

TRANSCRIPT

Tech Working Group Meeting London

22 June 2014

Attendees:

Roy Arends, .uk
Jay Daley, .nz
Luis Diego Espinoza, expert
Ondrej Filip, .cz
Patrik Fältström, SSAC
Eberhard Lisse, .na (Chair)

ICANN Staff:

Patrick Jones
Kristina Nordstrom
Gabriella Schitteck

Apologies:

Cristian Hesselman, .nl

Eberhard Lisse: All right. Eberhard Lisse. Good morning.

For the record, Patrick Jones, Patrik Fältström, Ondrej Filip, Roy Arends; and Jay from the Tech Working -- Jay Daley from the Tech Working Group; Gaby and Kristina from Staff Support.

And it appears that from now on our Tech meetings will be recorded, and they will be transcribed. We discussed it informally earlier on. I think it's a good thing that we start to put this infrastructure request in. We want to be taken more seriously, we want to expand, and we also need to do the logistics in a little while.

We basically need to talk today about what we are going to do with the meeting in L.A. I think we should focus on the next meeting, more on a long-term strategy. The next meeting would be the 25th Tech Day. And because it is in L.A. on ICANN's home turf, and we will, as far as I understand, have a joint meeting with DNS-OARC again, I think we can make a bigger event out of it.

Luis Diego Espinoza just joined us.

And the first item that I want to mention is we were having, initially, some problems with our meeting times here. I think you all got my email. The Meeting Committee -- or the Agenda Team apparently told the Meeting's Team that they needed our room a little bit earlier, and then it filtered via three other -- we have staff to ask, and I think this is not the appropriate way of dealing with this.

I don't mind so much being told, we need the room, if they tell us early and then we can -- if the room is being needed, the room is being needed, but I don't like the way that -- the approach that was taken. So I have -- Ms. King from the Meeting Committee has emailed me. I think I copied the Program Committee on it. And I will have a pleasant chat with them, and instilling in them the idea that this is not on. Not so much that they do it, but how they do it.

If they need the room they must talk to the Chair of whatever Group is affected, or the Group, as early as possible. If they tell us what they want we can help, and the other groups are the same thing. I think this is not in any way controversial, so I think we can accept that as (inaudible).

I think you have all seen the agenda for this meeting. I'm abusing the prerogative of the Chair a little bit, because I have had, from my new little project with which I am having way too much fun, analyzing my (inaudible) data -- I have talked to a local lecturer, of Computer Science at one of the local universities, who happens to live in Hamburg and he is on a holiday, so he is hopping over here. And he's doing some stuff with Levenshtein algorithms, and I find it important that we push a little bit local talent so that we'll search that -- I think Stephen Deerhake is talking to the math teacher of his school, who has also got ideas on analysis and things, and it's good to show that even for small places we can look at things, whether it's something that we need to do, or we want to do, is another thing, but I want to push a little bit; also that we can get deeper into matters than just superficial talks.

Roy?

Roy Arends:

Roy Arends from Nominet. You mentioned Levenshtein distance, and that just rocks my boat because we -- we will show you -- we will show tomorrow during the host presentation, a few of the analysis things that we have done at Nominet, and per request from last time to do something about big data. Now what we don't (ph) mention tomorrow is some additional research we've done regarding Levenshtein distance.

If we look at the bulk of your DNS request, you can actually determine whether a website is male or female related, and you do that because of Levenshtein distance. If you look at keyboard plus Levenshtein distance, then the circumference of the type (ph) on the keyboards, if it's slightly larger than average, then it's a male-oriented site, if it's slightly smaller than average, this it's -- then it's a female-oriented site; because on average, males have larger hands than females.

And you can also do the same thing with left- and right-handed people. If you look typo on the left-hand side, keyboard distance again, Levenshtein distance, you can see, right. And it perfectly match the ratio between left-handed and right-handed people, and it doesn't discriminate between men and female -- men and woman, sorry. So just a sidetrack, we won't mention this tomorrow, because even though it's nice information, it really doesn't do anything. Thank you.

Eberhard Lisse:

To famously quote one of the Namibian High Court Judges, let the record show we were amused. But I will get in touch with the guy from our university, because this is interesting stuff. He is -- he is a Computer Scientist by trade. He has written a book about Open Source Business Intelligence, Neil Scott (ph). Maybe it's interesting to just reflect on this.

Roy Arends: Yeah. So, I think we need to avoid -- oh no, not avoid, we just need to be careful about us moving too much into the territory of DNS-OARC because that is, you know, the primary place that people go and talk about analysis and other things like that. I think we all recognize that some of the things that were important to OARC are now transitioning into the mainstream, such as big data and other things. And I think we just need to coordinate so that we are following that transition as things come out of that and move into our space. But we want to avoid, I think, moving, you know, too much into their space in that regard. Just to let it fit together quite nicely.

