Transcription ICANN61 San Juan
ISPCP Open Meeting Part 2
Tuesday, 13 March 2018 at 17:00 AST

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

The transcriptions of the calls are posted on the GNSO Master Calendar page http://gnso.icann.org/en/group-activities/calendar

Tony Holmes: If I could ask everyone to take their seats and we will pick up the meeting again. Thank you.

Okay. Can we get going again, please?

I know from previous association with us that it's always really difficult to get time in our agenda. So really appreciate Rod being with us. And I'll ask Rod to take us through where SSAC are with their issues currently particularly during focus on issues that are important to the ISP.

So, Rod, over to you and thanks.

Rod Rasmussen: Thanks. Hello, everybody. I met some of you but I see other faces in the room that I'm not necessarily familiar with or may have just seen in the hall. So my name is Rod Rasmussen. I'm the new chair of the SSAC. To my right here is Julie Hammer, who's the new vice chair. And behind us is Patrik Fältström, who is the - you will recognize him as the former chair. I brought him along as a subject matter expert on one of the issues of one of our recent reports in case you have some deeper questions that I cannot answer.

So I want to do just have a quick chat about things - I do have a deck here, which probably would take way too much time anyways, about topics of interest that we're working on. Obviously, the big one for us, if you've been following along, we have this Name Collision Analysis Project or NCAP in response to the board's request that we take a look - a hard look at what's - what actually is going on with name collisions, understanding the size/scope, giving some thoughts on how to quantify that and quantify risk, as well as understanding root causes and then potential mitigation methods. It's a fairly ambitious amount of work to do and to do it right.

I would say that members of this community in this room would be people we would want to try and work with either as bringing in as - you know, people who are actually part of the work party because one of the things we're doing, which is unprecedented for us, is having this be a much more open process. The board requested that for, I think, many reasons, which we don't need to get into, but the idea here we're going to bring - be bringing - including people who may have data, may be of interest and analysis capabilities, et cetera, to actually take part in the work and that will be - that we will give public readouts on that as we go through this.

We expect this to take a couple of years to get through those various stages and we'll have a series of studies. But one thing I would definitely hope we could do is be able to work with some of your members to - through some vehicle, this vehicle to get some access to data or at least some recent information that would be of interest to understanding and categorizing some of the things that you're seeing on your networks that would be part of collision types of scenarios. So that's the big thing that we're doing.

Currently, we have some current work open on some looking at Internet of Things. In particular, we're looking at that with respect to DDoS capabilities and the effects it may have on the DNS infrastructure and then some potential - different ways of looking at mitigating that. We're also looking at

WHOIS rate limiting as part of a wider project we had around various access to resources of things related to gTLDs.

And we also are, well, unofficially/officially going to be looking at the KSK roll as far as the current plan that has been proposed to deal with that. We have - we do have a couple of publications that have come out recently. One of those was SAC 100, which relates to that, and that we did a - what we did there was basically a summary of earlier advice and kind of put it all together in one place. And then SAC 99 was something else you'd asked about, which was one of the IDN ones which is why I brought Patrik along, so he can actually talk about that a lot better.

So those are kind of the current topics really quickly of what we're doing. I really like to get anything from you on what your interests are and hearing more about what we're doing and then any other questions about SSAC in general, I'd be happy to have.

Tony Holmes: Thanks, Rod. Mark?

Mark McFadden: So really easy question about name collision. Patrik is laughing because all the questions about name collision are easy. So in terms of the scope of what SSAC is going to do, how's it different from what the JAS report was, what was that four years ago?

Rod Rasmussen: So I think if you take a look at the - we have a - by the way, I failed to mention that we didn't know we have actual project plan proposal up for public comment already. So you can go to standard ICANN Public Comments page and take a look at that where we do talk about that.

I think we're trying to do - well, we have the benefit of a couple of things. One is time and there have actually been - we'll call them experiments and that we were only anticipating prior to the rollout of the new TLDs. So there may be a

wealth of data to be found there and people who've actually stood these things up and have seen what's been going on.

Another is that we've had some maturity in some of the instrumentation and things that weren't - didn't exist at the time. And then there's also access to - we're looking to try to broaden the scope a bit and get resolver data and work, you know, people with networks, trying to get at least large corporate university, other kinds of networks like that.

The other thing we're looking at doing is setting up test lab type of situation to actually drill down on root causes and try and basically recreate the conditions, so we can understand, and then that - which could drive potential mitigation methodologies as well.

So I think we've got a broader remit around what to do here. We can take a look at the board resolution and ask a lot of questions. So I think that's kind of the difference.

But there's a lot about work. Part of what are the first things to do is kind of go back and take a look at their stuff and other things that have been done by others in the same space and kind of bring that together.

Man: I had a similar view on that because I remember in the past in this community, there was a lot of angst about potential name collisions and even - when we had discussions with the board, they seemed very reluctant to engage with us in a way that was really meaningful and take this on. And I know from previous dealings with Patrik, he's certainly beaten me up a few times and said, "We only do things that you ask us to do and it's a waste then trying to get a focus on what you think is important and get that on your agenda." So I understand all the dynamics of that.

But similar to Mark remark, I was really surprised when I saw that being that work and, so to speak, quite a time lag. And now, all of a sudden, it seems

that we're back on it. It's good news that's happened but I'm still a little bit mystified, I must admit, as to why it was such a time lag before we went down that far. Maybe you can shed more light on that but it just seemed a surprising thing when I found out it was…

Rod Rasmussen: Yes, refer back to the comments Dave Conrad made yesterday on the public session we had on the cross-community session. There were questions asked -- I'm not sure of who, that wasn't us -- and answers were not forthcoming and I don't remember exactly where he was pointing the finger but he did talk about that because the same question came up yesterday. But, you know, from our perspective, it's - you know, we've said it quite a bit prior to the original rounds. We haven't really looked at saying anything else until the board came along and said - and I think part of it, too, is just the pressure from figuring out home corporate mail. I mean, frankly, that was that sitting there and the board is taking their own separate action, obviously, on the, you know, quote-unquote, "business side" of that. But, you know, we were ordered to clean that, you know, issue up. I think that was a catalyst as well.

