

---

PANAMA – ALAC and Regional Leaders Working Session (3 of 7)

Monday, June 25, 2018 – 13:30 to 15:00 EST

ICANN62 | Panama City, Panama

ANDREI KOLESNIKOV: The board decision, it took them three months, but it's okay. Let me introduce you, Rod Rasmussen, the chair of SSAC. We also have other SSAC members here in the auditorium. Please raise your hand.

ROD RASMUSSEN: SSAC members raise your hand. There we go.

ANDREI KOLESNIKOV: See, the whole army is here. Here we go. I pass the microphone to Rod, please.

ROD RASMUSSEN: Okay, thank you, Andrei. I report good things back to the ALAC that Andrei has jumped right in, participating in a bunch of our work and contributing already. We appreciate that very much.

We do have a deck. I can see it up there. I don't know if it's being projected, if it can be projected any bigger than that. It's on the left over there. There we go. Thank you. I just want to skip ahead to the next slide. I was going to go a couple slides and ask you a question. Go back one. There we go.

---

**Note: The following is the output resulting from transcribing an audio file into a word/text document. Although the transcription is largely accurate, in some cases may be incomplete or inaccurate due to inaudible passages and grammatical corrections. It is posted as an aid to the original audio file, but should not be treated as an authoritative record.**

---

This is our prepared deck. It's got everything in it that we can talk about. I don't want to go through every single slide ad nauseum. What I really want to do is get your input as to what you'd like to hear about going on.

The main big items that we have, besides just talking about what SSAC is. Is there anybody in the room who is not familiar with SSAC, the Security & Stability Advisory Committee, or can I skip that part? Good. I don't see any hands up. Good.

We've got the name collision analysis project, which we've been working on with the board. That's a big one taking a look at potential net round. What are the things we need to be concerned about with strings that may be dangerous in some way or another in figuring out what may be and how to potentially mitigate those?

We just published SAC 101. That's number three on the list up there, which is a set of recommendations around access to domain name registration data. It talks about rate limiting issues and also several things that are tied into the current GDPR work. Then, we have an Internet of Things project we're working on. We're still in the work party there. We have some preliminary thoughts on things we want to do there, and then other publications we put out. You can skip to the next slide.

Okay. So, that's our standard bit there. We're up to 38 members now. We've added one member after Andrei. We added Tim April is now a member of SSAC. I don't believe he's here. He just joined, so he wasn't

---

eligible for travel. We've published SAC 101 and several other things. Next slide, please.

So, our standard bit about how we develop work product and the formal advice for all we have for the board. You've all seen the slide before because nobody raised their hand saying they hadn't. So, we'll move onto the next slide. Next slide, please.

Okay. I already talked a bit about what the current work parties are. I talked a bit about the big ones, name collisions, operational ... The other big one that we didn't – actually, we should put that at the top is the KSK roll. Let's take a note of that and we'll update this slide deck, maybe. But, the KSK roll is one we're going to be giving out advice. The goal is to get it out by early August or mid-August on ICANN's proposal around the KSK roll and we are very intensely discussing that on quite a regular basis and we're going to be talking about that here as well.

Later this afternoon, be giving a talk on what I've got here is the emerging security topics. What we're going to be talking about today. It's ccNSO Tech Day. We're going to be talking about the hijacking of Amazon's authoritative servers via [inaudible] route injection, BGP hijack to get to the DNS servers to create fake DNS servers to steal people's not BitCoin, but Ehtereum. Same kind of thing. Steal a whole lot of money. Very interesting attack that we're going to be talking about. So, if you're interested in that kind of stuff, we can talk about that. Come by that later on. I think it's at 3:15. Of course, [inaudible] stuff we do.

---

I'm going to pause here and just ask the room if there's any particular areas you want us to deep dive on here and talk about at length, whether it's the NCAP project, the KSK roll, SAC 101. Is there anything? I see, John, you've got your tag up. What areas are you particularly interested in?

JOHN LAPRISE: I'm interested in the KSK roll. Thank you.

HADIA ELMINIAWI: So, I think most of the topics you've wrote up have been discussed thoroughly throughout the past meetings. But the one I think that hasn't been really discussed a lot is the Internet of Things and I see that one of the items that you put up there, so maybe that's the one I would like to hear more about.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: Thank you, because [inaudible] did not get the opportunity to open this meeting. Thank you for that, Andrei. This is [Bastian] speaking, acting on behalf of Alan who is in another important meeting. I want to join Hadia on this. I'm very curious to hear more about what work you guys are doing on the Internet of Things and how that relates to what ICANN stands for, the DNS, etc. I'm looking forward to that.

ROD RASMUSSEN: Good. What I'll do here is then quickly go through other things and we'll spend some more extra time on IOT and KSK. PDQ, right? That's

---

pretty darn quick. Okay, could I have the next slide, please? Next slide, please. We like to repeat ourselves.

Here's some areas that we're taking a look at. This has not changed I don't think since the last time we met with you, so let's go ahead and move on to the next slide.

This is stuff we've done. We put out, actually, several different what we call our communications which are more letters and things like that. Some of that involved some IDN stuff. We've made some comments on our own review process, which is also going on, by the way. I highly encourage you. There was a public comment out about the preliminary review. Please take a look at where the review is on that and add your comments. We'd appreciate that. I'm sure ALAC is probably going to take that up. They usually do.

Fortunately, for us, we're very happy so far with our review for the most part. It sounds like we've had a little bit better experience than ALAC may have had.

Then we made some comments to the NomCom. I think you guys had some comments as well in a similar vein. Those are kind of just correspondences. The big report we did was 101 on the addressing or talking about access to RDS data. Then these are various other things we've got on the hopper going forward for next quarter. Next slide, please.

I just talked about the review. The links are there. If this gets distributed to you guys, then you can click [inaudible]. But of course

---

that's the ICANN website. It's in the normal place for reviews. Again, please provide some input on there. It would be appreciated by all. Then, we're looking for a final report out in November. Next slide, please. If you have any questions, feel free to interrupt. There we go. I think we skipped. I think this is the NCAP, name collisions. That slide turned up blank. It was good on my version. That's just I think a header, so go ahead and go to the next slide.

This is the name collision analysis project. Since you didn't bring up a lot, I'll just give you a quick overview of where we're at. We had a public comment period. I think it says on there we've got a dozen comments or something like that, 14. We're working through the process there. We're actually meeting here. We have an open meeting tomorrow, I believe. Yes, tomorrow. What time? Tomorrow morning. Okay, that's specific. It's on the schedule. That one is open, so if you've got time and want to hear about where we're at on that, we have that session open. Then we have our closed session as well where we'll be doing some more work party work. 10:30, thank you.

