SAN JUAN – ALAC & Regional Leaders: Work Session, Part 8
Sunday, March 11, 2018 – 13:30 to 15:00 AST
ICANN61 | San Juan, Puerto Rico

ALAN GREENBERG:   This is ICANN. We use nothing but the latest technology here. It's effective, as it turns out. Welcome to session 143 of the ALAC at ICANN 61. I've lost track. I don't know what number it is, so it's easier to make numbers up.

This is a meeting that, of all the regular meetings we have, I suspect this is the most regular one. Often, among the most productive ones. Sorry about that. Is that what you said?

I'm going to turn the floor over to start with to a somewhat familiar face, to Julie Hammer, as our ex-SSAC liaison to introduce the new faces, or the new faces in their new guise, and then immediately go right into your session because we only have 45 minutes and we don't want to miss another minute of it. Julie?

JULIE HAMMER:   Thanks, Alan, and thanks for having us again. I'd like to introduce the new SSAC chair, Rod Rasmussen, who has taken over as of the first of January from Patrik Falstrom. And I'd like

to introduce the new SSAC vice chair, Julie Hammer, who took over from Jim Galvin.

I'd also like to introduce all of the SSAC members, if you wouldn't mind standing up. There's a whole bunch of SSAC members come here to join you. Thanks, everyone, for coming. They're here for a purpose. If we get any hard questions, Rod is going to deflect them to the relevant SSAC members.

But, most importantly, I'd like to introduce you to the new SSAC liaison, [Andre Kalishnekov]. I've tried to hand this role over to him, but he's said that he's under training for another one hour and then that's it.

Over to you, Rod. Thanks.

ROD RASMUSSEN:     Thanks, Julie, and thanks Alan and everybody for having us. This is one of our more productive and interesting sessions at ICANN. It's interesting [inaudible]. This is my first time running through the deck of things we're doing, so please be gentle.

As Julie mentioned, we just took over with very large shoes to fill from Patrik and Jim, so we're going to do our best to be just as engaged, even more so if possible, with all aspects of ICANN community. Is there a clicker for slides or do I ask? Oh, there is a

**EN**

clicker. It's the verbal kind of clicker. I've got two different slides showing up.

ALAN GREENBERG: Can we try to synchronize the slides?

ROD MASMUSSEN: Okay, there we go. That's us. We are starting three-year terms. You can already see us in front of you, if you want to change and go to the next slide.

This is how you might see us more normally. That's how you'll recognize us in various locales outside of this room. Next slide, please.

This is the standard slide that probably most of you have seen a lot of times is who we are. We're 37, about to be 38, because we have a new member that has to be approved by the board, but that's about the approximate size.

We advise on security and stability issues. We just hit 100 publications, so we've crossed over that threshold. We were smart enough when we started our numbering system to put a leading zero. Of course, if we get to 1,000 publications, we've got a Y2K problem but we'll deal with that. And of course, we have a

ICANN COMMUNITY FORUM 61
SAN JUAN
10–15 March 2018

wide variety of expertise in infrastructure and security. Next slide, please.

I'm going to go through the first bit here and then I'll have some questions to you guys about what areas we want to emphasize and cover and then we'll go into the various areas, just to give you an overview there.

We normally have a publication process where there are topics that are brought up by the board or by other SOs and ACs or things that come up for our own interest from our own members that are relevant to SSR issues. We put together a party within SSAC to work on these things, grind those out through whatever process that it needs to go through. Sometimes short, sometimes long.

We review and approve that throughout the entire membership, drive to consensus. If there's a lack of consensus, we may or may not publish. If we do publish without full consensus, we'll have contrary objections and things like that that we publish.

In that, we have findings. We have a lot of material potentially about the issue that we're talking about. We have primary findings, and then potentially, but not always, recommendations. If there are recommendations to the board, the board then has to take a look at those. There's an iterative process with the board. Do they understand what we're saying?

What are we asking for? There may be actions taken by the board or they're deferred to ICANN Org or some other entity out of the recommendations we take. But, our recommendations, when they're to the board, they are considered by the board. Next slide, please.

This is just a list of things that we are currently looking at, are working on, and things that we recently published. There are more details coming forward later on in the deck. This is an overview, a nice short summary. For those of you who get the deck who want to dive in more, there's some addresses there. Next slide, please.

Here's the current work that we're taking a look at. We have the big one that we've been spending basically the last three or four months on is the name collision analysis project (NCAP). We have another acronym, what we had internally for that. Those of you want to share, bear with me. I'll tell you what that one was. It was a lot more fun. But, we said if we ever have a congressional testimony, we didn't want to have that as the acronym.

We have some more details about that. We have our organizational review we're going in right now. Then we have these other open work parties, some IOT stuff, WHOIS, [rate limiting], and then we have the DNSSEC workshop which is

pretty much Wednesdays at every ICANN meeting. And our membership committee, which obviously just successfully did its job. Next slide, please.

These are some things that are potential for us to be working on, besides the things that we've already got. This is an area of various topics of interest to the community or that have come up through questions and things like that. If there's any topics of interest there as you're taking a look at that list of things, I'll be happy to talk more about it.

One of the things we'll talk about doing internally are a couple of things that may be of interest. We have already gone back in a review of all of the publication we've done in the past and are going to be doing a series of updates to them. Some our old advice. We are going to combine some of those and republish those. We're also looking to be able to provide information publicly about the skills we are looking for for new members. We're trying to be a little more open and provide some inputs or provide some information for people so they can [inaudible]. We're still going through that process, so that's not going to be happening tomorrow, but it's something we want to do.

Then, we're also talking about doing some sort of a session in a future ICANN meeting – hopefully, the next one – around

emerging security issues. We'd like to make that something we do. Next slide, please.

This is just a summary of the work we've done over the last two quarters, and then again looking at some of the things that we're going to be doing this current quarter, organized conveniently. Next slide because we've got more details on the ones that are interesting here.

Now we're starting to get into the details. If there are any particular areas that you want me to spend a lot of time one, like the NCAP project or something of particular interest, let me know. But, it was basically the list we just saw. The last two lists of things is what I'm going to go through here.

We have the organizational review. That's the independent review. We're actually doing interviews here. It took a while to get the reviewer set up, but they're up and running now. I know we're getting a few ALAC members around the list, potential interviewees. We've given the Review Team as much input as possible as we could on potential interviewees so we can get as close to a 360 review as possible. We've actually been working internally on this for quite a while because we are quite anxious to actually get our review and see about … Especially since we've had a change in leadership. We want to be able to take

advantage of that if there are process changes and things like that to be able to do that.

As that comes out, we really encourage members of all the constituencies, but I know ALAC in particular would be good to get input from whatever they come up with, whether it's really good or really crazy. We have no idea, but we'll see. We do have a fairly … They just started and the goal is – and they believe they can hit it – is to get it out by November. So, within a year. We'll see if we can get that done. Next slide.

This is name collisions analysis project. This is in response to the board resolution in the last meeting in Abu Dhabi around taking a look at these problems that came up in the new gTLD expansion. This is the issues here around when you introduce a string, it turns out other people may be using a string at the root level somehow and it's leaking out into the Internet. As you know, there were all sorts of interesting things there.

Part of what we have to do is actually get a better definition for collision strings. We have arguments internally even about what that looks like and what that should be.