Tony Holmes: Okay. Thanks. Philippe?

Philippe Fouquart: Thank you. Philippe Fouquart. Yes, a question or a comment, if I may. Are you going to try and learn from that experience of the last round beyond the few cases that you mentioned, the comment being the following - we were one of those. We are in the unusual situation of being both TLD operator through a partnership and being a source of collisions through our mobile connectivity machine-to-machine devices. And we continue monitoring this.

As an experience, we, through the control interruption period, we were waiting for (unintelligible) and then, eventually, it was more like a - the bridges of (unintelligible), if you see what I mean. It wasn't just nothing happened message from the CGO to have a 24/7 support during that period and basically all of this was due caution but for nothing. So I was - what sort of

feedback would you expect from people like us who would continue that monitoring and how to go through that hustle?

Rod Rasmussen: When you say "the monitoring," which side of the equation are you talking about the monitoring on?

Philippe Fouquart: Both.

Rod Rasmussen: Both, okay. All right.

Philippe Fouquart: Both the client and the server.

Rod Rasmussen: Okay. Okay.

Philippe Fouquart: We do both.

Rod Rasmussen: Yes. And I think that - and I'm not sure how much you were engaged with JAS or anybody else that was looking at that the prior bid but, I mean, those are the kinds of things where we want to go to two things. One would be, you know, any historical data that you've collected during periods where there may have been something that was going on, I obviously don't know where you may have kept or not, any analysis done. Those are actually were the useful inputs even if you, you know, quote-unquote, "didn't see" anything happen, lack of something happening is actually one of the things we need to identify as well.

And then also just things are currently going on, on network as far as potential - potentialities for understanding why there are things leaking into the ecosystem that would basically be considered a collision capable type of a thing. You know, it's really until we start getting into the projects and scoping out where we - where all the possible data sources may be and things like that, we're actually going to be putting that kind of stuff out for comment and having this open discussion group around that.

So one of the things we're standing up is a discussion group, too, so that people with information then and experience can actually chime in and say, "Yes, that's not really an issue. You can kind of - you know, here's what we saw." That's extremely valuable because it keeps us from wasting time on something that may not be there.

Philippe Fouquart: Thank you. That's so useful I'll be glad to take part and it would certainly also be useful for the - potentially the next round and make sure that people would not replicate the sort of - I wouldn't call that "mistakes" but call for caution, that - and procedures we had in place which proves unnecessary from an ISP perspective.

Tony Holmes: Thanks. Could I ask you to say a little bit more about - you mentioned IOT and DDoS. A little bit more about that piece of work because I wasn't aware that was taking place. So I don't know…

((Crosstalk))

Rod Rasmussen: Yes. And, well, we started out, you know, getting a lot of requests from the ICANN community to talk about IOT because it's a thing, right? And so I said, "Well, what is there to say that hasn't been said already by, you know, 30 different other commissions or more like 300 other organizations we're working on?" So we've tried to work and we add some value in the space because it's one of the gaps that are unique to the ICANN world and/or where we might have some different insight. So that was kind of the catalyst for starting, you know, taking a look at this and we did a cataloging on that.

What we've evolved to and there's no guarantee this work will actually go, you know, be pushed as a work product because we're still taking a look at this, does it make sense to do because if we're not adding something new to the conversation, we'll just shut up the work - shut down the work and not finish. We've done that before in other topic areas.

But where we've kind of concentrated on is there's this interaction, especially if you take a look at (unintelligible) and a couple of these other large scale DDoS attacks done by these IOT botnets where the DNS is obviously highly affected. There are people concerned about the scale that we're starting to see. And so there are also maybe some capabilities that ICANN or the ICANN community - members of the ICANN community can be part of in order to have a better prevent - understand how to prevent them better and share information around that kind of thing and also respond during times of duress, so to speak.

And when they're actually coming to folks, like yourselves, who actually have to deal with this stuff across the networks for some thoughts on that. But we do have people, you know, in the same thing on the work party itself, so - but, you know, that's the kind of thing where we - I mean, where we may do a little outreach on and see if this makes sense kind of thing.

Tony Holmes: I'm sure that there would be some interest in that from this community.

Rod Rasmussen: Yes.

Tony Holmes: Philippe?

Philippe Fouquart: Thank you. Philippe Fouquart. Just to build up on that, are you - maybe you said that but I missed it. Are you interested in DNS as a target or as a source of DDoS or both?

Rod Rasmussen: Both. "Source" is more the reflective side, right? Because you don't have too many IOT DNS-only devices out there, yes.

Tony Holmes: Okay. Any further issues on any of the points that Rod raised?

I realized we're letting Patrik off the hook. It doesn't seem right. Okay. One ask before you go, Rod.

Rod Rasmussen: Sure.

Tony Holmes: We always struggle to get scheduling with you. And certainly with the focus now on - particularly on name collision, so I would say I would ask that we try and schedule a slot for you when we go to Panama. So just to note a request maybe and things like that into account, I appreciate that.

Rod Rasmussen: Yes, I really like to - go ahead. I was just going to respond to that.

Tony Holmes: Yes, yes. Go ahead.

Rod Rasmussen: Yes. And then we have to figure out a way to do it…

((Crosstalk))

Rod Rasmussen: Yes. We got to figure out a way to get around because we have a little bit more flexibility because we have, like our admin, committee meeting over the weekends and things like that but the Tuesday is tough. And that's the…

Tony Holmes: Yes. I know.

Rod Rasmussen: But we really - actually given what we're going to be doing with our work party, we might be able to do something that was the end cap work party, so it's relevant to what you're doing. So we'll get creative on that. But I really, really want to engage with your group here for sure.

Tony Holmes: Appreciate that. Thank you. Fiona?