We are working with the Board Technical Committee. We had a meeting this morning. We've been working with the office of the CTO as well trying to put together what we're calling an ICANNified project plan for this. We put out our proposal. That was an SSAC [inaudible] proposal, and there are some things that need tightening up. There were questions about, of course, budget as there always would be, but also the work plan itself, how it would be managed, etc. It sounds like OCTO is going to be taking over some of the responsibilities of running parts of the project and obviously once board approves all that. So,

---

we're putting that plan together and we'll be looking towards getting this thing up and really doing analysis and things like that within the next few months, before the next ICANN meeting. Those are the times for the meetings there. So, that's where we're at with NCAP. Could I have the next slide, please? I don't know if there's anything else here on NCAP.

This is important, too. We are extending the membership. We mentioned this before. I'll mention this again because it is very important. We will hopefully be doing this soon is providing an avenue for non-SSAC members who have the technical expertise and interest in participating to join the work party. The plan is to have one of our co-chairs actually be a non-SSAC member. So, this is all our efforts to be more open transparent about this particular project and provide avenues for people who have an interest in this to participate. We will continue to have members, and as I said, one of the co-chairs is the plan. We will hopefully soon have a way of joining. Of course, we're trying to work on several different things at once. Next slide, please.

That's a blank header. This is SAC 101. Greg, you were the lead on that. Do you want to do just some highlights real quick since we didn't get a lot of questions on that?

GREG AARON:

Greg Aaron, SSAC. This paper is one of the more timely and consequential papers we've written in a while we think. It deals with two issues. One is there are legal and policy issues that have come up that are preventing access to WHOIS information by legitimate users

---

and the GDPR, which you've probably heard about is one of the big drivers and the best example.

However, access to the information by legitimate users is also being affected by some technical and operational practices at registries and registers. It's called rate limiting where they decide how often someone can access their WHOIS server. So, we've tackled these two issues.

At the high level here, the things that we said in this paper and why they matter. There are legitimate uses for this data for security purposes. The people who are basically running networks and doing the work that keeps people safe on the Internet use this data and there are legitimate uses for it. Usually, those legitimate uses are also enshrined in privacy laws. The GDPR, for example, lists those kinds of uses as legitimate ones, although there may need to be some rules around exactly how much it's used and so forth. But, there are those things listed as legitimate uses and they can be balanced with the privacy interests.

What we found is basically the access has been lost to a point where it's becoming dangerous. ICANN needs to do more work to ensure that that is balanced. The new temporary specification that registries and registrars are acting under does not provide that balance. Then we have some specific recommendations, if we can go to the next slide. We can go to the next slide after that.



---

One of the things we say here is that we need some mechanisms for these legitimate parties to access the data. Next slide, please. Here are the recommendations.

What hasn't happened is that there is not an overall plan for solving these issues and there's not been for a while. So, we suggested to the board, and the Org, and the community as well that there needs to be an organized plan that fits together several different pieces and these problems need to be solved together.

One, we need a policy-making process that will result in a registration data policy. A policy that says, for example, why the data is collected and legitimate uses of that data. That kind of thing is required under GDPR, for example, but the community has still not created that. We're hoping that there will be an expedited PDP at the GNSO and we can get past that problem.

We are suggesting that the board and the organization move forward with getting the contracted parties to start using the RDAP protocol. That will allow you to identify your users, whether they're legitimate and known or not and we'll be able to allow parties to serve differentiated data on a tiered or gated basis.

We suggested that the board move the remaining thin TLD registries to thick status. That means where all the contact data is held at the registry. This is basically dot-com and dot-net. That was a decision that the community made in a PDP some years ago, but it still hasn't happened. So, we would like that to move ahead.

---

That means the data will be available in a more predictable fashion and people won't have to go to registrars anymore to get WHOIS information. They can get it from the registries, as happens now in most TLDs.

Then we support the creation of an accredited access model. This is a model that's being discussed in the community right now, but basically what it means is you can figure out who has a legitimate interest, say a law enforcement body at a national level or a known security company, and then they will enter into some sort of an agreement for the data. That means that they will have to identify themselves when they make the queries. They'll have to say why they're making those queries. Their use can be logged. And these are ways of showing that they're using the data properly under privacy laws. Then we need to wrap up some of the contractual language around all of these things. Next slide, please.

Just briefly, what we're saying is once you get to that kind of a model, if you're a legitimate user, you should be able to query the domains that you need. The registry or the registrar should not decide how many domain names or rich names you can query or when. Security practitioners are important. Rod, what would you say as far as the last bit?

ROD RASMUSSEN:

Sure. Just an important point here is that query should all be legitimate. Legitimate queries, not just ... Obviously, we're not saying willy-nilly. Then, codifying – next slide, please. So, it should be

---

recommendations 6 and 7 – or 3, 4, 5, actually. Or, 4 and 5. There we go.

We also recommend that there not be any fees imposed until there's a policy development process around that. So, basically you wouldn't use an [RSEP] to do that. You would actually have the community weigh in on that.

Then, a formal risk assessment round. The whole system itself should be part of this. We've asked for this a long time ago and it really should be [inaudible] risks of using, collecting and distributing the data and the risks of not having the data, basically a 360. Next slide, please. They're all point four, apparently. These are all point six.

Then, we have basically ... There's a technicality in that. Some registrars don't publish the same data on the web as they do in Port 43. That should be fixed. The contracts are a bit ambiguous about that, so we'll just make it clear. Then, make sure that all the stuff is actually enforceable by compliance because one of the things we found in doing the rate limiting project was that compliance's hands are kind of tied because they have no tools to use. That's the end of the 101. Do you have a question on that?

HADIA ELMINIAWI:

So, my question is regarding the recommendation to migrate from the WHOIS protocol to RDAP protocol. Is this a requirement actually to fulfill the authentication access control and the security? So, without this migration, that won't be possible? That's the question.

---

GREG AARON: It will be much, much easier. RDAP was designed to provide that kind of a functionality and security and authentication. ICANN asked the registries and registrars to move to RDAP about two years ago, a year-and-a-half ago. But, that did not happen. We need to accelerate it and get it done. The latest thing I heard was that ICANN Org was planning that migration.

HADIA ELMINIAWI: So, unless this happens, the access control and authentication will not be possible?