And just one other thing so that -- I don't know if you know, but for the Los Angeles OARC Meeting, Sebastian Castro who works for me, is the Program Committee Chair, so we have a very close ability to tie that together. And I've put him in touch with Eberhard. He doesn't yet understand Eberhard, it might take several months, but hopefully that will work out reasonably well from that regard.

Eberhard Lisse: I overheard that. Jacques Latour is also, sort of, in liaison with this, and he suggested that we should go deeper into the matter in L.A., but I think Jay is quite right, but the smaller TLDs, are not really involved OARC, they should be teased a little bit, so that they can look into these things and get interested into the deeper things -- side of things. I personally don't want to get too deep into this, this OARC's stuff, this is -- I'm not a professional computer scientist, so I don't even understand Levenshtein, I just know the SQL commanders do call it, yeah. But the point is, we need to push a little bit, and that's just -- the question is also, whether it needs to be done.

I believe it should. The people from COSA (ph), for example, say no, it's not necessary; we don't need this, that's a separate issue. But I think it's important to show that not only deep analysis of big data can be done, but also analysis of smaller -- let me think. So I fully agree with you and Sebastian Castro and our -- we are in touch, and I think we should proceed from that to the planning. Last time when we did the OARC in L.A. -- not L.A. -- in San Francisco I think, we did it in a way that we did put the deeper things on Sunday with OARC, and sort of the lighter things, which for us would probably be -- more be more likely to get some good speakers in to get some showcasing into, sort of, the 25th Meeting.

And then we have the guy from -- DNS-OARC Chair, the Tech Day, and OARC Chair, DNS-OARC. So we have a little bit of cross-breeding, in a way. So we need to basically focus on what we are talking. Patrick has made a suggestion, so I think you should talk about it.

Patrik Fältström: Sure. One option is that the Chief Security Officer at Facebook might be available to be a potential speaker, and we could help set that up with other keynotes that you had in mind.

Eberhard Lisse: I don't want to put this on record, but I'm talk -- I'm making it as a pitch, and if something comes up we can talk about it off-the-record. When something comes out of it, of course we'll go on the record, but I don't want to put it on, and then nothing comes of it, and then and then we don't look -- So I just mentioned the name. So you will make the approach -- the pitch to this guy from Facebook, yeah, it would be very interesting.

Then Paul Vixie is interested, I asked him whether he could -- I wanted him to Chair the Roundtable in the afternoon today, but he is not coming so -- but he did say he is coming to L.A., and I think he is always interesting, and with his history of many years, I think he should -- if he wanted to speak he should -- I know he's got a new company so he has also some interest in that. But I like his way of doing things.

Roy?

Roy Arends: A former colleague of Jay and I, and a good friend, and happens to live in San Francisco and works for Twitter. Similar as Facebook talk, and if there's interest from the Working Group I can ask if maybe Twitter is interested in doing something there. I have no idea what I can manage, I just -- it's just a question of asking, but then, who knows.

Eberhard Lisse: Inviting people from big companies has the additional advantage that we don't have to strain our small little budget, because they will come anyway.

Roy Arends: Got you.

Eberhard Lisse: Yeah. I basically have to put this on record too, and I'm extremely grateful that we are now included in the Global Stakeholders Engagement budget from a central point. I had to look what GSE stand for, and I had to actually read the budget to find that out. I'm extremely grateful both from a personal perspective, as far as total support is concerned, but also that we can now make a pitch to somebody who might, otherwise, not come. And we can support him with Trevor. I mean, senior people who, we really want, we can always go to New Zealand and to Dot.AU, and Dot.CA, and they will all pitch in, and it has happened in the past, and I'm -- if I want somebody really serious and it says here, but I need the travel support a little bit, we always find the money that's not a problem.

But it's now good that we have a formal budget so that we can actually, if we agree on something then -- and how would it work. I do not want to have control over the budget if I'm benefiting from it myself. I do not want under any circumstances to be -- not only to be accused, I also don't want it. So, how would that work?

Patrick Jones: This is Patrick for the record. That is within the budget that I oversee within the Global Stakeholders Engagement Team, it's part of the Security And Technical Community Engagement bucket, and so I oversee that, and I report to Sally Costerton, so with advanced notice we will be able to provide the funds out of that bucket to whoever, or for whatever purposes, and that includes not just the Tech Day, Working Group Chair, and the keynote speakers, but it's also some of the logistics associated with the room. Some meals or other things associated with the event, starting with the Los Angeles Meeting. So it will be for three meetings a year, within each fiscal year.

Eberhard Lisse: Jay?

Jay Daley: Just one moment. Good morning.

Unidentified Participant: Good morning.