Fiona Asonga: Thanks a lot, Tony. Just a quick on Rod. As you're doing the work on the DDoS, are you documenting it? Is there somewhere where we can find it?

Or do we give you some more time to finish what you're working on before we can have some materials to look at and to possibly show the ISPs or something like that?

Rod Rasmussen: Okay. So just the standard SSAC modus operandi for doing this stuff is we do everything internal and then publish the document. We may, during that process, reach out to individual experts to get opinions.

Now Patrik wants to talk. And through various processes, we typically don't publicly publish drafts on things like that. There could be an opportunity though, depending on how this work party goes, to do something on a, you know, quote-unquote, "nondisclosure" based, you know, not an NDA but, I mean, basically a - something that we could share with some of your members to get feedback on. That's, I believe, been done before and Patrik can probably fill me in on that.

Patrik Fältström: Thank you. Patrik Fältström. I would like to point that a different work item that is going on in the community is all being Internet of Things that we are synchronizing. We have - and that is that right having its community and working group on the Internet of Things and we exactly are coordinating with that group. So the right working group, compared to us, is a public discussion.

Tony Holmes: Okay. Thank you. We really appreciate your time. Thank you for joining us. It's always a pleasure.

Rod Rasmussen: Thanks for your time.

Tony Holmes: Thank you.

So waiting very patiently in the back, I think, was Chris. So, Chris, welcome. Please come on. Talk to us about the North American engagement strategy.

I know there are other people here who are involved in that, Jen being one person and Mark being another.

Chris Mondini: Are you okay for time?

Tony Holmes: So - we've always got time for you, Chris.

Chris Mondini: Yes.

Tony Holmes: So I will cut you off on appropriate time when you're overrunning but feel free to…

Chris Mondini: Okay. Thank you very much, Tony. This is Chris Mondini. I have two hats. I've worked with a number of you already wearing my first hat, which is a global role for business engagements and helping businesses like for example ISPs and telcos become more involved in ICANN.

I'm also, as you probably saw on Monday, the vice president for this region, which is North America, even though it doesn't feel very northern.

But I'm always very grateful for your interest and engagement. So first, was there anything in particular - before I just start, is there any particular spin or aspect of it that you wanted to…

((Crosstalk))

Tony Holmes: From a constituency perspective, this is pretty new to some of our members. So I was keen for them to basically learn more about it and make sure that they're having awareness of what's going on. So if anything along those lines would be useful.

Chris Mondini: So engagement defined is really about involving the people who are affected by your work and decisions in the work and the decision-making. And so that

is actually something that's outlined in ICANN's mission and commitments as well. And so there is a team within ICANN org that works with you in the ICANN community to involve those stakeholders.

Now, the next challenge is how do you define involvement and does it really arrange that can go anything from signing up for a newsletter and knowing what ICANN is to participating on a review team or drafting a public comment or being on a working group for serving in a role like you are.

And so the ISPCP constituency, I think, especially is affected by this because I've spoken to organizations that sometimes say "Oh, ICANN. It's that body that's, you know, asking us to implement new systems or, you know, universal acceptance or an (unintelligible)," all these things that we can really - we see them as investments and expenses and costs and yet also the organizations that have the helpdesk who get the calls when something isn't working. So engagement, I think, is particularly relevant to this group.

In North America context, as compared to my counterparts in the different regions, engagement is somewhat different. In other regions, there's a lot more just letting stakeholders who don't know or know that there's an openness to ICANN to get involved.

In North America, because the Internet and ICANN both grew up in North America, because the language constraints are relatively and the cultural constraints are relatively lower, it hasn't required sort of building something from the bottom-up or even asking stakeholders what they need.

And similarly, the community in North America is a little less coherent before it gets to ICANN. So I'm charged with being balanced across stakeholder categories, so business, technical community, government's at large, civil society and so forth.

And some parts of the world that you come from, those communities I'll talk to each other as part of sort of an Internet community in a smaller geography before they get here, I often experience North Americans at the ICANN microphone sort of debating there who's in front of ICANN before they - or sometimes it's helpful if they talk to each other before they get here.

But just what we do in terms of activities, we do some of the usual stuff like the newsletters and the Webinars and the kind of calm social media all that stuff. We started doing more post-ICANN meeting readouts which is an idea that I pinched from our Asia Pacific colleagues. So in Asia Pacific, if you can imagine, there are so many different languages like Japan is a very good example. They'll send like two people to an ICANN meeting and then a couple of weeks after the ICANN meeting in Japan, they'll have the whole Internet community of Japan coming here from those two people that go to everything that happened in ICANN.

It applies in a way to other regions, too, because what we'll do is partner with any organization that wants to do one, working alongside the community member, we'll give a readout of sort of like five or six headlines hopefully for sort of stakeholder diverse group and it's a safe space where they can sort of debate and ask questions and learn in a way that it's not being transcribed, it's not going to be on the record. And so people who are sort of experiencing the community see where there might be talent in that room and people who are emerging talents and getting involved are feeling comfortable about learning about the sort of the intricacies of policy.

We're trying to do some structured things with academic institutions where students and things like technology policy might get academic credit for actually performing a role that a PDP working group might request or your community might need help on.

And then finally, the initiative that Jen and Mark and others have been helpful with is I kind of have sort of a - in a very bottom-up way put together advisory

group across North America. And this really - it was spurred on by, at large, (unintelligible) and I teased them. I said it's very easy to get at large people to turn up to give their opinion on something. But in North America, I also have to say the other stakeholder groups and categories across SO and AC and constituency structures are very busy on their stuff. And I would like to get a balanced point of view.

So working with a bunch of you, I identified people in each sort of either SO/AC stakeholder group or constituency, put a small group together -- it's about 20 people -- across North America and I'm trying to take as little of the time as possible to get input about what - how engagement might work. They can answer a survey. They can attend to Webinar. They can come to a lunch tomorrow on Wednesday at noon here at time of sandwich. And I just have asked three specific questions about North America.

