EN

Tuesday, June 26, 2018 – 10:30 to 12:00 EST
ICANN62 | Panama City, Panama

UNIDENTIFIED MALE:	Salon 6 ALAC and Regional Leaders Working Session (4 of 7).
ALAN GREENBERG:	Okay. welcome to Working Session #4 of the At-Large Advisory Committee and Regional Leaders. Sorry to have started a bit late. The first part of the session is a very brief introduction, although I hope most of you don't need an introduction at this point to the issue of GDPR EPDP since I presume all of you were at an EPDP session yesterday and have some knowledge of what's going on.
	The accreditation model might be something that is less familiar to you. Holly will give a very brief introduction and just alert you to some of the high points and things you want to pay attention to and perhaps contribute this afternoon. Holly?
HOLLY RAICHE:	Okay. Can those slides be on screen? Because they're not really visible. I can talk to them anyway. These are really just a bit of background. For those of you who haven't memorized already, I'm just going to go really, really quickly.

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

The GDPR, that's what it stands for and it applies – the reason we're all concerned is it applies beyond the EU and the really real reason is the penalties, 4% of the annual turnover or 20 million euros. This is why we've paid attention to it. Next slide, please.

This is what makes the GDPR of more notice than the European directive or other privacy legislation globally. The things, in fact, that were clarified and strengthened in the GDPR from inter-directive, consent has be clearly stated. In other words, you can't have something that's scrolls down 44 pages and have somebody agree at the bottom. You have to have reached notification within 72 hours. There has to be a right to access your personal information. I won't go into the others. It's clear. Next page, next slide.

This is where we're up to right now. And for those of you who haven't caught up with it, we the ALAC actually had a policy page for this temporary specification. It was called the interim model. The temporary specification, which is what was passed by the board, taking effect on the 25th of May to coincide with the coming into force of the GDPR was a temporary specification and it includes – it was based on the interim model. I hope all of you at least looked at the policy page to check out the really important features of the interim model. These were the changes from the old WHOIS requirements.

Under the temporary specification – now the temporary specification – the specification can apply to the European economic area, but the registrars and registries have the option of changing their system so that, in fact, the requirements can apply globally. There may be an advantage to doing that because then you have one set of systems. There may be advantages to doing it the other way. But it's within this stage the scope of the registrars.

Now, another really important point from the interim model, which became a temporary spec, we've got tiered access. Now, we have to fill in a lot of blanks as to what that means, but it's a recognition that there will be gated access, that there's not going to be universal access to all of the registration data that's collected.

The third, it applies to all domain name registration personal data. This includes both legal and natural persons. That was an issue that was in dispute and it now applies to legal and all persons.

And for the WHOIS personal information that will be displayed – and this is the only data now that will be displayed – the name of the individual, their organization, the state, the province, and some anonymized e-mail or web form. And if you look at the WHOIS information that was previously available, we realized

ICANN
POLICY FORUM 62
PANAMA CITY
25–28 June 2018

that that is a significant difference in the information that will be available to everyone at no cost. Next slide.

This is what's being discussed now, and that is the access. I'm not going to go any further than this, but the requirements and temporary specification as to access – and this has become an issue as to how do you determine who has access and how do you manage it. They are two separate issues or two separate puzzles, problems. But they are being discussed in this meeting.

The specification says – and this is a direct quote – users with a legitimate and proportionate purpose for accessing the non-public personal data will be able to access through that data, through the registrars and the registries.

And that leaves open, number one, what is meant by what is a legitimate purpose and proportionate. It includes not only that there must be an individual who has accreditation but it must be available only for a legitimate purpose, so that there are two limiting factors there.

In terms of the mechanics of how that's done, there is a model floating around, and I thought rather than sit and walk you through the model, it's being decided. But it's a question of, first of all, how do you set up a system if you are a registrar or registry, to number one, validate the requestor to make sure

that they are in a category of legitimate requestors and then have a legitimate purpose?

At this stage, Alan, I just didn't think I would start to go into details because none of it has been decided. That's the issue we are confronting right now, as to put flesh on that paragraph from the temporary specification.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you. Just in light of our discussion yesterday of why are we here, why do we care is one of the really interesting questions. From a user perspective, why do we care if information about registrants is going to be redacted or not?