Eberhard Lisse: Would you like to--

Unidentified Participant: (Inaudible)

Eberhard Lisse: This is a closed meeting, we don't mind anybody watching or listening, you are just going to be very bored. You are more than welcome to stay, but it's an Internal Working Group Meeting, you are under no obligation to leave--

Unidentified Participant: (Inaudible)

Eberhard Lisse: You can sit here if you want, and listen, but you are just going to get bored.

Jay Daley: So I suggest then, to solve your problem, that we set up a small sub-committee to do the finances bit, or possibly sub-committee of everybody except you, with Patrick (ph) on it,

and then that's the one that makes the request to Patrick about funding for particular things.

Eberhard Lisse: Yeah. And as I said, I don't want it to be in anyway involved in any financial decisions that I benefit personally in any way from -- and I want this on record, so that there is no --it's not that I'm afraid of criticism, I just feel this is not right, and I don't want to -- I've always felt that it was not -- it's not right that we should do that, and if you read my postings to the mailing list about these things, you can understand where I'm coming from.

Ondrej Filip: So, Vice Chair, it's highly unlikely that I would do such a -- such money, so I'm happy to Chair the sub-committee. Ondrej Filip, for the record.

Eberhard Lisse: Okay. And I'm seconding that. So we can basically take this approved. So Jay and -- basically Jay and Ondrej and Patrick will do this, if we come to an understanding what we want and we'll -- you guys then could basically sign the -- send the email and whatever needs to be done, you decide on it, so that I'm formerly -- I'm out of it. All right, good.

I am not so keen on funding lunches, per se, I mean, it's a nice thing to have, but if you can spend that money for something more important, I would prioritize it in a different way. (Inaudible) Ashken (ph) was a little bit reluctant to make good on his promise, this time because he's a speaker, and he's sort of -- Microsoft is slowly coming into the ICANN fold, so he was a little bit concerned about appearances. But there are so much little shops around here that we don't really have to do this for London. But we can see what we have available in L.A. funding wise, and I'll also see what it costs. I don't want to send a lot of money on things, because the hotels usually are very expensive in this regards.

Okay. So now, what are we going to do in L.A.? Ondrej?

Ondrej Filip: I just have a technical a since we have DNS-OARC Meeting, and you know, I'm the Chairman of DNS-OARC, so I will probably be very busy. I would like to know, if possibly, in advance when it's going to be this Tech Working Group closed meeting to be able to plan it actually. Do you have any idea; because it would conflict on Sunday morning, probably, with the presentation stuff?

Eberhard Lisse: And on this again, Kristina will organize it in a way that it will not interfere. All right?

Ondrej Filip: That was simple.

Eberhard Lisse: Yeah. But Christina basically books these meetings first. If she knows that we have a two-day meeting --

Ondrej Filip: I understand, but I just wanted to raise it because I'm not sure if she will be aware of DNS-OARC, since that's not an ICANN thing, so that's why I wanted to raise this issue.

Eberhard Lisse: Good. So this is solved?

Ondrej Filip: I think so.

Eberhard Lisse: Ray Arends is next.

Roy Arends: I would like to speak on the subject of a long-term strategy, and technical goals in the near future. I think it would be good for the group, and for ICANN and the community as a whole, if the ccNSO Technical Working Group would focus on the advancement of the security stability; and resilience of the DNS with the focus on ccTLDs. That's to me, working or ccTLD means a lot, cleaning up the name space, it's understanding DNS,

from a low level to a deep level. Where do people -- where can people get help? There is NSRC, National Startup Research Center. There is (Inaudible) Clearinghouse; there are a lot of open communities available, regarding DNS check, regarding any cast.

I would like to get our community interested; involved in all of these things, and I would like to focus in the long term on -- like I said, the stability and security resilience of their DNS. And in the short term about getting all of these groups that I just mentioned involved in the ccNSO, Tech Day. I'm hoping this is a good start for the discussion.

Eberhard Lisse: Patrick?

Patrick Jones: Yeah. Patrick Jones. So it's really great that Patrik Fältström could make it to this meeting. I had reached out to Steve Shenk to offer that, and I think it just worked out by accident but--

Eberhard Lisse: No, by design.

Patrick Jones: I thought it would be helpful for SSAC to be either more aware of the Tech Day Agenda, especially as we are planning for Los Angeles, but to have some more interactions between SSAC and this group, so that's why I wanted to make sure he was here.

Eberhard Lisse: I will give Patrik the word just now; I just wanted to respond to what Roy was saying. I fully agree with you, it's just, we must refrain from saying CC, for all small TLDs, it's for all TLDs, I think. The New gTLDs, the non-commercial ones, have the same problems that small ccTLDs had and we have learnt already a lot on how -- on what can be done, so while our motivation, my motivation is also more for the ccTLDs, we should also -- we should not focus on the silos, that's what Jay always said, we should go on -- let me finish -- we should go on the size. If the ccTLD is small or gTLD is small, whether they are commercial or not, and they have the same problem, so we are in the same situation, so we are in the same -- the same opportunity to offer solution for them. We should not exclude them just because they are Gs (ph), that's what I'm trying to say.