GREG AARON: You could possibly do it some other ways, but it is also time to bear down.

ROD RASMUSSEN: Most importantly there, there are other ways potentially to [inaudible] together, but nothing that's consistent. Very likely to break and be insecure in and of itself.

HADIA ELMINIAWI: So, actually, we need to wait for that, right, in order to proceed with ...  
No?

---

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: That's a technical migration which could happen in parallel with some of these other things.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: Wait for what?

HADIA ELMINIAWI: If we actually come up with a process and we develop the policies and everything and then we have them ready, can we go forward or do we need for the migration from the WHOIS protocol to the RDAP protocol?

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: You could start the migration to RDAP now soon, and then policy could follow on. Then you'd be ready.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: You wouldn't want to delay it, if that's the question.

HADIA ELMINIAWI: Yeah.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: That would be a gating factor at that point.

ROD RASMUSSEN: IOT is next, I think, so if we could do two slides and get to the part you were looking for. Yeah, DNS and IOT. Christian, do you want to walk

---

through the IOT problems? At this point, we have a work party where – Christian is walking up here. We have a work party where we’ve been looking at this problem or a while and we have a proposal within the work party. You’re going to get to see a little bit of the sausage making here as we’re going. This is an idea we have that hasn’t fully baked yet, but we thought it would be interesting to share.

CHRISTIAN:

Thank you, Rod. I’m Christian [inaudible]. I’m with the SSAC. As Rod said, this is a preliminary idea. So, what we’ve been looking into is – four minutes? Alright.

What we’ve been looking into is what are the challenges that the IOT poses on the domain name system. We basically identified two. One is actually the DDoS attacks that IOT devices may generate. As you may remember, there have been several attacks on DNS operators over the past few years and we expect that this problem will, at the very least, increase because the number of devices that will be connected to the Internet will also increase and they will be able to generate large amounts of traffic and we expect that the number of affected devices – so, devices that are insecure – will also increase. So, this is potentially a risk for the security and stability of the DNS.

A second motivation for our work is that the IOT devices, so there are going to be more of them, and we suspect that some of them might be using the DNS in a different way than servers and laptop computers currently do. This is because IOT manufacturers are from different background and they use different types of software, so the DNS

---

stacks that they use, the software stacks, may actually differ per IOT device.

Another motivation is that, at least that's something we want to investigate, is that some IOT devices may have on board validating resolvers which might increase the problem of the KSK root rollover because IOT devices are notoriously hard to update in terms of software. Next slide, please.

So, our proposal is to basically set up what we call an IOT security lab. The objective of that lab is to bring IOT-related information into the DNS ecosystem. At least that's our current thinking.

That would help us in two ways. It would enable better incident response. For instance, if there's a large botnet generated DDoS attack, for instance, on the root or on other levels in the DNS, and it would potentially also help as a community to improve our policy-making that is related to the IOT.

This IOT security lab would basically do four things. It would measure the DNS behavior of IOT devices. So, are they actually using the DNS in a different way than from what we've traditionally seen? What are vulnerabilities of IOT devices? And what is the DNS behavior of the botnets that infect these devices? So, these botnets may use the DNS as a target, but they may also use it as a communications channel, for example.

A fourth element would be to also look into how IOT devices are concentrated on the Internet.

---

Is there a third slide? Okay. Next slide, please. This is way too small. Let me give you a quick overview here.

This is our current thinking of what this IOT lab could look like. There are two roles. One is what we call an IOT lab coordinator which is the box in blue at the top. And there is a lab operator.

The lab operators are basically folks or organizations that focus on analyzing IOT devices. In particular, their security properties and also how they use the DNS. So, the lab operators are basically ... Their focal point is IOT devices, individual IOT devices.

Then we have the lab coordinator, which is basically closer to the ICANN remit or ICANN realm, if you will. Its role is to combine DNS information with IOT information and turn that into Internet response information that the operational community can use or produce [inaudible] information that we can use in the SSAC, for example, to provide input to policy making.

So, there are two roles. One is lab coordinator, which combines all the information in terms of DNS measurements and IOT measurements and there's a lab operator role that basically focuses on obtaining information about individual IOT devices.

That's our current thinking and this is something that we're trying to flesh out right now. So we are looking into potential players for the different roles. We're trying to flesh out what kind of companies could potentially play these roles and that sort of thing. Next slide, please.



---

ROD RASMUSSEN: Oh, it's blank. This would say Q&A on IOT. So, questions?

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: The lab you mentioned there is not something similar that the one set up in Argentina, [inaudible] last year?

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: I'm not aware of that lab. I'm not sure what that is.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: Okay. The people from [inaudible] put something like an IOT lab in there, just to check some of the things that you mentioned in your slide.

CHRISTIAN: Okay. We'll take that into account. Thank you.

ROD RASMUSSEN: Let me add that there are other people doing IOT labs. This one will be focused on DNS as the driver rather than necessarily effects on in-home networks.

CHRISTIAN: Yeah. The focus here is specifically on the impact on the DNS. So, it's specifically about the combination of IOT and DNS.

---

ROD RASMUSSEN: Other questions?

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you. Does the work that the SSAC is doing on IOT security inherently mean that ICANN is ready to take a leadership role in IOT security?

ROD RASMUSSEN: It's not necessarily one follows the other. This is an area that we've gotten a lot of feedback from the community that they wanted SSAC to take a look and this is how we've approached it at this point.

I think the approach we're proposing – potentially proposing here, I'm going to call this a potential proposal – would allow for that to happen, depending on the role that ICANN would want to take in either helping coordinate or stand up or encourage others to stand up given budget considerations and things like that.

But, in general, getting the idea of the impact on the DNS into the thinking process around IOT is an area I think that's well within – and should be – something that ICANN would be doing because it's the center of what we're at. We'll see if we can come out with at least something that would star that process.

CHRISTIAN: Also, even if you want to think about taking a leadership role here, you first need to understand what the problem really is. What are we

---

talking about? So, we need to build up that expertise before we can make any decisions about leadership roles.

ROD RASMUSSEN: Okay. Any other questions on this one before I move on?

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: A follow up?

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: This is just a personal comment in that I welcome the fact that you're looking at this. thank you.