Then, taking a look at how you quantify that and how you quantify things and risks, things you may want to do to determine whether it is in that class and then what you may want to do to potentially mitigate that.

This is a new thing for us. It has been created as a fairly large project where we are actually going through a public comment period on thee things. We're doing a lot of new things as a result of this project. Actually, this is kind of the problems here. If we can get to the next slide, please. I'm trying to remember what's on which slide here.

This actually gets into it. The [home court] mail were the three, as many of you know, were held up because of these issues. The board resolution specifies those three in particular, but this is not just about those three strings. It's about any potential name collision, whatever we define that as being an issue.

We now have a corpus of information potentially out there of the facts of things we've done in the last round and have visibility into things and knowledge that we didn't have before we did the last round of TLDs.

We really are trying to define parameters for how you measure this, how you could potentially classify these and then deal with them as mitigation or classifying them as potentially some string that you may not ever delegate. Those are the objectives that are in the board resolution around that. Next slide, please.

So, we took the last few months with the administrative committee within SSAC. It was the old and new. We got together. We had extra bonus people to work on this. Then, we created a

ICANN
COMMUNITY FORUM 61
SAN JUAN
10–15 March 2018

work party with SSAC, which constitutes almost half of the SSAC membership. It's a large number of people who have been working on this.

We have put out for public comment the initial preliminary proposal. I emphasize this is an initial preliminary proposal. We don't even have full consensus within SSAC on this, but we're putting it out for public comment, which as I've said, we've never done that before, so that the community can weigh in on this.

What we've proposed is a series of three studies. The studies are basically to get the information and create ways for people to provide information because this is supposed to be an inclusive study, not just SSAC doing this. We're bringing in outside experts and people who have actually a vested interest in this thing who may have data and want to help work on this problem. This is a new thing for us. They're creating that.

Then, there's looking at root cause analysis for the things we find. Why are these things happened? Is it something to do with the way software is configured, the way people configure their networks? Some random background radiation from Neptune? Who knows? So, figure out root causes.

The third thing is to try and quantify some methodologies for dealing with those to either mitigate them or designate them as

too radioactive or whatever we come up with. The idea here being we want to be able to, if there is another round of things, have these parameters for when which to make decisions around strings and risks and all that. Far more concrete than we did in the last ones. So, those are the various studies. Next slide.

So, this is where it gets more interesting for all the folks here. We are going to have a session tomorrow. It's one of the cross-community sessions where we're going to go through this in much more detail. Looking forward to having input from the ICANN community broadly around this. We are looking to get data from people who may have resolution data. They may run ISP networks. They may run name servers. There's a lot of data out there that we want to be able to get that kind of information and bring that in. We are going to have a couple of different ways to participate with invited guests and we're also going to have just a general mailing list for people to follow this if they're interested in it.

Again, new for SSAC, as we're really doing this pretty much in the public eye rather than our typical process. It's working experts with experts. I'm sure that there are some members here that will have some interest in that. So, we're going to have that.

Then, we're going to have an open work party on Tuesday morning. We're actually going to have the work party there.

Typically our work parties are closed, for members only, but we're going to have that one open to anybody who wants to come in and listen in and then maybe contribute some thoughts to the problem space.

What we're really looking for here is looking at the proposal itself. It's a rather large, complex project. We've done a basic cost estimate for it, which was significant. We're going to obviously work with the board on that and all that.

Also, just the management of it. This is not something that we've done before. There's open questions about the best way to go about this. We really are looking of input.

Then, we'll have a series of workshops over the next basically two years or so to go through all these studies and bring that in, get interim products around each of these and push that out.

I see a question over here on my right, on the end down there.

ALAN GREENBERG:       We're not sure if it's Olivier or Alberto

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND:   I can read Olivier.

ALAN GREENBERG:　　　　　But you had the blank side facing us.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND:　Ah, okay. It's for later. I don't know when you're going to open the queue or whether you wanted to…

ROD MASMUSSEN:　　　　　Is it on this topic?

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND:　It is on NCAP.

ROD MASMUSSEN:　　　　　Yeah, let's do that.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND:　Okay, thank you. Yes, thanks for presenting this project to us. I wondered what the end point was with regards to the NCAP project because it's exciting. It's something that we've been very concerned about for many years. In fact, the history of it all, at some point the SSAC provided advice on these topics, then it was somehow ignored by the board.

The ALAC actually drafted – I think it was in Durbin that the ALAC drafted a supporting document regarding these things and then

it sort of came back and light and so on. The ICANN was just on the verge of actually letting these strings be allocated and so on.

But, looking at the news, though – and correct me if I'm wrong, but ICANN has actually offered a full refund for dot-mail, dot-home, and dot-corp. So, if there's a full refund and a resolution that was passed by ICANN, isn't that a non-issue at that point?

ROD MASMUSSEN: I can't really speak to the financials on the business side of that. Obviously, the board is doing what it feels it needs to do. We're looking at the technical side of this. I would note that is dealing with the current situation of the conflicted and stalled applications in the last round. That doesn't sound the problem should home, corp, or mail be delegated ever. That's part of our charter on this is to take a look at that. SSAC is separating ourselves from the decision that the board made around that.

The first question you asked, I neglected to say. The product is here, which is important. There will be a series of interim reports that will talk to each of those levels of studies that we're doing. We concentrated on that.

At the end, we'll come up with an overall set of findings and potential recommendations around those questions that the

board asked. But, the end product will be a final report that addresses all the questions in the board resolution, [as the IDN].

In fact, if you take a look at the project plan which is available in the public comment, we actually kind of mapped things that we're proposing working on to the actual board resolution. We're trying to make sure we've got all the bases covered in answering those questions.

Any other questions on NCAP before I move on? Anything you want to add?

JULIE HAMMER:     Just to follow-up, what we're hoping to be able to achieve is to have a framework by which the board can make judgments about the risks involved in any string that might be subject to collisions, and as a result of that come to an assessment about whether it ought to or ought not to be delegated. But, that's really just looking at the technical risks. Then the board itself needs to factor in other non-technical decision-making factors.

Basically, here's a framework. Plug into the input home, corp, or mail or any other string and it spits out something at the output in really simple terms. Obviously, it's not going to be that simple.

ROD MASMUSSEN:   That's the concept. Yeah, exactly. Let's move on to the next section. This is an area we have … This is a euphemism for all the WHOIS stuff that's going on. RDS is Registration Data Services.

SSAC gets asked a lot of questions about this in various forms and areas. These are the three areas that we see that we may have some sort of work to do around to help with the ongoing debate around these in various areas. We're not going to comment particularly on GDPR or something like that because that's a policy issue more.

But, from the technical and the security-stability side, we look at these three areas as areas where we can probably offer some help and guidance to the community or at least advice. Those are around dealing with technical abuse. Those people who are using these kinds of … The data [in an] RDS to deal with issues that are going on with it's a DDoS attack or some sort of technical issue, vulnerability, things like that, to dealing with phishing, malware, and things like that. So, those people use that. We [inaudible] that, especially when you start thinking about DDoS at scale and things like that could affect stability and security, that that's an area of our remit.

Law enforcement in general kind of ties into security and being able to deal with those issues that are abuse raised to a higher

level, whether there's actual people needing to be looking at enforcement around that.