Unidentified Participant: I concur. We then need to rename this group. Thank you.

Eberhard Lisse: Patrik?

Patrik Fältström: Thank you very much. For various reasons, I of course, personally have known about this Tech Day, both because my day job, but not now -- enrolls, actually run the (inaudible) DNS for CCs, and actually working in my day job much more with sort of your normal audience than gTLDs, but also secondly, just because I happen to have a couple of SSAC members that are all very active here, including the gentleman to the left of me.

So I think, unfortunately, it might be the case that both groups has taken for granted that we have had more communication than what we, in reality has had. So I thank you for bringing this up, and maybe it is the case that, for example, it could be such simple things like, for example, that we from SSAC could, together with you, before every minute, think about whether anything on our plate could be interesting for you. And the same way, see whether anything of what you have been doing in the Tech Day, or something, that should be made known explicitly to SSAC, which means that we promise each other's groups, to explicitly think about whether there is information to be moved between the two groups, instead of just implicitly thinking that that is happening by accident.

So that would be-- that would be my suggestion. Without formalizing or having more bureaucracy than that so -- and just because we would an overlap of individuals and, for example, having me as the Chair of SSAC, just increasing the priority of this and, for

example, coming to these planning meetings, or whatever, we find out. Or it could be we don't have to do much more than just promising each other to do this, I think.

Eberhard Lisse: Eberhard Lisse. And it's, in any case, easy because Ondrej is on your Committee anyway. For me, some of the stuff that SS (ph) sectors is a bit deep, but he's there anyway, he has the better understanding, and he is part of the Program Committee, so this problem from our side is already solved. I don't want to load another thing on your shoulders, Ondrej, but I think it's a very good idea that -- and it's not just that we should start looking slowly but surely, also to liaise better with other, because I'm a full supporter of what Jay wrote in a paper of -- I think before Prague even.

We must stop thinking in these silos. We have problems, they should be solution-based, outcome based, so that we can -- what can we do to change outcomes. Yeah. I'm not saying this is a criticism, but this is -- we are ccNSO, and so we tend to focus on our things, and I don't think Roy here, but the ccNSO as a whole.

Whereas, Jay was fundamentally right in saying there is a technical issue, the technical issue affects any -- gTLD, (inaudible), CCs in the same way, so the solutions will be the same, so they must be two different entities trying to get the same solutions. And also I find that it's -- and very interesting, if two people look at the same issue but from different perspectives, they come up with different ideas, and if you then bring them together they learn from each other, and the outcomes will be better.

Patrick Jones: I just want to add that -- Patrick Jones -- is one of ICANN staff members which also are approved to be on the SSAC mailing list, so he also has full insight in what we are doing even though he is not an SSAC member.

Eberhard Lisse: Jay?

Jay Daley: So one of the things I think that goes together with this idea of creating a technical data, it's not just for ccTLD, is the idea of creating some form of technical stream to ICANN meetings, so that we can increase the engagement of technical people. It's easier for them to come and things. One thing I've suggested before, it's like a sort of tagging of the meeting agenda, in where the technical, and legal, and policy, and that kind of stuff, just so that people begin to see it. And then that brings some self organization because, for example, on Monday when we have got our Technical Working Group, one of the two meetings of the Expert Working Group on WHOIS is taking place at the same time, and I would like to be there, because it is, you know, it is a number of our technical people who need to point out quite what a train wreck one of the particular ideas in that would be from a centralization and things.

I wonder though, if in the interim, that those of us who are involved in technical meetings can do a little bit of tagging ourselves, so that effectively, at the end of the meeting we can point people to the other technical meetings that will take place or other -- during the week, so that people know about them, so we'll just, you know, effectively advertise those things. Like we are providing some sort of a link systems, and things. That might actually get things working a little bit better as well.

Eberhard Lisse: I like your fundamental trust into ICANN being able to change itself.

Jay Daley: Yeah, I mean--

Eberhard Lisse: No. But I'm just joking. But I think this is a -- it's a very good idea, at the moment the meetings are taken, sort of, like by constituency and the color of the calendar. We should actually have an (inaudible) with the meeting, but I don't know whether the person I'm going to talk to is high enough to do this, but it might be good that you can sort of look --

okay, what Technical meetings are running and blend all the other ones out from your view, that you only see this, and policy in that. And then you flag different calendars.