ROD RASMUSSEN: Thank you. It was fun, on top of that. This is the kind of work that we like to do in SSAC rather than a bunch of the other stuff we get stuck with once in a while. So, go to the next slide, please. Thank you, Christian. These are recent publications. I'm going to basically skip through this stuff and get to ... We don't have a slide on KSK roll. I don't know how we managed to do that. Joe, would you like to come up and talk about what we're doing with the KSK roll since I see you're sitting over there and you're co-chair of the work party? We had a couple of people who wanted to hear about the KSK roll. Russ, I'm sorry. Russ, come on up. Here's our co-chairs in this work party. They can tag-team this.

---

RUSS MUNDY:

We're in a somewhat different position than either the two products we've talked about already from SSAC. One has been published and the other has been worked on fairly extensively and it's relatively settled down in terms of a final say. The KSK roll work party has been – was driven by a letter sent by the board to SSAC, RSSAC, and RZERC, essentially asking us, the three groups, to respectively provide advice on whether or not the KSK rollover plan should be resumed as currently planned, which if that happens, that would result in the KSK rollover occurring on October 11<sup>th</sup> of this year.

So, that's the basic question. Let me turn it over to Joe to get his view on where we are and what we can say, which isn't a great deal.

JOE ABLEY:

Joe Abley. Russ and I co-chair this little working group. This is a working group that has a fairly compressed timeline because the board gave us a recommended date where they'd really like feedback from. We're effectively contributing towards the same question that was asked in the public comment period around the ICANN staff document that proposed to restart the role and ultimately roll the key on whichever date in October it was. 18<sup>th</sup> of October?

RUSS MUNDY:

I think it's 11<sup>th</sup>.

---

JOE ABLEY:

11<sup>th</sup>, okay. We have a healthy group of people who are very engaged and we are looking at a number of longitudinal axes around the current plan with the view to giving advice to the board as to how they might make a decision about whether to proceed. It's important to realize that we are not going to recommend whether to proceed or not. We are trying to give advice to the board as to how they should make that decision and things that they should think about.

An example that we've talked about at some length is has the outreach as advised by ICANN staff that has happened in public around the plans to roll the KSK, has that reached the right audience? Has that been sufficient? Has that been measurable in a sense that they can reasonably say or assess that that was sufficient in order to continue? We have a number of different axes like that that we're assessing.

We've met I think three times so far, four times, and we'll meet one more time tomorrow for an hour. So, it is fairly early days. We don't currently have ... We have a lot of working documents where we're collecting idea. We don't yet have something that looks like an SSAC advisory which we're reviewing. So, it's an early stage in the process. But, certainly, if there's any advice from anybody else as to aspects that are relevant specifically to this community, by all means, feel free to mention them because there are no bad questions. We will hold them, again, with the goal of trying to assess the current plan, the state of the operations, the various external studies that have happened on the data that has been collected as such, so that we can

---

get the board the best framework we can to allow them to make the decision.

RUSS MUNDY:

I'd like to add just one more thing. The timing of this meeting is slightly awesome with respect to this, but this morning was the DNSSEC workshop. A big focus of the discussion in the DNSSEC workshop was this exact issue and the workshops are, of course, recorded and the Adobe Connect sessions are recorded. So, if folks want to look at those, they will probably be posted relatively soon – I think this week. The discussions that occurred in that workshop I want to make it clear were not anything that directly reflects SSAC's view, if that's what ALAC was interested in hearing about. But it does reflect the broader community's view of some of the discussions and some of the things that were being considered.

So, if folks want to look at it and review the session, hear what folks are saying. And please, feel free, as Joe said, there's no bad questions, contact any of us individually and we will be happy to put in additional thoughts and ideas that you all may have and want to add in at this point. Thanks.

ROD RASMUSSEN:

Questions? Wow, we satisfied you, John? Oh, Olivier. Of course Olivier has a question.

---

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much. And Rod, you're always looking right, for some reason. Right, right here, [inaudible]. I'm just picking up on a point actually that the discussion on the root KSK rollover. The ALAC tried to bring this to attention to the GAC during the last meeting that took place in Puerto Rico. We were told in a rather blunt way that really it's the SSAC that deals with this sort of thing. I wondered whether the SSAC had already been speaking to the GAC about their root KSK rollover, mentioning the fact that it's a real concern in our community because the requirement pushed the thing back for a while and our community only can go so far with doing outreach in our own respective countries.

As I said, my question was has the SSAC touched on this with the GAC?

JOE ABLEY:

I don't believe we've made any direct comment to the GAC. We've expressed a lot of opinions as an advisory committee in a bunch of previously published documents which contained commentary about the KSK roll in general and also specific advice to ICANN the Organization about how they should handle it. Part of what we're doing right now is reassessing that and trying to work out where there are any recommendations there that were made in the past that we think haven't been implemented and should be. Maybe that's part of our response to the board. But, it's early days to say what a conclusion of that is.

I think our advice has been to the whole community, not specifically to the GAC.

---

ROD RASMUSSEN: I can validate that we have not made any specific outreach to the GAC on this particular issue.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: Alan, go ahead.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you. Two points. Just a follow-on on that. To be clear, the GAC didn't tell us it shouldn't come from us. A GAC member told us who are we to talk about a security issue? The implicit part of – and to scare the hell out of all these government representatives who are new to ICANN anyway, and it should come from SSAC.

In terms of ... We spent a fair amount of time at the last meeting discussing this, the rollover. One of the thoughts that we had is we've got a large community on the ground, pretty well everywhere in the world. Not every city, but most countries, who are in general not technical people. We were looking for ways that somehow we could use that community to either spread the word or relieve, reduce the tension. One of the things we came up with was if you simply query a DNS-protected site that has a bad key. And I forget what the right ... There's a few websites around the place. If you get to the site, then obviously you do not have DNSSEC enabled. I'm trying to remember the right URL, but I can't right now.





---

will facilitate this stuff and it's proceeding for the IETF quite quickly, which is something that's like a fast glacier.

We think that there's going to be some experiments and some end user tools that are possible through that soon. Whether or not that's possible by October this year seems doubtful. Part of the commentary that we give to the board will observe that there will be more opportunities for this kind of tool and this kind of measurement later, which might guide them as to when this first key roll would happen.

To your second point, though, which is what kind of messaging can a non-technical end user use when they go and talk to their ISP, in the session that Russ mentioned this morning, I did a presentation that described a similar kind of exercise where I was talking actually to technical end users and the difficulties I had with that.