Then, an area from a technical perspective is how you do regimes and best practices, etc., around implementing gated access of some sort and authentication and that kind of thing.

We're looking at those areas as areas that we have expertise or ability to do some studies and things like that to provide advice.

Any thoughts or concerns or questions around this area that you think we may should be looking at, besides the three I've listed here or any questions on these three before I move to the next one?

ALAN GREENBERG:    Looking at that, it strikes me that some of the more difficult questions are not ones that are technical ones. Your middle bullet of law enforcement it's pretty simple in one jurisdiction to say, "My law enforcement should have access." How you work law enforcement across jurisdictions becomes really interesting.

The real law enforcement people work with bilateral agreements. Bilateral agreements don't work really well with a central database. At what point does the technical problem stop and the political one start or vice-versa? I'm not quite sure where those boundaries are, even. I see some real challenges.

ROD MASMUSSEN: I agree. I think our emphasis here is on the fact that law enforcement actually gets involved in dealing with the outcomes of that. There may be some things, if you tie that to the third point. Actually, if you take the middle point, you can kind of tie it to the first point and to the third point because you have these things about access regimes and things like that, that would touch on law enforcement as well.

Yeah. Who gets jurisdiction and things like that, that's not an SSAC remit. But, we do consider it important that law enforcement be able to do some of these things because only law enforcement at the end of the day can solve some of these issues of taking care of people who are doing really bad things. Next slide.

Those are the areas of major interest. Go ahead.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: A quick question on this. Since you're part of that community, this cybersecurity community, do you know what is the proportion of private players in this environment compared to law enforcement agencies? Are we talking just 99% of the participants are law enforcement and it would just affect 1%?

ROD MASMUSSEN:   Reverse that number. It may not be 99 to 1, but 90/10 probably.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND:   So, very significant.

ROD MASMUSSEN:   That is not an official SSAC position, but having been one of those practitioners … I came from Panama where we were having a meeting with those kinds of practitioners and law enforcement and that's kind of the ratio in the room, to just give you an idea.

Recent publications. So, we had to put this one first. What we've done with the new regime and some new demands on how we're doing is we've got a new numbering system. We're finding we're doing a lot more correspondence, which is not official big, long reports and things like that. But, when we are responding to particular requests for comments or things like that or comment on a public response period, we're using a new document system which is pretty simple, which is SSAC and the year and a dash, whatever the number of the document is.

Of course, the first one in that series is telling you about the series, because we're, of course, engineers. So, [inaudible] RFC 1 and it tells you about the RFC series. So, we're doing that.

We actually provided some comments around diversity, which we're generally supportive of. We didn't think an office of digital literacy was necessary at this point. These things are all online, so if there's any particular question about any of ours, I'm happy to take those. I don't see any on these two. I think we have one more slide, if you go to the next slide. There we go.

We had some fairly extensive comments on the review of the NomCom. That's one of the things I encourage folks here to take a look at. We had some concerns around how the community in general is considering the process of how we decide who's going to be members of ALAC and the like and how those are stable processes over time. Then there's transparency around the process.

Then, of course, as technical folks, we are also of course concerned about making sure that there are adequate technical skills on the board, so that when we give advice, there's people who can work with that advice and interact to enforce it or implement it – enforce is the wrong word. That was one we recently submitted just last month. Any questions on that? Go ahead. You should move up here.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND:     Thank you very much. I like to stay away in case there's any hostility. Exactly. There's a higher chance. You're an engineer.

You know there's a higher chance of you missing, although you might be a marks person.

Just on the numbering of [SSACYYY.NN]. I note that it says here that it's a new system for comments and other correspondence on administrative community and other non-SSR issues. How do you establish a limit to this remit that you have here since this is a non-SSR issue? Of course, SSAC was originally just SSR issues.

JULIE HAMMER: Thanks. What the SSAC wishes to do is, in the SSR series, confine itself to the technical stuff. But, we've found for our own purposes that [inaudible] what we've said about various non-technical and community issues without a numbering system was problematic and we had started, if you like, polluting the report series with non-technical matters like comments on CCWG accountability stuff and we thought we need to stop doing that.

As a principle, what we're trying to do is say we comment on technical stuff, but there are other things going on in the community that impact either the way in which security is delivered by ICANN or the way in which SSAC is able to operate in the community.

So, some of the accountability stuff fell into that category where if the outcome is this, then SSAC will be implemented because SSAC is part of the community.

What SSAC doesn't want to start doing is commenting on everything that's happening whether it impacts us or not. We really only want to comment on the things that impact on us.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND:    You've seen through the ALAC, it's a slippery slope.

ROD MASMUSSEN:    Okay. We definitely want to avoid that. This is part of the evolution of ICANN as well. We're all now part of this great big community that has to somehow make decisions about things. We'll have some comments on stuff [inaudible]. But, we want to separate that around away from hardcore technical advice. Next slide, please.

We have a couple of recent publications. SSAC 99 was very particular on IDN guidelines and it was some recommendations. They're pretty consistent with just being the nerdy engineers we are and how you actually do this stuff and make sure it's done right. If there's any questions about that, I'm happy to put Patrik up here to answer them.

Moving on to the next slide, SSAC 100. This was taking a look at some questions about root zone and looking at the questions around expanding it, etc.

What we did here was basically took recommendations we had given previously in other documents and brought them together here just to reemphasize that what really matters as you're expanding the zone is having a monitoring capability, knowing if you're going to have a problem. You need to implement the tools to tell you there might be something going off the rails before you start trying to drive the train down the track. That's a major thing you want to do.

It doesn't matter necessarily any particular number. I know it's been the infamous 500 or whatever the number was that got put into the Applicant Guidebook or whatever have you.

It's the rate of change that matters in doing these things. It's not necessarily just from a technical DNS servers and infrastructure handle it, but how about the organization and the administration of that stuff? That actually can create more stress and break things.

In general, you need to take a look at doing some studies and investigation around how you do this over the long term in a much larger root zone. Any questions on that? I have one over here.

HADIA ELMINIAWI:

Now, the number of domains added to the root zone, I don't think this affects the stability in any case. At least that's what I see. I have an engineering background as well.

My other question is related to the rate of change. How do you determine the appropriate rate of change that would not actually affect the stability?

ROD MASMUSSEN:

Right. I say see point four which is actually do some studies on the problem. The point we wanted to make was that's the right metric to use rather than a fixed number. I agree with you. At the end of the day, you could have a very, very large zone. There are people who run very large zones and underneath the root. We do not give a hard number in that report. No. You want to add to that, Patrik?

PATRIK FALSTROM:

It's actually quite important to read all of these four together. When we talk about [inaudible] long-term obligations and maintaining of a large root zone is one thing, we talk about the rate of change. Also, doing the addition and doing changes is very important to monitor what happens and what signals for various kinds of disturbance, and for example, have a plan for

potentially even undelegated something that you added if it was the case that you added too much or too fast.

So, the ability to adapt the end change, the rate of change, accordingly is much more important to discuss than what the number of TLDs or number of zones there could be.

HADIA ELMINIAWI:     But, what's too much or too fast?