One is about converting passive followers who are now aware of ICANN and interested and maybe have learned enough to become more active in signing up, becoming penholders, becoming discussion leaders, becoming active in those ways I discussed earlier, improving the experience for remote participation because I think we're in an era where making it meaningful and rewarding somehow for people to believe that participation in ICANN does not require going to every ICANN meeting.

And then thirdly, in North America, we have a couple of geographic locations where there are a lot of stakeholders that are very active and have a community. And I'd like to get these other pockets across the region. North America is really - has the easiest job because it's really just two countries in the territory. It's not, you know, 47 countries and multiple languages.

So I posed those questions. I tried to be very focused and try to get some feedback. We've surfaced some great ideas on - everything from remote tools that we could improve upon to really something that we've always struggled with which is identifying what are the stakes and what - why should

you care and why should you, the person that, you know, turned up or something, have any motivation to get more involved the story that we tell. And, of course, we're trying to measure all of it.

But some things are easy to measure like how many people you get through the door, how many people read your articles and the newsletter but measuring - you can even measure who signs up for a working group. But you can't really measure like if they - how they contribute or how much faster policy emerges out the other side. These are things that we're always struggling with.

And then finally, I just want to say again many of you in this group I've worked with and on the very stakeholder led, you know, ideally, like my all is to support your efforts but you're very busy on the policy. So when you do have initiatives or ideas, I really want to go or hearing what your ideas are. And again, in the business engagement role, we've done that. We've done that successfully around the world, I think, in a couple of instances.

If you know the places where stakeholders gather in North America that are ISPs or telcos and we aren't there, whether to talk about things like, you know, KSK or name collision or just ICANN policy, we will go there on your suggestion.

And then finally, at some point in your upcoming discussions on engagement, do give some thought not only to Panama, which I'm sure you're thinking about, but also Barcelona. There's quite an opportunity there to do something effective, I think, in the business constituency and also is interested and then you could even do it as a commercial stakeholder group. I will be very happy to support any programming you want to do there.

That's off the topic in North America but I want to plant that for whenever you have plan to discuss it.

Tony Holmes: Okay. That's very helpful. Jen or Mark, anything you want to add from that perspective or are you going to remain passive? No, you're not, Mark. I would not expect you to. Thanks. Go ahead.

Mark McFadden: I'm just channeling Jen.

So Jen and I participated in the Webinar. I thought it was really interesting. There were - I was actually in a car crossing Texas when I was on it but it was another person on the call that had the gunfire in the background, as I remember. It was not me.

I think what was interesting was that what we had on the call was a pretty diverse community of people and yet there were lots of positive ideas. I think that the - I really - one of the things that's been really helpful about these three very focused questions to respond to, right? And so you're not responding to a survey of 50 - I mean, that just wouldn't have gotten you what you wanted and you would get less participation.

And I think what's interesting is that as someone who lives in between the coasts, the ideas that came up were pretty creative in terms of solving the second and third problem, right? Not so much - I didn't feel like we've made a lot of progress on the first. But the second and third of those problems I think there is real possibilities and I was - Jen and I were reflecting after the call which actually shows something, right? That, you know, maybe the question about remote participation is not just a North American question. In fact, our reflection on this was, well, I gave that answer about "Boy, one of the things that would make remote participation better was better remote participation tools." And then I thought, "Well, geez, that's cool and that's cool to say that in the context of North America" and my joke was about Adobe Connect which I hate.

But that's a general - that's an engage - that's a step up. I mean, that's an engagement issue in general. So I think - I guess from the ISP's point of

view, I think we've seen some creative suggestions that came out of our community but also came out of others as well. I was really intrigued by the kinds of suggestions we were getting. And they weren't parochial. They weren't targeted at particular constituencies or interest groups. I thought that was really useful, too. So I thought a good input and I know that I'm speaking for Jen here that we'll be at lunch tomorrow to contribute some more. So it's really been a interesting effort.

Tony Holmes: Thanks. Jen?

Jen: You know, the only thing I'd add to what - to Mark comments really -- I won't take credit -- would be, you know, Tony actually had - Harris had some ideas when we have an internal discussion just about - and I don't want to take - you know, steal your thunder if you want to mention any about that sort of regional organizations that, you know, a certain focus. And I can't remember the two organizations you mentioned in DC right now. But what I found interesting about that point was that I still think there is - we definitely need to do more in the middle for sure. But I still think that there are missed opportunities in the main hubs. And we can talk about this more tomorrow, too. But, you know, Internet governance is a subset of my portfolio in terms of my broader role and there are so many - you know, so many times I'm around DC at various events where I think ICANN should be here. And so these people will be interested in what ICANN is doing.

And I think some of that could go to, you know, what you were saying, too, Tony in terms of looking at different organizations but we'll talk tomorrow. So I'm going to stop talking.

Tony Holmes: Okay.

((Crosstalk))

Chris Mondini: …briefly. Thanks for both of the comments. One of the reasons I wanted to pull this Friday the group across the community is to break each SO/AC kind of things that they have. Some of them have common issues. Others, you know, the GAC or the SSAC, they'll say "Oh, we don't need people" or "We don't, you know." But there are things that can be helpful when you're thinking about your audience, thinking about getting your word out, thinking about how an SSAC publication gets distributed which is a thing I still haven't gone to SSAC to think about but I get a lot of people that say "Oh, I just want to sign up for the - I don't want to - all I need is when they published something, how can I get that?" There isn't a mechanism actually yet.

And on your point, Jen, about associations and partners, especially for business engagement, business associations are key, right? Because we can't talk to everybody. And in a way, I mean, I once spoke to somebody who is from an ISP who said "Oh, I followed everything that's at ICANN and then I have an informal phone call quarterly where we talk about ICANN stuff with other ISPs." It was on the policy but I said "That's the ISP constituency," right? So, you know, don't - so to your point about being in an event, thinking ICANN should be there, well, guess what, you're also ICANN.