So, talking to non-technical users and trying to get that message through is an order of magnitude more complicated than that. I think there are some miracles we can hope that will happen within our lifetimes and there are others that perhaps are not worth spending our time on and I'm not sure in which category that one falls, but it is a very complicated message to say I would like to talk to you about a very obscure component of the DNS which may or may not cause a problem next year sometime, maybe. That's a really complicated conversation to have, especially when you're talking to people like ISP help desks that are already running on slim margins and don't really have the time to deal with non-urgent problems

---

So, I think it's great to think about how we could make that better, but I think it's a hard problem.

ALAN GREENBERG:

The only thing we came up with is, essentially, a URL to point them to. Tell your third-level guy to look at this and they may understand it because you're not going to. Now, two-third of those will ignore it. A third may pass it on and it may be useful. It's clear that the tool is not going to tell you whether you're okay and it's not clear that the [inaudible] will really address the issue because it's only going to be people who adopt new software who are going to have it anyway and they're probably the ones who may be okay.

But, the real issue is can we reassure some people and perhaps alert the others who might have a problem? We think it may well be worth ... We're in a position to reach communities that you're not likely to be able to reach. ICANN is contacting the top thousand ISPs in the world, but these probably aren't the top 1000 ISPs.

JOE ABLEY:

Thank you for that. We've already [inaudible]. I want to give Alberto the opportunity for a quick, short last question.

ALBERTO SOTO:

With respect to what Alan was saying a few months ago, I took a URL. I posted it, published it, in two or three places in my field and I received some 50 replies rather quickly. The only thing I said was, yes or no, and

---

they would reply to me. Yes, I can access that URL. No, I cannot access to it. They replied to me. This is how I have some sites in Asia-Pacific, some in the US, some others in Latin America, that have not accessed. This is then telling me that they have [inaudible].

I asked LACNIC what to do. My idea was that the end users would need to communicate with us and then we would need to communicate to you or LACNIC or whoever it is, and then to have sort of an intermediate scale with people like us who do have knowledge about this issue and then to reach to you more quickly.

We can also reach out with our ALSes to ISPs, universities, etc. that have the possibility to have this kind of issue. Thank you.

JOE ABLEY:

Alright. I think that sounds really interesting. I think that's a nice layered way of introducing the question. I especially liked the way that the initial question was very simple. Can you load this or can you not load this? That seems like a good starting point to try and get people who are interested communicating so you have that channel. Yeah. I would like to talk more about this. I think the advice is probably not for SSAC to coordinate this kind of outreach, but it's certainly the kind of pointer that we could provide to ICANN as they continue their preparations for the key roll.

---

RUSS MUNDY: If you had a short e-mail already written up in the URL [inaudible], if you could e-mail that, that would be great. My e-mail address that I get a zillion messages on already is [mundy@tislabs.com](mailto:mundy@tislabs.com).

ROD RASMUSSEN: Okay. We are over time. So, I'd like to thank you for the opportunity to collaborate again, as usual. I look forward to doing that again next time. If you have further questions, grab one of the SSAC members you saw waving earlier and ask away. Thanks.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: Thank you very much. Give them a hand. Thanks, guys. We really appreciate you coming and having these discussions with us. Well, the SSAC members are leaving. Alan, once again, will be taking over position as chair of the meeting. Thank you. I'm the chair so I can [inaudible].

ALAN GREENBERG: Alright. The two high-interest cross-community sessions this afternoon are one on work track 5, and Javier who is somewhere – there we are – is going to give us a bit of a quick introduction. Work track 5 of the gTLD PDP is perhaps the most participated in by At-Large of any PDP in history. So, this group has a fair amount of knowledge already, I think, but if you can give us just literally a five-minute summary of what we can expect and how would you think we could optimally both gain knowledge from it and participate.

JAVIER RUA-JOVET:

Sure. Thanks. Javier Rua-Jovet for the record. So, yes, we have this session at 15:15. Maybe some of you participated in the capacity building we had May 23<sup>rd</sup>, one of those capacity buildings set up by Tijani. We spoke about what work track 5 is and what it isn't.

As you all know, we have a new gTLD subsequent procedures PDP going on, a GNSO PDP. It has several work tracks. Work track 5, which is the youngest of those work tracks, started recently. It deals exclusively with geographic names at the top level. What does that mean? Geographic names, right of the dot at the top level.

The work track 5 is set up with several co-chairs. An ALAC co-chair, but we have of course Olga Cavalli from GAC, we have Annebeth Lang from ccNSO, and we have Martin Sutton from GNSO. That leadership structure reflects the high interest across communities that justifies the cross-community meeting we're going to have in an hour or so.

So, geographic names at the top level. What are we discussing? We are discussing country and territory names, two-character letter-letter, and also three-character codes from the ISO list. What is going to be the treatment for that. We're tasked basically with whether or not we're going to have changes to current [inaudible] policy in the 2012 guidebook, whether we're going to keep things as they are or make changes.

---

The things we're discussing are country and territory names in the ISO. Capital cities, what is going to be the treatment of that? Non capital cities, what is going to be the treatment of that? UNESCO regions.

So, whether or not or we're going to keep the current treatment that tends to favor non-objection letters by public authorities, whether that will stay the same, whether that will be tweaked.

There's also categories that are not in the Applicant Guidebook, like country and territory names ... I mean, like territorial, geographical indicators that are not there, rivers, lakes, mountains, names that might be significant to cultural groups, minority groups, etc.

So, in the meeting we're going to have, we're going to basically say where we're at, what we've discussed, where there's perhaps a little bit more consensus and what are the things that are still open. I think the really open topics are right now what's going to be the treatment for capital cities and also non capital cities. I think that discussion will also influence a lot what the treatment will be for geographic names that are not in the Applicant Guidebook.

All this is in view to draft an initial report as soon as possible. I think it's going to be probably late July, hopefully before August. So, we're a bit behind the other work tracks that are soon to have their initial reports, etc.

So, that's basically the flavor of what we're doing. I think At-Large has a lot to offer in this discussion. I really urge you to get in there and chime in. Discussions in work track 5 tend to be a bit binary, like

---

people that tend to favor states views, GAC type views, versus people that tend to favor more open and brand views. I think At-Large can be very effective in understanding both sides because we have a very varied set of people here and we have some good people participating in work track 5, but we can always use more.

If you chime in now in the process, it's going to be really impactful I think and it's going to give you, as I think Alan said in the morning, rights to chime stronger afterwards when the comment periods starts, etc. So, that's basically it for now. Thanks.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Thank you. I'll add one more quick comment. The ALAC, when this ALAC formed after last AGM, we had a strategy session, an engagement session, and as a sample example of talking about a policy issue, we talked about work track 5. It was interesting. The outcome from that group, basically which was answering the question should governments have ultimate ability to get any name they want or should commercial enterprises and trademarks win?