PATRIK FALSTROM:     No. Once again, you have to implement a system which monitors what's happening and detect when it is the case that you might go over some certain unknown limit. Then you need to have a plan for what you do if it is the case that [inaudible] that kind of disturbance. If we take one process that we in SSAC think has been done exactly the correct way, it is the KSK rollover in the root zone, where the project itself made a very detailed plan in I think it was 12 different steps, and after each step they were looking at what the situations were and decided to move forward immediately or to wait a little bit. I think it was on step seven. They monitored. They got some indicators and they paused to just look what those indicators were. Now we're discussing to move forward again. This is nothing changed. That's why we don't know where these limits are.

HADIA ELMINIAWI:    The thing is comparing it to the KSK that's I think not fair because that's something very new. Or not new, but it's the first time that's going to happen. But, actually adding a top-level domain, that's not something new. That's something that's been happening before.

Actually, by now, you should be able to know what happens and what does not happen. I don't think that something would come up that's surprisingly new or you haven't seen before. There's no reason for that.

PATRIK FALSTROM:    Okay. We should continue the discussion offline because all the reports that have been written they say very explicitly that you cannot say a number. It is the rate of change and you need to monitor what is happening and act accordingly.

ROD MASMUSSEN:    Okay. That's our last slide. I know there were some questions about KSK. Go ahead.

ALAN GREENBERG: We have two people. We have Christopher and John, if we can set a one-minute timer. We have our guests already here and we have to end in five minutes. Thank you.

CHRISTOPHER WILKINSON: Thank you, Alan. This is just a quick comment for the information of our colleagues. Some of us in the PDP actually think that the next round should be based on batches or groups of new applications from the policy point of view linked to that purpose, whether it's geographicals or communities or brands or whatever.

I think there's a certain scope for synergy between policy idea of phased introduction through in the way I've described and [your concern] to control and monitor the rate of change.

ROD MASMUSSEN: Thank you.

JOHN LAPRISE: I want to thank Julie for corresponding with me offline about the [inaudible] KSK recommendations to the board that SSAC has made in the past. The spreadsheet shows that, yes, the board has received recommendations and instructed ICANN Org to implement.

But, the spreadsheet does not know the status of those implementations. In fact, the two orders – sorry, the two advisories, SSAC 063 and SSAC 073 are actually very similar which leads me to think that maybe 063 wasn't followed through on, so there was the need to reissue the instructions to a large extent to ask the board to do something.

So, has that advice actually been implemented at ICANN Org? Do we know?

ALAN GREENBERG:        This sounds like an offline discussion that we should continue.

JULIE HAMMER:        John, that's a separate question, but I think one of the real issues that you were asking about was what is the concern right now? And that's I think the more important point to talk about. I know that Joe Abley, one of our SSAC members, is pretty knowledgeable about this and I'd like him to make some points about it.

JOE ABLEY:        Thanks, Julie. I'll just frame the whole thing by saying the SSAC has not had a chance to build any consensus on this, so I can't speak for SSAC. I can only speak for me. I'm aware of the data

set that ICANN has collected from the root service that relate to RFC 8145. It's a newly implemented mechanism and it's resulted in a data set, the results of which were confusing.

Because it was confusing, I think ICANN made a very prudent decision, as Patrik said, to pause the process which is why the process was developed in steps, so that there could be time to try and derive any kind of useful signal out of that data.

I think what we've heard so far, as recently as the OARC meeting that immediately preceded this ICANN meeting as it was presented by ICANN staff is that that data set is very, very noisy and it's very noisy for a number of different reasons. Some of them are implementation specific, because even different releases of the same name server software implement the specification differently. It seems like no implementation implements it accurately.

It was all done very, very quickly because there was a timescale here and I think we are paying a little bit in the quality of the signal because of that.

But, the other thing that we know is that there is no direct correlation between the numbers and ratios and percentages and things that come out of that data to the impact on end users. That is very clear because it doesn't map end user experience. It maps sources of DNS traffic as seen by the root

server system and that is the result of a very complex mesh of DNS servers, forwarders, resolvers and it doesn't map to the end user experience.

So, while it's an interesting data set for research, I think if I were going to put my finger in the air and make my personal assessment of what the technical consensus generally SSAC and everybody else is, it is that that is a very interesting but also very noisy data set and it doesn't contain any clear signal that there is significant risk from rolling the key.

The other thing that I think is very clear and perhaps not as well circulated because it doesn't relate directly to this data set is that there is a substantial risk of not rolling the key because when you have a cryptosystem where you have no experience of rolling a key, that in itself is a risk that potentially affects 100% of DNSSEC users.

So, I think, as with all of these things, it needs to be a balanced risk assessment and it's not a simple case, like everything on the Internet, that is just cut and dry where it's either completely safe or completely risky. There's always a balance and we have to weigh these two things.

One of them is the responsible stewardship of the keys in general. It's already signed. We can't un-sign it, so we have to

manage the way that it is signed and that includes rolling the key and knowing how that works against any other kind of risk.

I think ICANN staff are doing a great job at collecting and assessing both of those [inaudible]. But, I think that's the decision that the board needs to make. They need to say—

ALAN GREENBERG: I'm going to have to cut this off. We are over and our next speaker has an absolutely hard stop. We will be meeting with David Conrad this week. Thank you very much. I hate to shove you out while I'm saying thank you, but thank you.

If we can come back to order, we have Theresa Swinehart is going to talk about GDPR. And just so we understand the constraints, she has to be out in 40 minutes.

THERESA SWINEHART: Less than that. I have to be out by 2:45 at the most, 25 minutes.

ALAN GREENBERG: Under 25 minutes.

THERESA SWINEHART: First, thank you very much for adjusting the time. We're a bit in what feels like a time warp or something. Not quite sure. I'm

ICANN 61 COMMUNITY FORUM
SAN JUAN
10–15 March 2018

going to do a quick where we are with GDPR and then actually our thought was to open it up for questions. John is here. We can answer either specific questions or walk through different areas, if you prefer.

As you know, we recently posted what is referred to as the calzone model, which is essentially taking the input that we had received, putting that together in what is the iteration of the interim proposal. So, that is up along with a summary document that references the calzone area, flagging areas where there are differing views among the community on about four or five different specific topic areas.

Then, a few days ago, we also posted what is called the cookbook. That is the background in greater detail around the specific aspects of the model. So, those materials are posted. And we have bene also updating the community with a blog on a regular basis, including the discussions that we're having in relation to the DPAs and the broader community and sessions here.

With that, maybe I'll turn it to John for a few words. Then, Alan, if you want to open it up for questions.

JOHN LAPRISE:          We can go straight to questions.

THERESA SWINEHART:     We can go straight to questions, whichever way you prefer.

JOHN LAPRISE:     The documents that Theresa is referring to is the model that we posted on Friday last week, as well as the grid which you may have seen. We call it a non-paper, but it basically grids the different models that we've received from the community across the different key elements in the approach.

Then, on Friday, we posted what we're calling the cookbook, extending the metaphor of the calzone. The cookbook is the justification document. It's providing rationales and some of the explanation both from the law as well as from the information collected from the community on the reasons why we've selected the different pieces for our model. With that, I'd open up for questions, or if it's useful we can walk through the model, but we're probably going to have a very short period of time to do both.

ALAN GREENBERG:     Once we open up for questions, we'll start using a two-minute time for both questions and response and go down to one minute if we start running out of time with a longer queue.