So I've got several calendars, if I don't want to see what my son's lectures are, I blend them out. If I want to see whether he is there, I look there, and then I look iPhone Friend-Finder, to see whether he is in his lecture, 2,000 kilometers away from where I live. And at least he's sending his cell phone to relate, just from what I can see. But the point is, we need to -- this is a very good idea, we need to find a mechanism that people who want to go to policy, for example, policy, even if it concerns Africa, that they can know--

Unidentified Participant: Yeah, let me just point out that this was actually the conclusion of the Cross Constituency Working Group Conference Planning, or whatever. So they said exactly this, and they presented at the previous ICANN Meeting, and the ICANN Meeting in Singapore so, personally I'm also -- have the same U.S. Chair of SSAC just like you have, and what I'm trying to push for and encouraging you to do the same, is to make sure that ICANN actually implements the findings, that now actually exists.

Eberhard Lisse: Can you send me -- can you send me a copy of that last -- or a link or something that I can go and hammer on the same nail.

Unidentified Participant: Yes. I will do that.

Eberhard Lisse: Okay. So, what's next? Maybe I want to return a little bit on ideas for L.A. So, basically what we are going to do is we'll have -- we'll liaise with OARC, and we go deeper into the stuff, and Jack suggested to do analysis. And I don't want to presume, but we will -- I will speak with then, with these guys so that we come up with a thing, and then basically we do OARC, we go into analysis, and in a deeper, detailed research for best way, if that's okay with OARC. And on Monday we do a little bit more showcasing, get senior people in to talk, and if keynote -- sort of more than one keynote speech. It will also -- if we have -- I will try to get the agenda with the name out a little bit earlier so we can advertise it a little bit heavier, so that we can increase the participation as well. And usually people who come once will come more often.

No comments? Oh, Roy?

Roy Arends: Again, Roy Arends. Again, I concur. This is -- I think focusing on analysis and big data and machine learning, now it's discovery, understanding why people are asking stuff, following Botnets, tracking malware, et cetera, et cetera, I think that's actually very, very good. It also helps to bridge the worlds between security and DNS.

I am a DNS guy who dabbles sometimes a little bit in security; there are a lot of security guys who dabble a little bit in DNS. Los Angeles is full of these folks; San Francisco is close by, and full of these folks. A fair amount of startups around the security wheels that deal with DNS, still there's a gap to fill. And I think understanding it first and doing analysis and big data, on what is DNS, helps to understand what is secure, what is not, what is abuse and what is not. So I think it's a very good thing. Thank you.

Eberhard Lisse: Diego?

Luis Diego Espinoza: Luis Espinoza. Yes, I think the analysis is a very interesting thing, and the results of the analysis, could be helpful for decision-makers if the results are focused on business needs, or business (inaudible). I think it's important to try to move the results to a high impact result for business, means of the ccTLDs, for example.

Eberhard Lisse: That's not the point; it's to achieve results you first need to have methods. And small TLDs basically don't have the methods. But I'm doing this not because I'm having way too

much fun since my kids are out of the house, and I'm not doing deliveries anymore, and I have too much time on my hands, but I'm interested in seeing what comes out of it. I have turned off two intellectual property violators and that leads me to the question, whether we should not, maybe, have some legal aspects. Whether it's actually from an -- why should we worry about this, not only how, but why should we worry about it? Is it -- not in a sense that it's criminal or something, but should we look at that aspect a little bit? Why should any TLD, commercial or otherwise, be concerned about what's happening to their data.

(Inaudible)?

Unidentified Participant: A couple of things; one just to share something that we will be doing in Los Angeles. So we, like many people, scan our zones so you know, these are zones you're then going to look up onto the authority of (inaudible), and then we have identified something like 17 different forms of brokenness that can appear, and probably loads more, I suspect out there. And we have a new portal for our registrars going live in the next month or so, which has a page that lists their domains and the level of brokenness that they have, and is basically just a way of reminding them of things that they need to go and sort out.

And they can choose to hide things, of that, or they can, you know, choose to say that they've fixed things, and there's a sort of brokenness score that we are working on, and we are potentially, what we are, we are probably going to do a brokenness ranking as well, so that they can see just how bad they are. You know, you are the number one broken registrar, you know, out of whatever number of them. And it's all just a bit of psychology to get them to fix things, so we'll be doing that. I'm thinking a lot, most of the codes that we do will be -- it is open source, it's just a question of us actually, properly putting it on to have them publishing it and all that kind of stuff, for the scans and things.

And that brings me to my substantive point really is, I think that over the years, of these meetings, lots of people have presented some very interesting things, and I regularly find myself looking at my notes, and then going back to find the meeting, you know, the presentation that somebody gave online, and then from that, finding the links that they had, and using the links to look at them, that sort of stuff. And I wonder if we should, at some point, find some sort of way of bundling all that together, any useful way for people. Now that could be website, I don't if it really needs to be, it might a bit excessive.

It could just be an email out from us, occasionally, that has, you know, a summary of stuff that people have picked up over the last year or something that's interesting, assuming that things are just going to get out of date after a period of time. But at least, you know, usually if we sort of a resource library somewhere, people can begin to build on them.