The answer that came out almost all around the room was we don't care, but the process should end up with no strong winners and losers. Somehow we have to find a balance. Most of the people around the room didn't really care about the details, but the balance and not destroying ICANN along the way was one of the outcomes. It's just interesting and how it will play out in the long term, that one meeting doesn't necessarily dictate anything.



---

Tijani, unless it's something very, very short, we need to go on to the next item. But, intervene if you want something. No?

Next item is the second session this afternoon, specifically on a new acronym we've never heard before, or not many of us have heard before, EPDP. Leon is going to talk a little bit about – very little about – what an EPDP is and, more important, why are we bothering to do one now or why do we have to do one now? Leon?

LEON SANCHEZ:

Thank you, Alan. Thank you for having me here back again. It's always a pleasure to be back home. So, the EPDP, as Alan rightly points, is a new word for all those who collaborate here in ICANN. It's a new word because never before we had an expedited PDP, or expedited policy development process. This has been triggered by the fact that the board approved a temporary specification, so that contracted parties could comply with the GDPR and its contractual obligations to ICANN.

We are, at this point, or the GNSO has been charged with the responsibility of carrying out this expedited PDP to form what would be the definitive model that would be incorporated to the contracts or the contracted parties, so that they could in the end comply with the GDPR and with their contractual obligations.

The expedited PDP, as per the bylaws, may not take more than one year. It's a process that needs to be carried out within a year, and that is a year counting from when the temporary specification was enacted

---

which is now almost a month ago. That was May 25<sup>th</sup> when the GDPR was entered in effect.

The session that we will be holding is led by the GNSO. Let's remember that this is a policy development process that is carried out by the GNSO. It's owned by the GNSO. But, of course, the intent is to listen to all the voices and all the stakeholders that may be affected by the outcome of this policy development process, of course end users amongst them.

Some of the topics or the key topics that are intended to be discussed during the session are the composition of the EPDP team or what will be the criteria for membership selection. Will different SOs and ACs be able to actually appoint people to this team? How these people appointed to work with this team will actually interact with the team. Will they have a vote? Will they have only a say?

So, we are in uncharted territory here, as this is a first within the ICANN community. We need to be flexible and we need to also be accommodating of the needs from the different stakeholders in the community.

There will also be a discussion on EPDP team leadership. How is this going to form? Who is going to conform it? The EPDP scope, and this of course goes tied to what the mission, the purposes, the objectives, goals, deliverables and timeframes are for this EPDP. It should of course be seen in my mind, and I'm of course just thinking out loud here, it should be within the remit or within the text of the temporary specification.

---

There will also be some decision-making methodologies discussed for this EPDP, and the status reporting – of course, follow – and hopefully the establishment of procedures for resolution and escalation processes.

So, this is the main agenda for this second session this afternoon. I definitely encourage all of you to participate in this session. It is a topic that I think is really important for end users all over the world. I think we have great responsibility to feed into this process to collaborate actively and constructively.

Now I would open the floor for comments or questions.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Actually, we weren't going to open the floor, but Tijani did put his card up and we'll honor it. We're already well into the next session, so Tijani, one-minute timers, please. Go ahead.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA:

Thank you. Every time I want to speak, it is very tight. No problem. What I heard from the GNSO people is that this is GNSO work and it shouldn't be a cross-community working group and the CEO asked them to find a way to make the other parts of the community participate. They said perhaps I don't know information for the other community, but the PDP will be done only by the GNSO.

So, I think that if this is true, this will be a normal GNSO working group with GNSO rules and we will also watch it from afar. Perhaps they will

---

inform us from time to time and that's all. This is for me a real concern. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG:

To be clear, this is a GNSO process. Other GNSO processes allow other parts of the community to participate. We are expecting to have other parts of the community participate. Tomorrow, they will be starting to draft the charter. This meeting has been scheduled today to get input into that process and to tell us what their current thinking is.

I would suspect if they end up saying no one has a say other than GNSO people, there's going to be a rather large outcry. I'm not predicting that, but we'll have to wait and see. Olivier, please, quickly.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: I'll be very quick. My question is, Leon, you mentioned an EPDP should be one year maximum. What happens if it gets longer than that?

LEON SANCHEZ:

Thank you, Olivier. So, what happens is that this year the temporary specification is valid and in effect for contracted parties, and if we cross that line of one year, then the contracted parties would not be [obliged] to follow the temporary specification. That's what would happen if we cross that line of one year. That's why this EPDP needs to actually end by this timeline.

---

ALAN GREENBERG: Just for the record, EPDP, the whole concept was only invented a couple of years ago because it was believed that there would on occasion be a need to do a PDP quickly. The standard PDP, if everything goes perfectly and no one has any real thing to discuss will still take about nine or ten months and that's not likely to be the case on any substantive issue. So, the EPDP was developed and its fortuitous because we now need it. Thank you, Leon.

LEON SANCHEZ: Thank you, Alan.

ALAN GREENBERG: You're welcome to stay with us for the next session if you have any interest. We're just talking about the mission of ALAC and At-Large in ICANN. May not be of any interest to you.

LEON SANCHEZ: Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG: Let me give you a little bit of history about why this session is on the agenda. There are a number of things that triggered it and a few things that reinforced it once it happened to be on the agenda.

One of the things that triggered it is during a number of RALO discussions and other working group meetings over the last couple of months, there has been significant talk, as there always is in At-Large,

---

about outreach. Some of the things I was hearing did not meet my model of At-Large. Essentially, people who are believing that outreach is the reason we're here. That, as I said, triggered some reaction for me.

The second thing is you'll all recall the letter that the NCSG sent to the board which explicitly said ... Well, it said a variety of things. It said, well, At-Large individuals can be part of policy things, but the ALAC shouldn't be. It also said At-Large shouldn't be part of policy development things. It wasn't a consistent message. But, there was a clear message saying we should stick to our own business and not the business of SOs. That goes directly against about the kind of things that Tijani was saying.

The last thing which reinforced having put it on the agenda is ... Before you start putting your hands up, you really want to hear the whole thing of what I'm going to say. Comments from a number of senior ICANN people at this meeting saying, "Why are we not hearing anything about the impact of GDPR on users?" I'm talking really senior people. And they're right.