The simple answer is people want to look up who it is they're dealing with. The reality, in my mind, is such a small percentage of the four billion Internet users want to do that, but that's not a relevant issue. It's a nicety for us techies, but it's not a user issue.

The user issue, why we care, is access for organizations that create, do reputation management. That is to say what the reputation of URLs is. What is a reputation server? Well, if you ever go to a site and your browser says this is a dangerous site, or if you have … How much spam do you people get these days? Very little. Do you know how much spam there is on the Internet? It's a significant very large fraction of the total e-mail

set. It's getting filtered out in most cases because of services that use WHOIS to determine what is spam and what is not.

People who fight malware, law enforcement, all of those people, if they don't have access to WHOIS are going to have real problems and we're going to see malware increase, spam increase, all of those things. That's why users care. Keep that in mind as we're going forward.

The next session is on policy. I think the title may have been policy development. I don't remember. But it's policy involvement of At-Large.

We have struggled for years with how do we decide on whether we do a public comment or respond to a public comment and how do we do that quickly enough to actually have a good comment written that is not just the opinion of one person?

How do we coordinate involvement in PDPs and things like that? Yes, we have a hard time finding volunteers who want to do it, but even when we do, it's not clear that they're doing it on behalf of At-Large or with the involvement At-Large.

Jonathan is perhaps the person at this table who has I won't say the most experience in policy development, but he ranks way up there with one or two others of us. He's done it from a perspective of the Business Constituency and the GNSO which

ICANN
POLICY FORUM 62
PANAMA CITY
25–28 June 2018

has done a very good job of doing that. I'd like to turn the floor over to Jonathan to present a few ideas and thoughts and then open the floor. We are running late, so everything is going to be somewhat condensed. Jonathan?

JONATHAN ZUCK: Thanks, Alan. Thanks for asking me to discuss this. As Alan said, it's just a few ideas and I don't pretend to have all the answers, so I've just been giving some thought to policy development inside of the At-Large and some things we might try or start to think about in terms of how we move going forward. Obviously, we're at a very critical time in the history of ALAC with just beginning the implementation of the reforms that the board has agreed to, etc. So, I think it's wise for us to do a little self-reflection, if you will.

The first question that comes to my mind is where does the end user fit in? That word gets thrown around a lot, and as Alan mentioned in the context of GDPR, you have to give some thought to the end user.

I came up with this graphic because sometimes the end user is caught in the middle, if you will. So, I tried to use the analogy of an amicus brief or a friend of the court brief, which is there might be two parties to a dispute in a court room, but what gets decided there has implications for a third party that aren't one

ICANN
POLICY FORUM 62
PANAMA CITY
25–28 June 2018

of the parties to the dispute, so they're able to file a brief that says, "Hey, I'm not one of you two. I'm not smarter than either of you, but if you decide this this way, it will affect us badly." It's a perspective to bring to a discussion in which you may not be directly involved.

In some ways, I feel like it's a very similar role for the ALAC and At-Large more generally. There might be a big discussion in context of GDPR between the intellectual property holders, consumer protection on one hand, and say the contracted parties on the other hand and that's the tug of war that's taking place. But our perspective is to raise our hand and say, "Yeah, but if it comes out this way, then we'll have this problem of spam, malware, etc." So, it's this sort of third-party voice. I think it's important to keep that perspective, that we're not trying to just be another voice, but bring a unique perspective to the discussion. Next slide.

When I think about an end user, and this might be the most controversial thing, I don't think that it's a group of people. And I think we've run into all kinds of problems when we think of end users as being a distinct group of people because that's when we get paternalistic about them. It's some group of people that are less smart or less savvy than we are and we need to find some way to protect them from themselves, etc. I think there are

other groups within ICANN that already play the paternalistic role with respect to end users.

Instead, it's a set of activities or roles, and most of us are end users most of the time. Every time we use Twitter or Facebook or any other thing, we are end users. It's a set of activities. It's a way of accessing the Internet. More often than not, all of us are doing it as end users, not software developers or whatever else we may be doing in our day job, but as end users. We just want things to work. When we click on a domain, we want it to go to the website that it says it will. It's pretty simple stuff, and we all want that. So, I think it's important to maintain that perspective as we go forward. Next slide. Thanks.