We had a rather spirited discussion earlier today. We didn't have GDPR on the agenda, but it somehow came up. Went around the table and had a number of people saying things like – and I'll paraphrase – our model does not consider rationales for collecting at all and there is absolutely no way the data commissioners are going to allow us to collect these kinds of things or we don't have a good enough justification for allowing X to do something without filling in the details.

How are we going to get some level of assurance that what we're proposing to our contracted parties to implement at great expense to themselves and to us is something that's likely to be accepted?

JOHN LAPRISE: That's a great question and let me give you a little bit of a background about the discussions that we've had so far on that very topic with a group of the DPAs.

The reason we provided the cookbook on Friday was just for that approach and that question that we also have with the DPAs. When you're selecting this model, what's the basis for it? What's the justification? Can you provide us with that additional level of information?

So, we completed the first level of that cookbook to share with the DPAs. They told us, the group that we've been meeting with, which is part of their technical group, told us that if we provided that to them by last Friday that they would then take that into account in their meetings this week and they would come back to us the week of the 26th of March and provide us feedback on that.

They had referenced the fact that there would be this Berlin Group paper that's come out also at the end of the week, which takes a very strong stance on some of these points and they would be referencing that as well.

We will be meeting with that group again the week of the 26th and we will hopefully be obtaining at that point some indication of whether we've gotten the basics of it right or whether there are pieces of it that are missing or need to be changed.

From that, we would then move towards trying to produce a model that is consistent with the advice that we've received from them. And depending on where we are in terms of the timeline and what it says, we'd look at how the accreditation portion in particular could be added in, how you obtain access to the non-published portions behind the layer. So, the non-public WHOIS data. And we'd be talking to the community and seeking forbearance of the law being applied against our

industry sector until there would be time to fully implement that model.

We've flagged for them that we think it's an opportunity for them and for us to bring 1,000 contracts on the registrar side and then more than 1,000 on the registry side all to the same discussion, and by doing that in this way, we would be able to adjust things within the model that could make it compliant with the law. So, that's the approach that we're taking coming into this end of the month.

ALAN GREENBERG:          Thank you. Holly?

HOLLY RAICHE:             I was particularly interested, how are you going to develop the accreditation model? Because that's where perhaps the least detail is.

JOHN LAPRISE:            We've provided to the GAC a paper based on the principles that have been included so far in the model and have asked for additional assistance on two fronts.

So, on the front of designating law enforcement parties that are legitimate law enforcement parties from each of the

ICANN
COMMUNITY FORUM 61
SAN JUAN
10–15 March 2018

governments, we'd be asking to collect that through the GAC as well as government agencies that need to have access to the information behind the non-public WHOIS. And to help us in setting a code of conduct for the non-governmental parties.

So, it isn't that the GAC has necessarily special expertise in setting that code of conduct, but it is important in terms of a justification. If they were seeking compliance, if the governments are seeking compliance in the future, to have some approach.

So, the concept on the non-governmental parties would be that we'd be seeking parties or collective groups that understand the elements of those groups that are seeking that data and to help use codes of conduct to select parties that could have access and set rules around it, so that if there's violations of that, that they would have their certifications removed.

HOLLY RAICHE: I'm going to do a follow-up. The agencies I understand, and I think in an Australian context, I'd expect it to be our corporate regulator, our consumer bodies, that sort of thing. Is that what you're thinking about?

JOHN LAPRISE:       So, depending on which level you're speaking of. Can you clarify?

HOLLY RAICHE:       Sorry. I was thinking in an Australian context in terms of who wants access to the data. I know, for instance, our corporate regulator. Also, we've got a competition consumer body that follows up on scams, things like that. They use that data now to actually track down that sort of thing. That's what you had in mind.

JOHN LAPRISE:       On the governmental side, yes.

HOLLY RAICHE:       On the governmental side, I'm interested in when you imply there are other sorts of bodies. That's what I'm kind of asking about. What else were you thinking about?

JOHN LAPRISE:       We're not pretending to have the expertise about who utilizes that data inside the governments, which is exactly why we were going to the GAC to make that request, if they could, to collect the information from the individual governments about the

appropriate law enforcement bodies as well as governmental agencies that require access to the data.

ALAN GREENBERG:          Tijani?

TIJANI BEN JEMAA:        Thank you very much. I will speak about the model as it is published now. I don't know what will happen in the future.

First of all, the data collected, we still stick to the thick WHOIS and this is the maximum of data that we can collect, while the GDPR is about minimization of the data collection.

Another thing. This data is maintained in three places: registry, registrar, and escrow. When we speak about public access, as much as you increase the number of places where it is stored, I think we cannot say that it is not more or less public.

Similar things, but I will stop here and perhaps I ill—

JOHN LAPRISE:            I'm happy to address those two points if that's useful, or would you like me to pause for more questions?

ALAN GREENBERG:    No, if you could do it quickly, and if we go to one-minute timers, please.

JOHN LAPRISE:    So, the set of data that we're collecting, proposing to be collected under the calzone model, is the full set of thick data. We went through, on the ICANN Organization side, went through a very careful analysis of what we were receiving from the community about why each of those fields need to be collected. We found a number of fields we thought weren't being utilized and proposed in one of our earlier models, an approach to an earlier model, that some of those fields could not be collected.

We heard from anti-abuse people and others that even those fields that we saw not being utilized in normal sites were being utilized by anti-abuse people, with different groups.

With that in mind, we think that's really a question in the long run for the policy process rather than having the ICANN organization pick fields that would be eliminated and then losing that data out of those databases.

ALAN GREENBERG:    I'm presuming when you get answers back, at least interim, from the data protection people, they will either say, yes, we accept your logic or no, and we'll have to react.

JOHN LAPRISE: We're certainly hoping so. Then, on the three points. The data being collected, it is the full set of data, whatever is collected, that would be transferred from registrars to registries because the registries also maintain WHOIS data from that database.

Then, escrow agents, we think that's of course a very important thing and that has a very limited use, which is under contract to ICANN in the event that there's a failure of a registrar or registry or a compliance action that requires that data to be utilized.

So, on the point of whether it's public or not, escrow data is very carefully maintained under confidentiality. The registrar and registries both have obligations to maintain confidence around whatever would not be published. I don't know we can do much better than requiring it under contract without any regulatory authority of our own, unless there's laws that say otherwise, and we're going to all rely on the GDPR that says that needs to be maintained in a confidential way if it's been designated as being PAI.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: When the concept of thick and thin WHOIS was made here in ICANN, it was said that the registry would have only the thin WHOIS.

ALAN GREENBERG:     Some registries.

JOHN LAPRISE:     I think that's a summary of a broader point that has many facets to it. I think we probably can't answer that in this timeframe.

ALAN GREENBERG:     I think we'll have to not have rebuttals at this point and we'll put people back in the queue if they're not satisfied at the first level. I'm next in the queue, actually. A very quick one.

I get the impression that in the past law enforcement and communications departments, those who oversee the Internet and privacy commissioners who are in two different parts of the government and never talk to each other.

Do you sense that's changing because of this perhaps collision between the two areas?