There have been lots of comments and discussion in At-Large. Most of them have focused on what will the privacy commissioners allow and what will the courts allow? And what is right? But, very, very little of it has been what's the impact on users? That's why we're here.

I'm going to read the section in the ICANN bylaws that defines the At-Large Advisory Committee because as you may have known, if you read the bylaws, At-Large community is not the entity the bylaws

---

create. The ALAC is what is created and then the At-Large community is a result of it – not the other way around.

It says, “The At-Large Advisory Committee (or ALAC) is the primary organizational home within ICANN for individual Internet users. The role of the ALAC shall be to consider and provide advice on the activities of ICANN insofar as they relate to the interest of individual Internet users.” Not registrants, users.

“This includes policies created through the ICANN Supporting Organizations as well as the many other issues for which the community input and advice is appropriate.” Very, very wide-ranging.

“The ALAC plays an important role in ICANN’s accountability mechanisms, and also coordinates some of ICANN’s outreach to individual end users.”

So, notice the order of that. Our main reason is to comment on behalf of end users. Since we’re here, we might as well do some outreach. Now, we also do outreach to try to recruit people, but it’s therefore recruiting people to do the primary operations. And that’s the whole crux of it.

I think we need to make sure that all of our people throughout the whole At-Large community, because now we’re talking about the whole group, understand why we’re here.

In listening to lots and lots of conversations, I get the feeling that there’s not a good understanding of that. As we go into implementing the At-Large review, we have sessions later on in the week which will

---

talk about the role of individuals. And I say individuals, not unaffiliated members – different. And the roles of ALSes. How are we going to meet the promises we made, the commitments we made, in the At-Large review proposal?

A core to that, I think, is understanding and remembering why we are here. Despite what an unmentioned letter said, we are here to talk about policy and accountability and all those other things that potentially impact users.

I think it's really going to be important as we go forward for us to get clear in our minds how these things affect users and why are we focusing? It comes down to another discussion we'll be having later on in the week about how we get involved in policy activities and how we do comments. How do we decide what we want to comment on?

It all focuses around a real understanding of why we are here. I'm going to open the floor at this point. I've talked enough. I see we have two hands so far, or three. We have Tijani, Kaili, and Olivier.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA:

Thank you, Alan. Thank you for reading the bylaws part regarding the ALAC. I have it on my desktop as well as the MoU we have signed with ICANN. Those are my Bible. And thank you very much to remind us of this part of the bylaws.

When I joined At-Large, AFRALO, ALAC, the word ...



---

ALAN GREENBERG: Tijjani, if I may interrupt – sorry, the one minute was for the last thing. Let’s do two-minute timers right now and give Tijani the benefit of the doubt and start him over again at two because I’ve interrupted him.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: When I joined, the word that was the fashion, if you want – in French, we say [inaudible] – was outreach. It was because people felt that we are not recruiting enough ALSes, enough members, and outreach was one of the, let’s say, main targets of the organization at that time. That’s perhaps why people still think that outreach is one of the main parts of their work.

But, of course, outreach is to have members and to have working members to undertake our mission, the actions in our mission.

I fully agree with you, Alan, but I also would like to come to those sessions or discuss why we are here because I think there is a very strong and very big misunderstanding about why we are here.

When I came here, it was outreach. Now it is policy development. I am really afraid. We are not here for policy development. We are here for policy participation, contribution, advice, but not only for that. And Alan just read it was two parts. It was advice and it was anything which is related to the interest of end users. So, we are here for the interest of end users. Thank you.

---

ALAN GREENBERG:

Thank you. Outreach is really important, as long as we're outreaching to reach people who are going to work, not just members. The numbers don't count.

Let me make one comment. And I'm not going to try to answer everything, but Tijani triggered something. Why did we spend so much effort on accountability? It's not because it said accountability in the bylaws. I'll give you the answer. It's not a hard answer. It is important for us that ICANN is accountable and ICANN has credibility because if ICANN ceases to exist, users do not have a seat at the ITU and other UN organizations. We do have a seat, according to this bylaw, at ICANN and it's crucial be ICANN be credible, because otherwise we disappear with ICANN. That's why we care about accountability. It was directly linked to users. Kaili?

KAILI KAN:

Also, some recent developments of the [inaudible] triggered me to rethink about the transition period which happened about two years ago. ICANN being detached from the US government. Before, it was a contracted relation. So, what was the case when ICANN was underneath the US government? Despite the nationalism or whatever, that US government or [DOC] is a regulator, I think, no question about that. And that regulator by whom, because as you [inaudible], sort of democratically and then ... So, it's elected by the consumers or end users, voters. Who do they regulate? They regulate the industry. So, in that sense, it is the end users, the consumers, to regulate the industry itself.

---

However, after the transition, is ICANN still representing the end users, the consumers, to regulate the industry? I don't know. So, I see that might be a missing part when we look at that transition. I think from there on, we can see where should ICANN stand and what ICANN should be, which is still not clearly defined yet. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you. The queue is closed. I have Olivier, Hadia, Yrjo, Sebastien, and Alberto. Next is Olivier.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much, Alan. May I go at the end of the queue, please? I'd like to speak after everyone.

ALAN GREENBERG: Hadia?

HADIA ELMINIAWI: So, I have a quick comment, Alan. You started or you did mention that we are here because we need to clarify and point out why we are actually here. My question is why do you think that the ALAC members don't know why they are here? I believe that we all know exactly why we are here. We do represent the interest of the end users.

I think the problem lies not within us, but the problem lies outside this committee. The problem lies, the problem exists, because others don't really see our role and don't know why we exist. I'm not sure ... Okay,

---

it's very good what you're doing right now, but I'm not sure that it will actually resolve or solve any of the problems our committee is actually facing. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Thank you. I'll answer that very briefly. I'll be glad to talk to you offline and give you some examples that may be counter to what you just stated. The understanding of why we are here is not as clear as you may have it. That's perhaps unfortunate, but I believe that's the case. Certainly, if you go into the rest of the At-Large community, it is very much not understood.

YRJO LANSIPURO:

I want to thank you, Alan, for what you said, because at least in my mind, there's no doubt that our main reason of existence is that we try to influence the ICANN policy on behalf of end users. That's policy.

We don't represent the four billion end users in the political sense, but we should know – we should try to know – what their needs are and then defend, articulate those needs, and defend them. [inaudible] we need the knowledge. We should really take seriously trying to know what the end users really need and want.