I think our goal here is a persistence of perspective. What I mean by that is rather than being the smartest person in the room "I know more than you do, I can make a better legal argument than you can" we're maintaining that perspective of an end user and always speaking from that perspective, and from the interests of an end user of trying to use the computer in a way where we want it to just work.

I was a software developer for 12 years and it took me a long time to get that because I'm like, "Well, all you've got to do is hold down the ctrl+shift=alt key and move over and then you don't have that problem anymore." Now that I'm not a software

developer anymore, I find myself saying all the time, "Why doesn't this just work? This is Windows 10. Why can't it update?" That kind of thing. That's the end user perspective, even though I was a software developer. So, that perspective I think is what we want to maintain.

I think the At-Large community needs to be selective in the issues that we care about, focused in the way that we address them, and consistent in the messages that we deliver throughout the ICANN processes.

As Alan mentioned, I think there's a lot of propensity to just make it a kind of free for all, we all go out into the world and give our personal perspective, but the extent to which the At-Large and ALAC can speak with one voice I think is where we'll have the most effectiveness inside the community. So, a selective focus and consistent. Next slide.

I came up with this idea related to comments, public comment for example, of a kind of a funnel. Questions that we should ask of ourselves before we take the next step of trying to get active in a particular comment. Is the question within ICANN's remit? If it isn't, we should stop talking about it. You can still talk about it in the restaurant. You can form a subgroup that wants to make an ISOC comment or something like that, but our job is to advise

ICANN
POLICY FORUM 62
PANAMA CITY
25–28 June 2018

ICANN on policy. I think, as Alan mentioned yesterday, we have to keep our mind on that role and that task.

The second, is there a unique end user perspective in this particular question being discussed? If there isn't, we don't need to speak on it. We don't need to just "me too". It's about whether or not we can bring that perspective.

Can we reach some form of consensus in terms of the positions that we would like to take on a particular topic? I would suggest that those are the ones that we should try to be most active on are the ones in which we can speak with one voice. Then, do we have the resources to deploy to write a comment?

Those are, what I believe, to be the questions we should ask when making a decision about whether to comment on a particular comment. Next slide.

Work group participation is another area where we have the potential to make an enormous contribution to policy development inside of ICANN. Even though they are GNSO policy processes, there's never been an issue that I've experienced in 13 years where somebody has said, "Hey, we don't need to listen to you. You're with the At-Large and you're not part of the GNSO." People are respected for their work in this environment above all. So, if you do the work, you end up having a significant amount of influence in the outcome of a particular work group.

So, we should attempt rough consensus on key issues before that work group convenes. Those that are participating in the work group should represent those views, those consensus views. They should bring back new issues that arise as part of the participation in that work group, and then we should go ahead and rinse and repeat, as we used to say in business process analysis.

Go back to the top. We've got new issues now that have come up in the work group. You bring them back to At-Large community and say, "These came up. What do you think our position should be on this? Let's achieve some rough consensus on that and send you back into the group, speaking on behalf of the At-Large community."

Everybody comes to the microphone. "I'm with At-Large, but I'm speaking in a personal capacity." I think at that very moment, you're deflating your influence. It doesn't need to just be the chair of ALAC that speaks on behalf of At-Large. If we get our act together, we should all be speaking on behalf of At-Large because we've done the work up front to obtain some level of consensus. Next slide.

So, we've recently formed a policy team that Olivier and I are co-chairing. I'm trying to think about what that role might be together with the amazing staff we have supporting us. We

should convene discussions on policy issues in order to try and obtain that rough consensus. We should facilitate consensus-building, generate talking points with working groups. When we reach consensus, we'll actually put out, publish something, that says, "Here's our three main points." Say these three things over and over again to everyone you talk to in the hallway, in the restaurants, etc. Say these three things because that's a basic premise of argumentation is say fewer things more often and you'll have more of an impact.

We'll take the first crack at the decision funnel on comments about whether or not and we'll put that back out there. This is our thinking on why we should or should not make a comment on this. And if nobody objects to assessment that we should comment on it, then we let it go. Then, if people do, then have discussed that further.

Then, finally manage the commenting process. I think we've got to take a more active role of bringing people on and then managing and prodding people to get through the process and making sure that it comes back into the discussion in the At-Large generally so that there's consensus around the comments that are developing, because right now, it's kind of freestyle and it's unpredictable about when people are commenting, what they'll comment on and whether or not it's a time that's most

ICANN
POLICY FORUM 62
PANAMA CITY
25–28 June 2018

helpful to the process that's taking place. So, I think some pressure is necessary in that context as well.