So, you know, to amplify and put your hand up and say, you know, "Let me connect you to the source of information" or "Let me tell you, I think, keep ICANN in mind for the next gathering" but also again, to that point, tell us whether it's you or us or us together will try to get there and get it covered.

So thank you very much again. I always appreciate the cooperation and thanks for your ideas.

Tony Holmes: Thanks. We enjoy working with you. So thanks for your efforts, Chris.

Okay. It goes down to a similar sort of theme now and I'm juggling with the agenda. But we've talked about engagement. One of the things we got on

our agenda is the community consultation on the fellowship program. So, Esteban, this is your moment of fame, if you could help…

Esteban Lescano: Yes. Thank you, Tony. Esteban Lescano for the record. I have a presentation. I'm not sure if you have it.

I think that this is a community consultation on the fellowship program, something in that.

No? Sorry, I sent to Tony. Tony, you sent to him or not?

Tony Holmes: I sent to Andrea.

Esteban Lescano: Okay.

Esteban Lescano: I have it in - it's not like I'm…

Tony Holmes: Yes.

Esteban Lescano: It appears this fellowship community consultation, the name of the - I'm aware that we don't seem to have anyone on - can I send to you?

And we seem to have lost Rod.

((Crosstalk))

Esteban Lescano: Okay.

Maybe, Tony, if you want, we can go with another point of agenda and when - once we…

Tony Holmes: Okay. There's something we can (discuss) pretty quickly because I don't think there's anything we got to debate at length and that is just to make sure

we turn to our counselors, Tony and Philippe, really just to ask you if there's anything you particularly want to draw attention to with regards to GNSO council meeting that would take place here. So anything you feel you should raise? Yes? Whoever.

Philippe Fouquart: Philippe Fouquart here.

Tony Holmes: Normally, we go through the motions. I don't believe there are any motions to…

Philippe Fouquart: No, there's no motion.

Tony Holmes: So anything particularly you just want to comment on…

((Crosstalk))

Philippe Fouquart: So the items for discussions or the FY19 paper that will be sent by council. The other things are for discussion essentially. I'm not sure we want to go into the detail of that. There are three of the items for discussion: The cross-community engagement group on Internet governance, the input on the fellowship program that we've just discussed and the registrar transfer policy.

On the finance, it will be (unintelligible) for the council meeting. I would encourage people on the FY19 issue and encourage people to have a look at the transcript of the GNSO/ccNSO council meeting. I think that was yesterday, was it? And on - in that document, I believe it's on - I can send it to the list out. CcNSO colleagues refer to rejection action petition which might be sent by - from within that community as part of the empowered community as a whole. It's in the transcript. So it is possible that we see that in the next few weeks. I thought I would mention that.

Tony Holmes: That is an important point. I don't - you mentioned it's in the transcript but I don't know whether, Mark, we don't know whether that's another quick detail

on why that came about would be helpful to people who weren't - that was - the essence of why that situation has occurred.

Man: Well, it depends on which situation you mean. The possible submission, so that would be a part of the organization that is so unhappy with the budget that they took that action.

Tony Holmes: Sorry, there was no substantive discussion at that meeting…

Man: No. In fact, the ccNSO is very careful to say that they had only heard discussions of that and that there was no formal…

Tony Holmes: Right.

Man: … - there is nothing happening yet.

Tony Holmes: Okay. That's what I wanted to clarify.

                Okay. Thanks for that. And we can have a short item budget for the ISPCP in a moment but, Esteban, over to you.

Esteban Lescano: Yes. Esteban Lescano for the record. We have the - well, now, the fellowship program is under a community consultation process which the idea is to review the program and, please, the next one.

                The idea is, one, to review the program after ten years, you know, maybe this program began in 2007 and the idea is to review and also to plan the - for the next decade, thinking in a long-term sustainability.

                Also, to rotate the program of greater accountability and transparency and it's also based in one of the inputs of the community consultation once ten years (unintelligible) that was made to all the ICANN fellows in June '17.

And also, the disconnected with the previous point of agenda is connected with a budget to restriction that the organization is facing.

Next, please.

Yes. This consultation is structured in a questionnaire that has seven topics and 19 questions. The titles of these topics were "Program Goals and Ambitions," "Assessment on Program Input on AC and CO Group," "Selection Processes," "Program Size," "Program Structure," "Information Available on Program," "General Question." And there is one I meant to send the answer to this questionnaire and what - which is very important that we have that link at these at the end of this month, really the previous day on Friday, the 30 of March.

As maybe a - now if everybody knows about this program, that's why I want to provide a brief view of the program. This program was designated as a tool to bring new people to ICANN mainly from underrepresented communities and underserved areas. This fellowship consists ICANN finance, these newcomers and participants with (unintelligible) economic class airfare, hotel accommodation for every ICANN meeting.

The meeting is prepared by fellows in previous sessions through a coaching process and through ICANN Learn platform. For example, they now have since Abu Dhabi meeting, there is a - an ICANN Learn course about ISPCP, okay? That was designed by Osama and me. We're working on that and we have this program that is available for newcomers and fellows.

During the meeting, the fellowship is consistent in a capacity billing program with sessions, you know, many sessions with interviews, with ASO/AC leadership trying to explain and to get the people involved in a (unintelligible) and explain the bottom-up process for policymaking.

The expectation is that once you finished your fellowship, you have to present a report but the idea is to engage with the community, you know.

Next.

This consultation - well, the selection criteria of the independent committee and there is many criteria to select the fellows that this focus in diversity in gender, sector, experience, expertise, members of underrepresented or underserved community and who needs the financial support. And the experience in the reference is also important for each applicant.

Well, if you will take a look to the whole program in those ten years, well, for example actually, there is 130 fellows per year. But for example, for next year, as this budget restriction applies, there is a reaction to 50 to 90 fellows.

In the total of ten years, 640 fellows who are - we're financing by this program. And 153 countries were represented.

These two paragraphs are quotes from the consultation that states fellows are active participants in the ICANN community, serving in a number of leadership positions across ICANN community structure, as member of the ICANN board, for example, (unintelligible) and Leon Sanchez, and ICANN organization.

