think it's fair to say we, you know, we would be generally supportive of the notion of accountability going on without - notwithstanding political timetables but let's - okay - we're probably BC were going to (unintelligible) today we have a more fulsome discussion on that point of view. But I think to Malcolm's point and what you're going to be raising in the - at the board I think we're pretty much on the same page there. Steve do you have a comment on that?

Steve DelBianco: Do you want a brief update on the timetable we face in the next several days and weeks and months?

Chris Wilson: Yes. I think that would be helpful if you could certainly with regard to sort of the bylaws drafting, the timeframe there and maybe for folks Steve if you want to provide sort of the, you know, an inside a bit into the Congressional calendar, US Congressional calendar how that impacts perhaps the timeline what might be helpful for those that aren't aware of that.

Steve DelBianco: All right. On the assumption that the community approves it this week the board has promised there will be no further issues. We have that in writing and we will submit it to NTIA on Friday of this week they would hand it over.

NTIA needs they say 90 days to prepare that report. And at the end of the report they will not stamp it is a final report until they have determined that we have implemented the proposal. And implemented is two things. It's adopting the bylaws which to Malcolm's point would be key. And its implementing by setting up the post transition IANA or PTI, perhaps putting up meat on the bones of the new IRP but not necessarily appointing all the panels and soliciting vendors. Some of that just takes too much time.

There may be placeholder panelists, placeholder board members for PTI but Secretary Strickling is anxious to say to Congress yes it's been adopted and implemented. We're not hiding the ball. We're not pushing something through that is incomplete. We're not exposing the community, the global community to the risk the ICANN would backtrack on this because we're going to make sure it's locked and loaded.

That sentiment matches what Congress adopted last summer the DOTCOM Act which was passed in the House but not the Senate even though it enjoyed Senate majority support said that the US Congress backs the community. It wanted to see the bylaws change as adopted pursuant to what the community wanted and which is the best we can hope for.

So look at the calendar. And I think you'll understand the challenge we have, work backwards from September 30 which is when the IANA contract will simply expire. If you work backwards from that the Congress goes on break middle of July and so election year in the House. So Congress probably needs to get NTIA's report probably the middle of June to give them some time to look at it.

Well if you work backwards from the middle of June what about the bylaws changes? The bylaws probably need several weeks of development with the lawyers and of both ICANN and the CCWG. And the rapporteurs and co-chairs of CCWG will stay conveyed and we will meet several times a week to review the bylaws drafting language to see that it matches what we had in our proposal.

But then we will meet with the full CCWG probably in late April to let the full CCWG comment on whether the bylaws match the report. That is not an opportunity to ask for stuff that wasn't in the report. It's just matching it up. Then we have to go to public comment because that's typically what ICANN board does is they put a bylaws change out for public comment. That's not

required in the bylaws by the way. It's something they do. Well that public comment period if it's 30 or 40 days look where that takes you, late May through June until the public comment period is over and analyzed.

And you can be sure that the public who comments on the bylaws changes probably won't restrain themselves to just say do the bylaws match the proposal? I have a feeling there'll be a lot of freelancing, griping about battles that were lost long time ago. So this is very challenging to get the bylaws adopted and substantial implementation measures done by the middle of June -- a very daunting task in front of us and Congress itself will hold hearings. They're likely to hold a hearing the week after we get back. They won't wait for NTIA's report. They're going to want to hear about it. But after NTIA's report comes back they're going to want to look at that as well.

So I think that's a daunting timeline. And at the same time look for a call for volunteers. There are seven Workstream 2 threads that we're going to want to work on and they're all - they're very important to CSG. So those threads will ask for volunteers to join with the CCWG to work on those Workstream 2 items.

And there will probably also be a call to the CSG constituencies to say do you want to renew your designated rep on CCWG or make a change in that because there's no assumption. That has to be the same people going forward. And Chris be glad to take questions on those details if you want.

Chris Wilson: So Malcolm why don't you go ahead yes.

Marilyn Cade: Yes, thank you, agree with what Steve has just said. But one quick clarification I would offer there on the implementation side as it relates to the IRP. Steve you said that you listed a bunch of things that it might not be needed in terms of implementation on that timescale. It was things like appointing people and so forth.