Eberhard Lisse: The dreaded book. Yeah, but just now -- As I said, I personally have -- am starting to find myself with more time on my hands, so that's another thing that I'm -- actually also was looking at and I will start working late actually from a personal perspective, to basically pull a framework together, and once we have a framework then we can decide, whether Roy wants to write about this chapter, and Jay wants to write about that, and Ondrej wants to write about this, and whatever -- in whatever way you do this, and then in the end I think we will put something together that can work like a website, but we can also put it in as a printed document, because it might be well, to have it look like a nice little bound thing -- and have it available as a PDF or as an eBook or something. People can download it and (inaudible).

But we should keep it on a website of sort somewhere, because if we update it; if people say, look, my stuff on that is not relevant anymore, we now want to go to this link, so that we sense -- some have some Web master type of somebody looking at the links once in a while, and make sure they are not broken so that we comment on it.

Patrick?

Patrick Jones: Yeah. It shouldn't be that hard to have a page within the ICANN website that has links to the past Tech Day sessions. Then we could pull up the other presentations and you can go back to the other Tech Days activities.

Eberhard Lisse: The agendas ... all agendas are basically posted on the ccNSO website as I said, and I try my utmost to make sure that I find an agenda that has got PDF links, with the then current emails of the presenters. So if you have an agenda, to where you click on whoever is chairing, you get the current email address. So that's at least one way of -- if a member of (inaudible) was interested, then email him and then usually these guys -- my interest to communicate.

Hang on. Kristina?

Kristina Nordstrom: Yeah. This is Kristina. I just wanted to say that if you go to ccNSO website you can find all the previous Tech -- with the presentations and all that, but it's not linked on the ICANN website.

Eberhard Lisse: Yeah. Where we put it is a separate issue, but to be honest I always feel guilty when we are talking about it, and then don't do anything -- don't do much about it other than thinking. I said that in my personal situation I am now starting to find myself with an empty nest and no more night work, so I will start, I will really start now. This is now one of projects that is at the top of the pile.

Jay?

Jay Daley: I was wondering if as part of Global Stakeholder Engagement, it's possible to have like a sort of page on the ICANN website, which is for technical participants, when then that begins to have a link to SSAC to the -- you know, to the Tech Working Group, those kinds of things, and that starts to, you know, sort of join things together a little bit.

Eberhard Lisse: For the record, Patrik nodded.

Patrik Fältström: Patrik Fältström. Yes, I nodded.

Eberhard Lisse: And the other Patrick nodded too. No, but I mean, for example, Sabina Dodd always said, now, my technical guys from dotDE are not coming, and this is policy. We are not making technology, we are not writing MRCs (ph), but we have a lot of users, and we can easily point people to good and bad experiences, and that, I think, it's very important we should do that.

Patrick Jones: I would just like to point out, of course, that the new Chief Executive DotDE is the old technical person, so we've won that one, all right.

Eberhard Lisse: Who is it?

Patrick Jones: Jörg (ph), Jörg is now the Chief Exec of (inaudible) and was CTO previously.

Eberhard Lisse: Okay. Yeah, I've also spoken with Peter Koch (ph), who still owes me a presentation and he is also interested in data analysis, and he is surely coming to DNS-OARC, so I will nail him on his debt anyway. But being I was on the -- our policy was that ICANN is purely policy, and the technical people; they are not really very much encouraged to come here. So I think we are sort of getting there. Any other business? No, no other--?

Unidentified Participant: I just wondered if we have any--

Eberhard Lisse: Jay first.

Unidentified Participant: Sorry.

Eberhard Lisse: You go first, Jay. Your mic was on first.

Jay Daley: Okay. If we have any more thoughts about future topics and things, because the big data stuff is good, that's one part of it, but I wonder if there's anything else we should also be considering. For example, I think that while many of us in the CC world, are not that influenced by developments in the WHOIS space, the WHOIS space is really -- has a lot going on in it at the moment, and we ought to have some way of bringing those together, the Expert Working Group stuff, the (inaudible) thing. There are little things like my own personal bugbear that I've gone about, about SRV records for the school nickname, how we can -- to actually get those moved out as a more of a common standard. Any other topics sort of things, that we are thinking, you know, sort of who is making things.

Eberhard Lisse: Ondrej was first, but if Patrick wants to respond? You go ahead, Patrick.

Patrick Jones: So one other idea for Los Angeles could be some of the Botnet takedowns, the experiences of either the law enforcement agencies that have been approaching some of the registries recently to take down some of the command and control. The names of our -- the name registration systems, there might be data that they could present on how bad of a problem that's been, or what have they learned.

Eberhard Lisse: Just a question. Do you want the affected registrars that have -- or registries that have taken down, or do you want Bobby Flame to come and present from his side; from the FBI, for example? He will come if I ask him.

Patrick Jones: Yeah. I think the Legal Day is the same day as on Tech Day, so it's a bit difficult for him.