The fellowship program has been successful in bringing new people into ICANN. There is a potential for it to be instrumental to helping ICANN achieve a great diversity by supporting participation from those countries and sectors with little to no participation.

It's important to take into account that the focus of the fellowship is these people that comes from region, like my region, like in America, that is not easy to get engaged with ICANN and it's not easy to get the financial support for participants.

Next, please.

Well, some figures about the fellowship program. Those are in the consultation process and for the sector represented. You can see that civil society is at the head but also - well, the private sector or the domain name industry in the case of the private sector is at 11% of the total of the fellows.

If you split by operation, for example, it's very important - well, you - and you can see all the underserved areas like Africa, 20%, Asia, 15%, you know, Eastern Europe and Central Asia, 7%. And, for example, Latin America and the Caribbean, 25%. North America, just 1%. And here, it's interesting because there was a change since last meeting in Abu Dhabi that now there is a problem of tribal and (unintelligible) and the people coming from North America is engaging this kind of program that the idea is to - also to bring the first people to the ICANN ecosystem.

Well, in terms of diversity, we have a problem, you know, but it's still increasing but also we can say that there is that difference but the selection committee, when choose different participants for fellowship, they try to balance also the gender.

But that is very interesting because, okay, what happened with the fellows? We chat with communities who received the benefit of the fellowship program because the former fellows are now engaged in those communities. Well, it's true that the at large is the most - the community that's most of the people goes there and also the noncommercial stakeholder group.

But for us, it's also important because you can see that in the - for example, in the commercial stakeholder group received a 6%. And in my personal view, I think that is - because it is - it's more common that the person who come from a - an (ONC) or not-for-profit organization is willing to get, for example, fellowship or scholarship that the person who come from a

government or from a company, you know, that there is a different mindset, you know, the same with academia. The people from academia or the people coming from not-for-profit organizations have more (unintelligible) to get financial support for this kind of programs.

Well, which are the next steps? Well, we have to finish the - or we have to answer, you know, all the questionnaire. I have a first draft but I want to listen to you to get some guidance and some ideas. Then once I finish the draft of this answer, I will socialize in the ISP public list and the idea is to send our final answers before the deadline.

Tony Holmes: Thank you for that. Thank you for the presentation. And I know from being chair for a number of years I used to go along and meeting fellows first thing in the morning and you did not want to go in there when you're late because the level of question, it was really good. And of all the fellowship programs I've ever seen, this, for me, was always the best without any doubt. I think ICANN did a really excellent job.

And I know from talking to the fellows, yourself included and others, they work really hard. I mean, it really is demanding to be on that course. But at the end of the day, it really does have really positive impact. And you got an awful lot of time for that and would like to support that.

I'm really pleased that you've taken the lead in drafting something on behalf of the constituents. You have showed your work and others on that. And it's a great way to go to socialize that.

Just a question on that before I turn over to Tony. Mark, do we also have the support from the document draft in - or is that…

Mark McFadden: I'm so sorry that the funding for that has run out.

Tony Holmes: Okay, which is a great shame. We could have helped you a little bit more. But, certainly, if you could produce that initial draft and circulate, I really urge people to chip in and comment on that and support it because this is a really worthwhile activity.

Tony?

Tony Harris: Yes. Esteban, if I interpret correctly, you're also looking for things to suggest for the improvement of the program or how to handle it since you're going to have less budget, right?

Esteban Lescano: Yes. But I think that we are talking about the future, the future of ICANN.

Tony Harris: Yes. Yes.

Esteban Lescano: Like I said, it's years plan for the fellowship program and that's why it's very useful to get also recommendations or proposal. I think that - some of the questions are oriented in that way.

Tony Harris: What I think I've said this in the past but I'll repeat it. I think if you're going to have less money, spending - getting all those people from civil society individuals does not scale as much as if you - at least you targeted people who are heading organizations. I'm talking of Chambers of Commerce, not the US Chamber of Commerce, small Chambers of Commerce in developing countries and NGOs who have large memberships because if you bring the leader of one of those organizations, when he goes back, he can scale whatever he's taken away from ICANN to an awful lot of people; whereas, if you're an individual in circle of contacts and, let's say, of sharing his experience is much smaller.

And I didn't see in the division of - where you pointed out a private sector and the different participants, participant segments, let's say, in the fellowship program. I didn't see organizations or NGOs, for example. And perhaps a

suggestion might be made that part of the effort in bringing people in could be directed at having, at organizations, more individuals. But that's just something I thought of, okay?

Tony Harris   Just from that point, Esteban, when you pull together the response back, I think we could make the point that we would like to try and see if engineered in a way where there was small equality across the various sectors of ICANN from the people that brought in a thing that would be positive.

((Crosstalk))

Tony Holmes: Any other comments on that?

Man: (Unintelligible).

Tony Holmes: That's in China.

                 Well, Wolf-Ulrich are you there?

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: Yes, hi. Can you hear me?

                 Hi. It's Wolf-Ulrich speaking. Can you hear me?

Tony Holmes: Okay. I tried to entice him to…

((Crosstalk))

Tony Holmes: Wolf-Ulrich, are you with us? You hear this many times with that echo. But, yes, please go ahead.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: Is that working?

Tony Holmes: That's good.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: Okay, thank you. I was on mute.

Tony Holmes: Please go ahead.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: And I couldn't speak. But, you know, there was an interesting presentation, Esteban. I have one question, you know, (also in regard to the budget cuts) (unintelligible)

Esteban Lescano: (Unintelligible) states that for fiscal year in '18 was the number come for a fiscal year, the next fiscal year is a reduction of 50%, okay? In the amount of (participants). Okay? In management because every ICANN meeting has a different budget and it depends on what (the area is) and the cost of transportation, accommodation and so on.

Tony Holmes: Wolf-Ulrich, it might be similar to some of the other comments that (are like casting the first stone) made a number of times across various things here and he always explains it as cost in the first time making some proposal that is there for people to comment on. So I think this falls into that category probably as well. And it's important that we go back on this.