JOHN LAPRISE:     Our understanding is that's not happening just because of WHOIS. But, there's a lot of industry sectors that are having similar discussions. One of the reasons we're relatively confident we're going to get advice is because we're seeing that in some other industry sectors. We're seeing where there's a plan of

action in place. They are indicating that they will forebear from compliance while those things are being built.

What they're looking for is a good plan of action to maintain the PII in a meaningful way. That's the way we're understanding it.

ALAN GREENBERG: It's nice to hear the parts of government are talking to each other. Hadja?

HADIA ELMINIAWI: I have a quick comment on Tijani where he said GDPR is all about minimization. It's minimization for the purpose of collection.

My question is back to the accreditation process. As I understand that you said is organizations, whether governments or others, will be – legitimate ones will be accredited access. Will this access be time limited? For example, would it be for a year and then it expires and they reapply again, or it's not a timely accreditation?

JOHN LAPRISE: Those are great detailed questions that we don't have the answers to yet and we'll be seeking guidance from the community, from the GAC and others as we build out that code

of conduct and the accreditation program. Good question and please bring it back when it can be something that can be plugged in. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG:     Christopher?

CHRISTOPHER WILKINSON:  Thank you. Several comments and questions, but in deference to the chair, I'll focus on one. When you spoke of accreditation of non-governmental agencies for regulated access, they were actually talking about the private policing of the trademarks by the trademark agencies. Is that the case?

JOHN LAPRISE:     That would be one of the groups. The anti-abuse researchers, those that are defending marks, intellectual property – I'm forgetting some of the others. Who are the others?

THERESA SWINEHART:   Cyber research area. There's a range of groups that are outside of the specific law enforcement space as well.

CHRISTOPHER WILKINSON: I think in the detail that may prove to be problematic because, particularly, it's the registrant is expected to have given or not agreement for the use of the data for purposes that were not originally foreseen.

JOHN LAPRISE: Yeah. I think that's a good point, but part of that analysis is going to be about whether there is a use that would be permitted under the law as it is currently constructed.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you. Seun?

SEUN OJEDEJI: Thank you. I'm just going to [inaudible], especially section seven, which actually talks about the model itself. Is there an intention to – perhaps this question is to coms, but maybe you can answer. Is there intention to find a way of presenting this model to end users in a way that's much more understandable? I was expecting to see some infographics, to see some flow charts or diagrams that communicates better [inaudible] to end users. Thank you.

THERESA SWINEHART:     Just for clarity, when you said point seven, it was in this document here. Is that right?


SEUN OJEDEJI:          No, I mean in the report, the published report.


THERESA SWINEHART:     The published report, yeah. As soon as we get closer. We have recently published this updated graphic with regards to where the model sits. As soon as we have some clarity on where things are and if there's any visuals or other things that can help reflect the information in a different kind of way and better way, then we'll certainly look into that.


ALAN GREENBERG:        John?


[JOHN]:                Thank you. John, question for you I think. All of those parties that you were speaking of earlier that would have more detailed access, they would all have to be GDPR compliant because they would be effectively data processors under GDPR.

                       Are the data controllers receiving any kind of assurance from those data processors that they are GDPR compliant?

JOHN LAPRISE:    Good question. Good note, and I think we have some issues to work through in terms of how the accreditation model rolls out and what requirements anyone that is utilizing data under that accreditation model would be able to do so.

When we talk about the code of conduct, that's exactly the kind of things we want to make sure are included in the code of conduct so that we're not violating the law by providing it to persons who would not be.

ALAN GREENBERG:    Holly?

HOLLY RAICHE:    Quick follow-up. Code of conduct. Number one, what will it cover? Number two, how will it be developed?

JOHN LAPRISE:    You're, of course, asking all of the hard questions that we don't have the answers to yet. I truly appreciate that and I hope that you'll participate in helping us design that. We will be very quickly into those phases where the sort of input that we get from your community will be very valuable. So, I don't have all the answers yet.

The idea is exactly the sorts of things John was referring to that we're hearing in the comments and other places. We want to be very careful. We're trying to comply with law. ICANN is a data controller of some sort, depending on how you define it in this process. So, the utilization of that data we need to have controls around. We need to make sure that the parties that are going behind and seeing the non-public WHOIS have rules around how they can use that.

There are some questions still pending from the community and others about whether that's logged, whether that's – by the DPAs, about whether it's audited. We expect there's going to be some dialogue about that as we design that code of conduct.

HOLLY RAICHE: You're looking for help?

JOHN LAPRISE: Always looking for help.

THERESA SWINEHART: Just to add on to that, to help with the help, the attachment two of the calzone document, exactly correct – you have it right there – has some additional questions relating to specifically this.

ALAN GREENBERG:    Tijani?

TIJANI BEN JEMAA:    Another question about the data collection. What about the consent? How do you imagine that you will make it in practice? Do you think that the purpose we have now, we have defined now, is the right purpose? Don't you think that perhaps things that are not there?

JOHN LAPRISE:    You won't be surprised to find out that in each room we go in there's a different opinion about some of these points. Some believe we're cutting it too narrowly and we're not just putting WHOIS up in its existing form because clearly there's legitimate use of all of it and why isn't it public? And some are taking the view that we shouldn't be publishing anything ever and that the starting point should be not collecting it and having a use case built for each item that would be collected.

There's a broad approach to this. The document that Theresa held up that shows the models sort of grids them across that. What we're trying to do is get as close as we can to matching it to what we believe are the legitimate purposes for the use of

that data. Only collecting what is going to be used and only publishing what needs to be published.

For example, one aspect of our model, which is very controversial, if you look at our current proposal, there are five different areas where we believe there's very divergent views from the community and the different models and from the discussions we've had.

For example, one of those is e-mail collection, so e-mail collection for the registrant, the tech contact or the admin contact. What we've proposed is actually a very middle of the road approach. Rather than publishing that actual data, we're proposing that there be an anonymized e-mail or web form where you can contact the registrant or the admin or tech contact through that.

As you can imagine, we have different rooms that would say that's the wrong approach. You should be publishing [inaudible]. What are we supposed to do with an anonymized e-mail address? And others are saying that isn't even legitimate for you to put out. People will figure out who that is by the nature of how it's anonymized or the purpose that it's set up from, and aren't you just allowing for collection when someone responds?

We're trying to find those middle edges, and really those are the kinds of things – in particular, those five different areas where we have divergent points like that, like anonymized e-mail, those are the questions we're going to put in front of the DPAs and hope that they give us some guidance on whether we should be zigging or zagging.

ALAN GREENBERG: I suspect some people in some of the rooms are saying anonymized is fine, but who's going to pay for it?

JOHN LAPRISE: Never heard that one.

ALAN GREENBERG: Never heard that one. I'm back in the queue at this point. In the real world, if law enforcement from some other country wants to get access to my data, they have to go through my law enforcement people and there's bilateral agreements and we trust some people and we don't trust others. That's hard to implement in a database.

I'm not asking … We're not going to set the rules, but do you envision there's going to be a way to make sure that the cyber researchers we trust can get access to information in another

country, but the law enforcement that we don't trust can't get access to our information or things like that? How do you envision getting to an end point, not that we're going to set the rules.

JOHN LAPRISE: Yeah, I don't know. I think you're raising a very good point and I think it's one of those challenges [inaudible]. We're hoping that we will be able to obtain some guidance from governments who care very much about their citizenry and who can access data.