Eberhard Lisse: But we can -- if we tell him early in advance, then we can give him a fixed date, a fixed time that we will not change, then he can schedule himself around that he is -- quite sure he is going to do that.

Patrick Jones: I think -- but building on that, a good idea might be a roundtable from providers of data, so Secured Domain Foundation, Greg Aaron from whatever, the Architelos -- Domain Sentry (ph), that's it. Possibly a few of these people, I don't know if you know any others, whether we get together.

Roy Arends: And this is Roy Arends. I know a large contingent of data providers, Spamhaus, SURBL, there are a lot of -- the security zones, and there are a lot of people who would love to help the DNS world out, by just giving data away in order to clean things up. Some of these would actually like to charge you, however, their main motto is, let's clean this up. So if you don't have any cash, for instance, you are still welcome to chew on the data.

Patrick Jones: Okay, so can we all vote that Eberhard has to arrange that.

Unidentified Participant: Yeah, right.

Eberhard Lisse: Okay. Okay, I'm against it and (inaudible) have it. Now we make a plan. One, Richie is on this Group, he is one of the guys of Secure Domain Foundation, so I'm going to discuss it with him. I know -- what's her name from Architelos very well--

Unidentified Participant: Alexia (ph).

Eberhard Lisse: Alexia, she always invites me to this -- to her reception so I will talk to her about that. And we'll keep in touch, so you talk to your contacts, and I think a roundtable, again, is a very good idea. And it also will give -- we can pitch it a little bit that it gives exposure to the entities doing this, that they get notice, and the people know they have got help available.

Roy Arends: I'm the Chief Scientist of the Secure Domain Foundation, I helped to establish it even though I don't like my name mentioned that often, but in this Group I will. So consider the Secure Domain Foundation done, they are on the table. If I can do that, I will do that. With regards to Architelos, Architelos actually only uses data from Internet identity, and Architelos has the products to sell, which is called -- (Inaudible) Sentry (ph).

Now that brings me to yet another topic for New gTLDs as requirements to -- and I think it's something about Section 11, that there's a need to report, there's a need for ICANN to those registries to report on abuse in their system. That's actually an interesting topic to discuss. So New gTLDs, I think it's good for CCs as well to actually consider this. New gTLDs, they have to report to ICANN about abuse that happened over the last, I don't know, I don't know the regulation, but there is a requirement there. It will be interesting to actually talk about this, and get the various people who provide data on this, do a roundtable as well. Thank you.

Eberhard Lisse: I am a firm believer that even if I don't have to report to ICANN, if this sort of has been sanctioned, I'm quite sure that CoCo (ph) Tools upper module is stuff that we are using, which is used and some gTLDs will implement it so that ICANN actually use it. And as a ccTLD, what I've been saying, we basically don't bother, but we pay for this, for not bothering. We pay in many ways, one of them is over-provisioning, and if we can't get it for free. We have to pay for it in fact, but it still has a cost in manpower, or whatever.

So if a formal structure is already in place for the gTLDs, CCs can make use of this for their own internal purposes without having to report it obviously, or even reporting it to ICANN. So that's a very good idea. I didn't know you were in the Secure Domain Foundation; it's good to know, so that I don't have to -- I can now play you and Norm against each other.

Patrick Jones: I suggest we have three potential topics then, for the next meeting. We have results from big data, where people are actually producing things that are practically of use to us, and things. We have the WHOIS, and I'd be interested to know whether you -- because I mentioned that, and I have then feedback as to whether you think that important enough to have as a topic, and we have the data providers which we all agree, I think, is a good topic. So if anyone wants to think about the WHOIS side of things?

Eberhard Lisse: In fact, if I was to prioritize I would put WHOIS third. Yeah. And I also -- I'm a firm believer in, live another day, there's always a next meeting. If we have too much on one meeting, we'll put it on for the next, and I would like to basically focus on sort of one -- if you took data, and I think in -- and we should -- personally, I think we should talk data. Deep on OARC and more -- even commercial. And I am not opposed at all to have commercial providers come there, and make a pitch, as long as their presentation is attractive. I've always said we tolerate a little bit of a pitch if the presentation is riveting.

I have -- in particular I've encouraged nonprofits to present, but I have given -- I always try -- if it's an interesting presentation, I'm always looking at allowing commercial -- I always put them so that, they get sort of positioned that they can't overwhelm the presentation, and if I think it's too commercial I'll try to nail them afterwards anyway. So I think this is the -- this meeting is not going to be a forum for companies to pitch their wares. But if they pitch their data, and then they mention that they are selling a service where this data can be used, there's nothing wrong with it as far as I'm concerned.