((Crosstalk))

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: Additional question, because of the question of the segmentation of applicants or people who are selected for this program, then maybe, you know, already know more people or coming from the noncommercial side and the ALAC side as applying for this, I would be interested to know how many people and from which sector has been rejected or has not been admitted to participate in these programs because that makes it - there's a question whether we should, for example, advertise in the future in our sector for this program anymore in order to attract people to apply for that. That's it. Thank you.

Tony Holmes: That's really a good point, Wolf-Ulrich, and we should include that comment in our response to raise that question. Thank you.

Esteban Lescano: We've been talking - sorry, I'll just (say) to close it down but in my personal case, I was a fellow twice. I am now a coach for newcomers and fellows. We are one and like an evangelist about the forum because I think that this is a powerful tool for people who wants to get engaged with them. That's to share with you for me and in the experience of my panelists and my fellows is very important is the opportunity to have a first encounter with the ICANN ecosystem.

Tony Holmes: You described yourself as an evangelist. I described you as a success story from the fellowship. So both are good. Thanks.

Tony Holmes: We talked about budget and one of the things I wanted to draw attention to is the official cut-off for the budget comments was the 8th and we did not make that as a constituency but we have had some dialog here with the budget team and we're not the only ones who struggle with that right before in the ICANN meeting. So there is going to be a process for comments submitted after the cut-off and I've discussed this with Osvaldo. We're pulling together a draft that we will basically circulate in a community or in the ISP community and we'll be getting that off pretty quick.

But Mark, very kindly and helpfully, drew together some slides that just pointed out a few major things on the budget. And I don't want to spend a little bit of time on this for one thing. We haven't got a lot of time. But there's, in case, for us while just stepping through this really quickly just for the background that if people haven't looked at the FY19 budget, it will provide flat background.

So if we could do that fairly quickly, Mark, and just go through the main points on those slide, that would be useful.

Mark McFadden: This always happens to me with this set of slides. Just go through very quickly.

Tony Holmes: Yes.

Mark McFadden: Okay. All right. So once again, these are personal observations that I was making for my own notes about the - it really wasn't intended as contribution to the constituency, although I'm glad that it's helpful. So maybe I'd go to the next slide. That gets me two down.

Thanks, Lars. So let me throw some numbers at you here. Back in the 2012 and 2013 budget rounds, the suggested growth for the new gTLD program suggested growth of the revenues as a result of deploying new gTLDs and the associated revenue growth with that in those two years was budgeted at 22% a year and that was - that turned out to be not very accurate, as we found out. One of the things that's been called into question this week is that the ccNSO is called into question the current, the fiscal year '19 revenue estimates. So that's an interesting point so that even though we know the 22% can't possibly be right, that could estimates are being called into question by people who know more than we do.

One of the things that, you know, we all know here is that there's a projected drop in revenue. There's also a projected drop in expenses. And so the second line there is supposed to be expenses.

And so what ICANN does here is it has a budget that basically takes the revenues as the top line and then tries to balance the budget with changes to the expenses. And I'll take the next slide here.

Some detail in increases here. The projection here is a very, very small increase, 4%, in revenue and there are some people who question that.

Personnel costs, I want to share some other figures here that are very important. Personnel costs continue to go up in this budget as does the headcount. Now, my notes on the headcount say that the current - the budget is being proposed goes by 25 FTE to 425 next year. So that's an addition of 25 in a budget where we're cutting.

The other number here that I think is really interesting, and at least again are in my notes, is that staff costs, personnel costs associated with staff comprised 56% of the budget and professional services account for 17% of the budget. If you take those two together, staff and professional services, that accounts for 73% of the entire budget that is proposed in fiscal '19. So that's just a note there.

And one of the things that is clearly done is that administration and operational costs received the bulk of the cutting -- that's 35% -- over the entire budget.

So, Lars, can I take you to the next one? Thanks.

If you make comparisons here, this was just the comparison that a friend of mine dug up as we were going through the budget. If you make some comparisons here, you can actually take a look at increase in staff and professional cost compared to, for instance, inflation rates and also other businesses in terms of headcount rate. And so that's just - this is a comparison ICANN against other metrics that you might use.

Now, ICANN is a different organization. Let's all acknowledge the fact that, first of all, it's a nonprofit. Second of all, it has a global reach. It's a very unusual organization but yet, I thought those metrics are interesting to compare ICANN's increases.

If you could go to the next slide. Is this fast enough?

So the major changes to come here. One of the things is that there are some - this budget gets a lot of bad press but there are a lot of good things in it. One of the things here is that there is extra money in this budget for research. There's additional personnel for the open data initiative and anyone who's been to ISP meeting with me that knows that I - that's one of my favorite things is trying to get data made public.

There's a goal to do more DNS abuse analytics. Our friends in the contracted parties really find this very important but our colleagues in the commercial stakeholder group also find this very important. So instead of actually being cut, this is an area in where there's actually money being set aside. And then one of the things that's interesting in this budget that I also think is a positive is the development of a fifth tank. For those of you who are old enough to remember Rod Beckstrom, I apologize to you. But if you remember Rod Beckstrom, there was this idea of developing a resource internal to ICANN that provided expertise in ways that the SOs and ACs couldn't do.

The budget actually includes that in a small amount of money to support it. Maybe I could have you go to the next slide.

Thanks, Lars.

I think many people have heard some of the things that our - in the budget that have gotten bad press. I'll go over a couple of them. One of them is that the budget is almost dependent on revenues from the DNS market, right? So there is no attempt to diversify the revenue stream.

Another thing is that constituency-supported travel remains even. So in this budget right now or the way I read the budget is that constituency travel is supported but not increased which in the long term is a question mark.

One of the things that has been important to the ISPs is that in this budget CROPP is removed. Now, I've been told that CROPP has been moved into (David Olive's) budget. But, of course, it's not been earmarked. Our ISP community made a lot of use of CROPP. We were effective at using it in terms of getting new members and doing outreach. It's actually a bad deal for the ISPs to remove CROPP.