ALAN GREENBERG: I have an idea, but we won't talk about it today. Olivier?

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much, Alan. First, on the name calzone. Great.

ALAN GREENBERG: If I may interrupt, the queue is closed at this point.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay, thanks, Alan. The queue is closed. Calzone, yes, cultural implementation of calzone is very different in different parts of the world. You might be quite careful on this.

ICANN 61
COMMUNITY FORUM
SAN JUAN
10–15 March 2018

But, coming back to this, I realize we're focusing purely on WHOIS and on registration directory services. Is ICANN also looking at the GDPR compliance of ICANN itself as a collector of data with its extensive international community that it has? And is it compliant in that respect?

JOHN LAPRISE:     Last year, we named Dan Halloran, Deputy General Council, as our Chief Data Protection Officer for the internal collection and the organization's collection of data. We've done a very deep dive through each and every system that we can find across the whole organization. I think the number of pages collected on it is … Just describing it is in the thousands. We've reached out to our outside law firm – a number of different outside law firms, actually – and we've had analysis of some of those and we're starting to roll back out through each department inside ICANN and we'll be rolling out into the different community groups suggestions and proposals about some things need to be cut out and deleted, some things need to be changed in the way that we collect it or store it. We're doing a very deep dive.

We're assured by all the outside council that we speak to that there are very few entities in the world that will be fully compliant on this in May. So, we probably won't be the exception to that rule, but we're setting priorities and trying to

make sure where we have critical data elements. In particular, PII that could be exploited in some way, that that is the primary focus, and then we'll roll through as other organizations are doing.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND:   Are the RALOs included in this review, as they have an MOU with ICANN and it's a bit of an unclear position.

JOHN LAPRISE:   I'll come back to you on that. I don't know the details of it and I wouldn't pretend to understand the thousands of pages that have been collected.

ALAN GREENBERG:   I know we have other people in the queue, but Theresa and John do have to leave now. I apologize. They apologize.

JOHN LAPRISE:   Definitely. If it was anyone else except the board asking us similar questions, we would stay longer.

ALAN GREENBERG:   Thank you very much for finding the time to come at all.

THERESA SWINEHART:    Thank you, and you know where to find us, too.

ALAN GREENBERG:    We have the last item on our agenda for this session is elections and selections. I will ask Heidi to, first of all, give the general ones of RALO members, of ALAC members, RALO leadership and the other positions that we appoint. Then, we'll go on to special case next.

HEIDI ULLRICH:    Thank you very much, Alan. I wanted to just let you all know that we do have now our 2008 ALAC and RALO election selections and appointments page posted. It is not yet complete. We will be developing the individual RALO pages as well, as normal. But, I did want to go through the proposed schedule. Or did you want me to go through who's up first, Alan?

ALAN GREENBERG:    You can do it whatever order you choose, as long as you take less than about seven minutes to do it.

HEIDI ULLRICH:    Thank you, Alan. If we could scroll to the ALAC selection timetable. Perfect. Thank you.

This is basically one day off of what it was last year, as you would expect. The proposal is to start the elections. Again, this is for the ALAC and the RALOs. We're going to be synchronizing those. That was agreed to a year or so ago and that works well.

Also, it's important that we end prior to ICANN 62, so we can inform the Nominating Committee of who has been selected from our side.

Then, all positions now take their seats at the end of the wrap-up session at the AGM. That will be at ICANN 63 in Barcelona.

Again, because of NARALO having now updated their bylaws, their provision for a 30-day call for notice has now been reduced to be in synch with the normal, all the others. So, we are completely in synch across the RALOs and the ALAC. So, the start will be 30th of April and we'll be doing an announcement. Staff will go ahead and do that.

The 30th of April through the 11th of May is the nomination period. The 18th of May is the deadline for nomination acceptances. We will be reaching out to those people to make sure if they are accepting or not.

Then, if elections are required, they will begin on the 21st of May and on the 25th of May. Again, as I mentioned, all people will be seated at the end of the wrap-up session at ICANN 63.

Any questions there? Eduardo?

EDUARDO DIAZ: I just want to ask if these dates, which we have ROP, which [inaudible] are defined. No specific dates, but timeframes. Do you check that the other RALOs ROPs are in synch with that?

HEIDI ULLRICH: What I believe you're asking is whether all the RALOs have signed off on that. Is that what you're asking?

ALAN GREENBERG: No, I think rules of procedure. I think the question is, is what you're proposing aligned with the rules in all five RALOs? That's if it meets the time constraints.

My recollection is, under the rules that were in effect last year, all four RALOs were identical. NARALO was different. But, the others were all roughly the same.

Some, for instance, said ten days, some said ten business days. So, we're taking the loosest definition. NARALO was different at that point. It had a 30-day call for nominations and that has now been aligned in the new rules. We carefully made sure they were the same.

I believe what we are proposing, but it needs to be verified, meets all of the rules. Whether it meets other constraints the RALOs may have, that needs to be verified.

Heidi asked: do we want to talk about acclimation issues? Acclimation is a process by which if there is only one candidate, that candidate is deemed to be the winner and does not require a vote. That is explicitly in the rules of a number of organizations. It certainly is in the rules of ALAC. It is in the rules of NARALO. I believe it's in the rules of APRALO.

Other RALOs have had procedures by which if someone was the only candidate, they still had to be voted in, which is fine if everyone says yes. And as our friends in LACRALO know, if you have only one candidate, and then everyone votes against them, we have a rather interesting problem.

The answer is I think right now we do not have acclimation rules in every RALO. I believe either we have acclimation or silence, however. I don't think any of the rules say you must have a vote after there is only one candidate. Alberto?

ALBERTO SOTO:            I will speak in English – in Spanish, actually. The thing is when there is only one candidate, we require that this candidate be present, that people know him, and that questions are asked.

So, a direct acclimation, from my point of view, should not exist and there should be at least a call so that candidate can say what they are going to do, etc. I am going to discuss this with Humberto and see whether this is included in LACRALO or not. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG: In the old rules in LACRALO, it was silent on it. I don't know about the new rules you're writing that are not yet in place. I personally would like to see all RALOs and the ALAC synchronize with the same set of rules, because there's a certain amount of fairness, but that's not my call. Humberto?

HUMBERTO CARRASCO: I'm going to be brief. You are right, Alan. Actually, there was silence. So, customarily, in the old rules, we had to have a call to vote. I think this issue will also need to be defined in the new rules of procedure and we will try and see if we can reach an agreement or reach consensus so that we can have standardized rules for everybody.

ALAN GREENBERG: Actually, in the old rules – I hate to tell the LACRALO chair what the LACRALO rules said, but in the old rules [inaudible] the rules. The practice was not a vote be taken, but a poll be taken, the

subtle difference being in LACRALO a vote is weighted based on how many ALSes there are in a country and a poll is not weighted. Each ALS counts for one. That was unwritten. That was just a practice. Next question.

HEIDI ULLRICH:     I don't see anyone else. To summarize that then, Humberto and Maritza, if LACRALO approves that aspect of your new rules before the start of the call for nominations, then we'll incorporate anything new. Is that what I'm hearing?