The other thing is that we should try to formulate common ALAC positions or questions like geographic names, GDPR, whatever, because only if we can present a common position, even at a lowest common denominator level are we taken seriously. Thanks.

---

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you, Yrjo. Sebastien?

SEBASTIEN BACHOLLET: I will not do as my friend has already done. I would like to be the last one, but ... Thank you for bringing this conversation. I totally agree with you, Alan, that unfortunately I am not sure that even within our group we are clear on what is our main mission and why we are here.

I would like to put a few words on that. The first one is that I think the bylaw, even though we change it not so long ago, it's wrong. ALAC is not the home of end users. What is the home of end users is our global organization of ALSes, RALOs, and ALAC. But, nobody understands in this ICANN organization since the beginning that when we talk about ALAC, we talk about 15 people, but they talk about all the structure and we are here with a big difficulty of understanding each other and knowing where we are because there is a discrepancy.

I would like very much, we spend some time and somebody spends some time to find a name for the structure, the overall structure, and leave the ALAC for the 15 people.

Outreach is not the main goal, but I want to remind you that from the first At-Large Summit, one of the ideas came out, as we have a way of talking about ICANN is one world, one Internet, we wanted to talk about one country, one ALS. Not to say that you can't have more than one ALS, but at least you have one.

---

I guess we do the simple thing going in the country where we are already, but going to a new country, it's not so easy. Sorry, I know. Ding-ding.

I want to send me now [inaudible]. Supporting organizations, we really think just about GNSO. We talk about GNSO. We [inaudible] GNSO. But, what about ISO and what about ccNSO? We really need to find a way to be more proactive in exchanging with them. I know that we have a liaison to the ccNSO. I know. But, we need to do better.

And I just want to give you one example. When I was at RIPE meeting in Marseilles a few days ago, one of the discussions was that it seems that it's going on in all the areas. Do we still need to be involved within ICANN? I [shortened] the question. But, if we end up with the CC saying that we are outside, the [inaudible] outside and tomorrow the registry and registrar decide that they have their own organization and they will just come back sometime to talk with who, maybe us, to say what they have decided. ICANN model will be ... How it ends the ICANN multi-stakeholder model will not exist anymore.

It's why it's important that we are here and we need to be the voice of end users, the worldwide end user, the voice. Not we are talking on behalf of, but we need to be the voice.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Thank you. I'll make only one very brief comment. One country, one ALS, whichever way it is, is only meaningful if those people actually

---

participate. Just being able to tick off a country doesn't help us a lot. Next we have Alberto.

ALBERTO SOTO:

When Tijani said that he went to his ALS and RALO, well, it happened to me exactly the same, but Tijani, when we started, end users didn't exist at that time. That was a long time ago. At that time, perhaps it was okay to say that outreach should be focused to get one ALS or more than one ALS. But, now, we have more, many ALSes.

So, I believe that we should change our vision, our point of view, our target for the outreach. I mean, we don't have to have or say one country, one ALS. We don't have to abandon that idea, but at least we have to do outreach, policy outreach. We have to get to those ALSes, particularly to reach end users and to get from them feedback, enough feedback, because we need the 15 of us. We do need that feedback so that we can get results and so that we can prove our activities and our work and nobody will ever say again that we are not working. ALAC and [inaudible], we have to do that and we have to focus outreach on what we want to – I mean, we want to reach end users.

For example, we can talk about the KSK rollover. We can reach out to them and see what they think about that, or perhaps we can take some other point. In order to modify existing policies or in order to create new policies because we need to change our point of view on outreach. Thank you.

---

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you, Alberto. Olivier? And we are two minutes from the end of the session.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much, Alan. I just wanted to thank you for bringing this topic forward into this discussion because of the recent events and discussions that have been taking place outside of the ALAC and At-Large that we're not doing policy, etc.

So, to square off what we're saying – and I was going to read the bylaws, and the very fact that you read the bylaws themselves when you introduced this topic, I would like to perform what's called in the US a mic drop. Now, if you don't know what a mic drop is, check it out. The only problem, we haven't got the money for this, so I'll do a card drop instead. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you, Olivier. Tijani, I'd like to ask you a question. You said right now in At-Large or ALAC or whatever, people say we are doing policy development. I've never heard anyone say that, nor do I think we've ever claimed that. I'm just curious where that came from.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: In our discussion, several of our members – and I would say most of them – find that when they speak about policy development, it is a noble topic, a noble thing. So, if you don't make policy, you are outside. This is the general impression I have here in this community,



---

and I think this is wrong, 100% wrong. We have to do policy, but it is not the only thing we have to do. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Okay. It's something, perhaps, to clear up. We certainly should be involved in policy development. We don't set policy. That's not within our mandate. Maureen wants a final word. Go ahead.

MAUREEN HILYARD:

Thank you. Just taking back onto that policy thing, which is actually an interest area for me, and I think one of the things that said that we need to have a bit of a culture change and a way in which we actually develop policy. When we're talking about outreach and we're trying to bring more people in, we're not actually concentrating on the people we've actually got in our system already, that we're actually not engaging it. We're saying that we're engaging but we're not. We need to actually get some mechanism in which we can, how to bring policy to those people who are already in the system and get them to the table. I think we will get more credibility from other agencies within ICANN, if we can show that we're actually improving our own system and getting more people involved.

ALAN GREENBERG:

That's going to be a very major part of the At-Large review implementation, so let's defer it to there. Thank you very much. We have a coffee break now, I believe, and a short break. Then we go into the cross-community meetings which are ... Can someone tell us

---

where they are? Salon 1-3. That's just around the corner, going further away from the entrance area, turning right as you get out of this room, I believe. Thank you, all. We'll see you there. See you all there. And we will reconvene here tomorrow morning, I believe. I think we have the interviews or discussions with the chair candidates at 8:00 in the [Radisson], if I remember correctly. If you haven't figured out how to get there, when you come in the elevator from the Hard Rock, instead of getting off at 2B, you get off at 3. Follow the signs. There are no footsteps there, but there are signs. You do not go into the casino, but you turn left before you get to the casino. Then through a long, un-airconditioned walkway. Then you're in the [Radisson].

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: I will be going to the casino with Maureen.

ALAN GREENBERG: Enjoy. Our own private little casino. Thank you, all, for your participation today. I'd like to ask for feedback for what you thought of the GNSO sessions but we don't have time for that now. We will have a wrap-up session on Thursday where you can comment if you remember all the way back to Monday. Enjoy the rest of the day. It should be an interesting session. Thank you.

**[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]**