One of the things to note, I don't have it on this slide but I noted for - because I'm allowed to take two more minutes, so that ICANN has in the budget -- you won't believe this -- but no money for GDPR related implementation and the Enforcement Division. I'll say that again. In fiscal '19, ICANN's included no money in the Enforcement Division for new GDPR related work. I'm not a GDPR expert. I actually hate it. I think it's taken over this meeting in Puerto Rico. I'd hold it but in the budget, it seems to me that you have to know that this is going to be an important part of Enforcement's activities in the next year.

Let me see here. One of the things that has been a big controversy - I can't even talk. Controversy in this budget is support for travel. And what is not broken out in the budget is budget lines for constituency supported travel, staff supporting travel, board supporting travel and so forth. You can't tell whether those lines are increasing or decreasing. You have no way of making a judgment.

And one of the things - when you saw the fellowship program which, by the way, let me be - let me get in the line to support the fellowship program. I was a mentor to the fellows two times and thought that program was great. We can have a conversation on whether we think that 50% cut is appropriate. I don't think that makes a significant enough of cut to actually do that. But there are other constituencies who argued for right sizing that program.

And finally, what shall I say here? There is a significant expenditure for people who are technical in the community. One of the things that you see in

this budget is a significant expenditure on IT infrastructure and security for internal activities inside of ICANN. So that's a sign for some of us where there's smoke, there might be fire. But that would be - I hope that was fast enough. Those are my slides.

Tony Holmes: That was perfect. Thank you. I've never used that word for you before, Mark.

Mark McFadden: No. And I never expect to hear it again.

Tony Holmes: It was great. And certainly, the major points that you've put out there will be utilized in our response that we'll get out. And we'll try to make it both positive and negative in terms of comments as well just in case that's the right way to go. So we'll circulate that pretty soon around for comments because we need to get it in.

Thank you. A couple of other quickie things. One of the items on our agenda and it doesn't take much discussion at the moment is the Board Seat 14 election process. This has been an ongoing issue. This is where we elect our board representatives in this part of the community along with the noncommercial.

We have to agree this side of house. And it's been ping pong for a long time and every time we have an intercession, we discuss this and we still struggle with it. I'm going to a meeting tomorrow morning, 7:30, where the leaders of the constituencies from our particular house are getting together to discuss this again. We haven't got that much disagreement left. But one of the key issues is whether you allow the noncom appointee appointed to your stakeholder group to vote in elections. We currently don't. The noncommercial, I've been very keen to make sure that that hasn't happened. In the contracted parties house, they do allow that. So that's a major difference.

There was a document that was circulated prior to this meeting that Chantelle kindly brought together, looking at the two ways of doing things across the house, the two different approaches that have been discussed side by side, so you could see the differences. People should have had the opportunity to look at that.

Wolf-Ulrich, is there anything you want to add on that item? Otherwise, I think it's a case of see where we are after the discussion tomorrow. Well, I'm fairly hopeful we'll finally conclude and agree a process to be used in future. But is there anything you wanted to add?

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: Hi, Tony. It's Wolf-Ulrich. Nothing else specifically. You will have also the meeting on Wednesday, I think. Tomorrow is CPH, contracted party house. And that's also…

Tony Holmes: That's right.

((Crosstalk))

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: …to discuss really if, you know, the contracted party house is really confirming that it includes noncom appointee. I think, you know, that should be not any problem and we should go the same way, you know, on both houses to nominate and vote for our board members.

So that's the only thing I would like to say which should be discussed all the other points of less importance..

Tony Holmes: Okay. Thank you for that. And I agree. I think it's unfair on the noncom appointees that if you guided one house, they do it one way and you're going to the other and they do it differently. So fully agree with you and that's where we'll be making that point tomorrow. I mean, we'll clarify that issue when we meet with the contracted parties house.

So we're almost done. An item under AOB is ISPCP elections. We are at the stage where we have to look ahead and discuss whether we've got any requirements for future elections which we have. But that is on the agenda for the first call after this meeting. So we don't have to have any discussion around that now. That will be for the next call.

So I'm just going to ask if anyone wants to raise any other items under ILB. And if that isn't the case, I can't see anybody indicating - Tony.

Tony Harris: Just like you said, we had a visitor today. He's gone from CANTO which is the Caribbean Network Telegraph - Telecommunications Operations Association. I was just looking through their Web site. We'll circulate a link to the list later. They have about 60 members in the US. It's a huge organization. They got all the (irons) in the Caribbean with service providers, cell phone providers. It's such an enormous organization. I had no idea. And he sat very quietly there in a corner but - I mean, they applied for membership yesterday. So I think that's good news as far as outreach and that was done by the ICANN SSAC member working in Caribbean. What's his name? Daniel…

((Crosstalk))

Tony Harris: Albert Daniels, yes. Okay.

Tony Holmes: That's indeed very good news, Tony, and thanks for your help in bringing them onboard. It's excellent, yes.

Chris?

Chris Mondini: Just that the risk is embarrassing, (Shabnil) has - is from Fiji. He's from Telecom Fiji. He sat through the entire meeting. He's very interested in the topic, asking me questions. I hope that you'll find and spend some time with

him, answering questions because this is a fellow who may be one of you someday.

Chis Mondini: From Fiji, Telecom Fiji.

Tony Holmes: Again, that's a great example of the fellowship and the engagement strategy that's really working. So thank you for that, Chris. And welcome. We really welcome having that dialog with you.

Mark McFadden: The second condition is that Fiji beats New Zealand in rugby, right?

((Crosstalk))

Tony Holmes: Okay. So with that, I'd just like to thank everybody for participating in the meeting. Wish you all a safe journey home. Hope you enjoy the rest of the meeting. And we look forward to having you back in the fold in full house for that next meeting. And thank you for staying up late.

So with that, meeting closed. Thank you very much.

END