ALAN GREENBERG:     I am assuming … We're in a really difficult position if the rules change in the middle of an election process. So, I think we're going to need acceptance from the RALO, every RALO, if there is a chance of rules changing, the chance of new rules being adopted in the middle. I believe those new rules are going to have to explicitly have an exception to say they don't apply to the ongoing procedure. But, they may have to cover the things that were silent in the previous procedure. You're probably [inaudible] to do it quickly or wait. Humberto?

HUMBERTO CARRASCO:     Very briefly. We will not have new rules as far as I know until one year's time. But regardless, I believe that within the mediation

process, we can reach an agreement among the participants and perhaps we can extend this to the rest of the region, and perhaps we might apply one criterion if we agree on that in order not to affect other RALOs.

ALAN GREENBERG: Alright. I want to go on to a related subject but a different one, and that is the ALAC chair. There is an ALAC chair selection process this year because this is my second term. This is my automatically renewable terms of the two terms that the rules of procedure call for.

So, regardless of whether I am staying or not, there is a selection procedure. However, I have said I am not staying. My North American RALO term is up this year, and although I am eligible for re-appointment, I am not going to put my name in for re-appointment. So, I will not be on the ALAC next year. By inference, I will not be the chair. So, there will be a chair selection at this point.

There's a decision that needs to be made and it is purely my decision, but I would like to bring it to the group for input and comments. I'm not taking a decision today in any case. That is when we do it.

Normally, the chair is selected enough before the annual general meeting to do the other selections that have to be done as part of it, the ALT in particular.

The other option, however, is to do it before the June meeting. The benefit of doing it before … There may be many benefits, but if you want to summarize it, there's one benefit of doing it before the June meeting is the incoming chair will know that they're going to be the chair and can, to some extent, shadow me as they would normally during the annual general meeting. But, it gives an additional transition period.

The downside is we don't know who the new ALAC members are and therefore they're not eligible to be the chair and we have a much smaller pool.

Now, the rules call for, say, you can select a chair who has a reasonable chance of being on the ALAC. For instance, Javier is off the ALAC as a NomCom appointee at the end, but he's eligible to be reappointed by the NomCom, to be reappointed by the ALAC, by the RALO. So, we could name Javier as chair with the understanding that if he ends up not being here, we have to select a new one pretty quickly. So, the rules allow for that. It's not necessarily an optimal way of doing it. I'll open the floor in a minute, if I may finish speaking, though.

There's pros and cons of both. We will not likely be able to select the chair after the new NomCom people are named because that ends up being too late. We have little control over when they're named. So, we're not going to make a decision today. I'm not planning to call for a vote this week. But, it's a decision that I have to make soon and I would like input either collectively from people or privately, but we have a couple of minutes but not a lot. If we can do one-minute timers. We have a queue. Tijani?

TIJANI BEN JEMAA:     Thank you, Alan. I am a little bit sad that you will leave ALAC. The tradition in ALAC is that the former chair will be vice chair for the new chair, and this is a kind of transition. This time, there will not be this transition. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG:     That's one of the reasons I'm asking the question about making the selection earlier. My original plan had been to step down after three years, but with the At-Large review and accountability and all the other things that got in the way, I didn't feel comfortable doing that. So, we are where we are. I could reverse my decision and run for the seat in NARALO again and maybe they give it to me. But, I've been in either on the ALAC or working closely with ALAC for 12 years and it's probably time to look at other things. I have the same regret you do.

[inaudible] I want to do anything in any other way. Anyone else? Alberto, please.

ALBERTO SOTO:          I do want to speak. Javier dropped his card and he was raising his had.

JAVIER RUA:            Considering the different risks and equities, I really think we should do this as soon as possible. We'll get that out of the way and then we'll have you more time to help out the new one. I agree with that course of action.

ALAN GREENBERG:        Thank you. Seun?

SEUN OJEDEJI:          I think based on the unique situation we are in, we probably should have reviewed the election timeline to kind of bring it further up. So, instead of it starts in April, could we start it in March so we can get the new ALAC members in early, even though they are not yet sitting, which at least we know who the ALAC members can be and then we can [inaudible] the ALAC chair election.

ICANN 61
COMMUNITY FORUM
SAN JUAN
10–15 March 2018

ALAN GREENBERG:    Heidi, you've seen the schedule. When are the selection due to be made, assuming we don't have to do any revotes?

HEIDI ULLRICH:    If there are no votes, then—

ALAN GREENBERG:    If there are no revotes.

HEIDI ULLRICH:    Okay, the 25th of May. Again, ICANN 62 begins end of June and this right now would say that these elections for the RALO and ALAC leadership positions would be ending on the 25th of May if there were elections.

ALAN GREENBERG:    Okay. The June meeting starts on?

HEIDI ULLRICH:    The 26th.

ALAN GREENBERG:    The end of June? So, we have a month. That's enough time to do a chair selection, I believe. It would be close, but it's enough time. The only potential problem is the incoming ALAC members

are not necessarily funded if they're a new person to go to the June meeting. That's something we would think about how to cover. We could probably allow for it. Probably.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: But, we still don't have the ALAC member brought by the NomCom.

ALAN GREENBERG: And I believe it's always going to be too late because we never know how late they're going to make their announcement. They have to make their announcement in enough time for the people to get to the meeting, but travel can work pretty quickly if under duress. Not necessarily enough time for us to do our procedures. I think hat we have to live with, under our current rules of procedure in any case. The rules of procedure are moderately clear on that.

I'm hearing … The only people who have spoken. Javier said do it before [inaudible]. Seun said do it before if we can wait for the new ALAC members to be announced. We have John and Ricardo.

JOHN LAPRISE: I think I would side on the side of continuity. Given everything we have on our plates, I think continuity is the best way forward. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you. Ricardo?

JOHN LAPRISE: Sorry, John Laprise again. So, to have the selection earlier rather than later. Thank you.

RICARDO HOLMQUIST: I support that. And also I have a question. How many people is changing this year other than you? Because in LACRALO we're still the same for the next year. I don't know if … NARALO it seems to be you. But, I don't know in the other RALOs who's going to change.

ALAN GREENBERG: Every RALO does a selection of an ALAC member every year. There's two members in they're alternate years. There's no guarantee it's going to be a different person. There is a selection every year in each RALO. Seun?

SEUN OJEDEJI:     Just a follow-up on what I said the other time. Do we have three weeks after 25th? I still think it won't cost us too much to actually have much more time than three weeks. That could also help us in the planning of whoever is the incoming chair, if it is not already funded to be able to plan it.

ALAN GREENBERG:     So, you're saying if we can move the other elections up by a week or so, let's do it.

SEUN OJEDEJI:     Exactly.

ALAN GREENBERG:     We'll look a that.

SEUN OJEDEJI:     Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG:     We're five minutes into the break right now. I'm willing to stay, but we do have to give our staff – the interpretation and technical staff – a break.

HEIDI ULLRICH:     The next one starts at 3:15.


ALAN GREENBERG:     The next one starts at 3:15 which is in ten minutes, so we're five minutes into the break. I think that's what I said. Wrap-up at this point. No other hands. Meeting is adjourned. We reconvene in ten minutes. The schedule I believe is unchanged and we have a number of interesting talks. One is effective reporting of ALAC, RALOs, and working groups. See you back in ten minutes. 15-minute break.


**[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]**