I'd be a little bit careful about saying these things are not needed as implementation on this track on this critical path. The reporters we have has a degree of constructive ambiguity as to what precise things in terms of implementation need to be done to say this is implemented. And the understanding and the clear statement is actually what you said, that the - it needs to be clear this is available and that ICANN cannot backtrack on this and ICANN cannot walk away from this. Precisely the individual things there are not specified in the report that leave a degree of flexibility on that. I wouldn't want to start glossing that by saying that certain things aren't. It may be for example that NTIA takes a view on certain of those things. It may decide that certain of those things are critical. I wouldn't want to get in the middle of that. Okay?

Chris Wilson: This is Chris. There is a queue forming. I think I saw Phil your hand's raised then Greg and then Steve Metalitz.

Phil Corwin: Just amplifying what Steve just said, the implementation of the bylaws is tight but it's in the best shape of all of the implementations steps. We got a presentation from staff and council on Sunday. I forget the other three tracks but the bylaws they were claiming is 10% done with a target date of mid-June. The other three tracks are 0% done with an expected complete date of September 30.

So there's nothing has been done on the other three tracks and there's absolutely no wiggle room if there's any delay in any of the three required tracks for implementation to have a transition on October 1st. So it's going to be challenging.

Steve DelBianco: If I could just add a little color to that if Secretary Strickling makes the determination that it will not be implemented by September 30 they would need to start the process of extending the IANA contract. And they would want to begin that process in the middle of August. So they'll have to make a

call in the middle of August about do we have visibility of implementation by September 30.

Chris Wilson: This is Chris. I think August 15 is the date by which USG has to notify. Yes so that's as far as deadlines is concerned. Okay Greg and then Steve and then we have four minutes left before I think we have to shove off to get to the Atlas Room so Greg and then (unintelligible).

Greg Shatan: Thanks, Greg Shatan for the record just coming, you know, amplify and clarify on the question of implementation. We can look at implementation two ways. We really have to look at it both ways. One is what is the sufficient implementation for US government to be able to or for NTIA to be able to say that we've kind of hit the proper implementation milestones for them to be able to make the handoff? And then there is kind of full implementation which is one every last bit is essentially screwed into place.

And implementation so there are, you know, a subset of implementation items which are critical pre-transition actions to take so. So in the case of the IRP it's basically it's getting the framework in the bylaws done but it's not having it - a panel ready for the first IRP to be filed.

Man: (Unintelligible).

Greg Shatan: Right. But in terms of what the US - what I anticipate the US governments view is that it's sufficient at the bylaws are there because the idea of putting out a tender and vetting panelists and getting all of that in by September 30 is probably, you know, it's unrealistic.

But the point is that if it's not - that's not what's required in terms of actually, you know, of taking the transition and making it happen.

Marilyn Cade: There are various views you could take on that. I mean you could say that it's sufficient to urbanization if this - if the thing is available. And you could say

that what we have at the moment is enough to receive a complaint and to start a process in the event that a complaint we received on day one and that further implementation to do it in the manner constructed could happen during the course of that.

So there are various views that one could have about that. But what I was arguing against was adding further statements that are specific as to what is and what is not needed that do not - are not found in the...

Chris Wilson: Steve Metalitz then Denise and then we'll close it off.

Steve Metalitz: Just as a sneak preview of our IPC comments the time periods are extremely important here. And if the bylaws are not available for review for more if we're at least 30 days or preferably 40 days I think there's a serious risk that the IPC will consider that the basis for its yes vote has not really been honored.

Chris Wilson: Denise?

Denise Michelle: Denise Michelle with Facebook. Related to Steve's comment I was quite concerned that the draft ICG proposal that was discussed yesterday developed by staff but not in coordination with the Community Advisory Committee that provided the guidelines and contexts raises great concerns about the board and staff's commitment on working cooperatively with the community to ensure that the guidance provided by the community and the proposals approved by the community are faithfully carried out in the implementation that staff does.

So I just wanted to flag that especially for those of you who weren't in that session yesterday that implementation and that the how and the when of the implementation and the involvement of community with the staff is going to be quite critical I think in the ongoing success of this undertaking. Thanks.

Chris Wilson: Thank you Denise. I think it's just in time, 10:45 so thank you all for taking the time to be here and let's all close this meeting and head on over to the Atlas Room. Thank you.

END