Roy Arends: Roy Arends. I think I need to give a little bit more context about my remark, that Architelos has products to sell. What I meant was; Architelos is a product to sell, so it would not be a problem to have on the table, they would love to. I'm also not against people trying to pitch their products, of course, as long as it's relevant, in context, and the group learn something from it, and we don't have to deal with things like signing NDAs or disclosures, et cetera, et cetera beforehand, I'm happy for it, absolutely. So I apologize if my remark is not -- was a little bit convoluted. Thank you.

Eberhard Lisse: No. Your remark was exactly on point. This is exactly a good thing to discuss. I have given -- I can't tell, along many -- I think when I was in Costa Rica the forum, just sort of the day -- get a little bit better now, and then the story, what was it -- about repositories, domain -- Escrow, we have nothing to do with Escrow but it's good to give -- I think we've given Iron -- what was that -- Iron Mountain has spoken in Brussels, and the other one has spoken -- when was it -- in China, that Patsy (ph) was working for, who is now at Architelos, I think.

Unidentified Participant: (Inaudible)

Eberhard Lisse: So I think it's actually good if we pay close attention that we don't let commercial interest overtake the technical clarity of the nature of (inaudible). Jay made a remark on somebody he requested for next meeting. I am inclined to review this, but if they bring technical stuff and make a pitch at the end, and there's nothing wrong with this. I fully agree with you on that. All right. WHOIS?

Roy Arends: I'll say this politely. I agree with Eberhard. The -- okay, there we go. So WHOIS, is a system that is, yes, it is broken here and there, and it kind of works. Everyone uses it, a lot of people have it, and I know there's a large effort going on to restructure it, to redo anything. I don't think it can be improved that much, definitely not by the proposals that are out there currently. I don't think it's a topic actually for the CC -- for the TLD or the NSO Working Group -- I'm sorry, I forget the name currently. I think WHOIS, that whole area is very political currently. And I understand your points, it's just not a point that I find high on my agenda. I apologize. Thank you.

Eberhard Lisse: So the polite phrase is, we'll take it under advisement. All right, anything else? Good. So basically we are looking at big data and data providers to see whether we can get one or two roundtables up, we are looking at some keynote speakers, and the whole focus basically should be on data, and DNS-OARC will be encouraged to focus on deep data, and we'll speak with these guys. And Ondrej is here anyway, so that I -- by no means want to tell them what to do. It might be a good thing if we do the whole thing in a consistent manner, so if I find something interesting that crops up, I always will say, sure, come in and talk about it.

And then we'll get -- we'll try to get some names -- some named keynote speakers so that we have got a -- that we can advertise a little bit beforehand that we can out -- that we can feature them prominently only the website, so that we have good attendance as usual, and in the long run maybe even get more attendance from the assets basis. All right. Anything else?

Patrick Jones: Yeah. Just at some point we need to, I think, make the effort to form an arrangement with ICANN that the Tech Group becomes a -- more than a CC thing. You know, we basically need to sign a data in which that happens, so that it moves out of the ccNSO website. That I mean, Gaby and Kristina have been fantastic, they work for the CC side of things, so I'm not sure if that will carry on in the future or not. You know, we just need to sort that out; I think clearly and set that, as I am--

Eberhard Lisse: Bart Boswinkel has mentioned this, and I am -- have the plan that I want to be very careful and very slowly on how and -- that it needs to be done, but we want to have a slow process around events, and interest don't overwhelm us; that we can basically continue this on an outcome basis. At the end that we don't get captured by business interest or whatever, so that we do this in another way, but eventually it should come out of the ccNSO. It should be a central issue. We will have to modify our Charter, or change it, and we have to, in particular, change the composition of or membership because we've got a lot of deadwood people who are never around. Even when they are around they don't pitch up. I've got a few names which I don't want to read into the records. That irritates me a little bit, but we have some very interested people that we basically can't get it on anymore, because we can't really extend it--

Unidentified Participant: I think part of that would be then tidying up the governance of this group, you know, and going into the future on things, definitely. Yeah.

Roy Arends: Sorry. If by slow, you mean, careful, I completely agree. Thank you.

Eberhard Lisse: We must be careful in reflecting that we take decisions consensus-based after we've thoroughly thought about what's going to -- what decisions will mean for everybody involved and what the effects are. As far as the workload is concerned, I'm very happy, extremely happy with the current staff that is supporting us. Eventually I would like to have Kristina or Gaby to give -- to be given sort of a certain number of hours just for this from the central budget, so that we can have a fixed person supporting us. But this seems -- I think I want to be very careful on what we are doing and how we are doing it, because in the big ICANN scheme of things, we can be overwrought and fairly quickly, if we don't pay attention to what's happening.

So I want to be very careful what we are doing. So far we have been, I think very successful, I mean, and the people vote with their feet and I want -- I don't want short-term decisions reflecting long-term goal.

All right, are we done then, otherwise? Good. Then we can close this. We'll start tomorrow. I think it was 11:00, yeah?

Unidentified Participant: Yeah.

Eberhard Lisse: 11:00. All right, thank you very much.