I think that's all I had. Those are just some ideas. I don't have all the answers yet, but I wanted to get the conversation started and spend less time talking and more time listening.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you very much. We have a significant speaker queue already. At this time, we have myself, Alberto, Satish, Eduardo, and Holly. I'll let Maureen manage it after that. We don't have a lot of time, by the way, so let's do a one-minute, please. In theory, because we started late, we only have about ten more minutes. We'll extend it a little bit. If you'd like to cancel the discussion on policy matters on travel issues, we can do that, but I prefer to have a little bit of time.

I have only one very quick comment. Although we are representing, we're from At-Large, we are also all thinking people. So, I know I participate in a lot of working groups and I will often make a comment because I believe I'm moving the discussion forward that is not a user issue, but I think I can contribute to a good end point. There's nothing stopping anyone from doing that and we encourage it, but that's not an At-Large point of view. You're clearly wearing your personal hat

ICANN
POLICY FORUM 62
PANAMA CITY
25–28 June 2018

at that point. There's nothing to stop that from happening and that's an important distinction.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Certainly. The goal isn't to muzzle anyone, but I think we increase the effectiveness of the organization and the voice of the organization if it's consistent and repetitive.

ALAN GREENBERG: Alberto?

ALBERTO SOTO: Thank you very much. It's very important. Thank you very much for your comments. You are very clear. And I think there is a very important point to take into account. We need to highlight our bottom-up system. We have an ALAC member, the ALAC member comes to the meetings to express, to speak the voice of the RALOs. That's why we have to go back to the RALO and ask them for the information.

The bottom-up system is a never endless thing because the ALSes do not go to the end user because we are the end users because we have the knowledge. And I am always repeating the same thing. We do represent the interests of those who are not

able to speak because they don't have the knowledge and we have to know that and we have to defend that point.

So, if our ALSes go, reach the end user and they take the information – and this is what I always repeat – this is where we have the feedback necessary for the RALO and the RALO will give that feedback to the ALAC member and the ALAC member will create or modify or amend the policies, because otherwise we're always saying the same. If the RALO is not providing information, then I go to ALAC and I will provide personal information because I have no information to provide and that is not good for us and not good for the end user. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you. Our next speaker is Satish, but I will point out that when Jonathan is talking about participation in these processes, that is not limited to ALAC members. Anybody who is willing to put the effort into it can participate. Thank you. Satish?

SATISH BABU: Thank you, Alan. I have two quick comments. First is I found the presentation very useful. The first is regarding some phases like one voice and the unique perspective. The fact that end users are not monolithic, there is a lot of diversity and potentially a number of different opinions can come up from the community.

How do we represent this [inaudible] at times, kind of positions [inaudible] judgment and decide one over the other? That's one question.

Policy perspective, from a process perspective, there was a [inaudible] that should try something like a policy ambassador from a RALO community to be a champion of a particular policy. Do you think the working group can support such an initiative as we go forward? Because we find there's a big challenge to bring in more people into the policy stream. That's the most significant challenge that we RALOs face at this point. Thank you.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Thank you for your question. I'll try to be quick, Alan. I know we're in a rush. As to your first question, I think forming consensus is difficult, but I think it's worthwhile. In other words, I think, as Alan mentioned, there are going to be opportunities to speak as an individual, to have a minority view. And again, it's not about muzzling anybody. But, I think it's worth the effort to try and reach consensus and to come up with a majority view despite the fact that there are diverse perspectives so that end user perspective is communicated in an effective way. If we are all just pulling in multiple directions, it's easy to ignore all of it.

ICANN
POLICY FORUM 62
PANAMA CITY
25–28 June 2018

So, I think, where possible, we should try to form a rough consensus and get on that page and represent that consensus out to the broader ICANN community and do whatever we need to do to make sure that inside that consensus-building process, that all perspectives are heard.

On your second question, yes, I think that some kind of a policy ambassador could be a very useful part of this policy committee. I think that the policy committee can be a driving force to make sure that we're active and monitoring and managing the process of participation whether it's in work groups or in public comments, but we definitely need participation not only in that committee, but also more broadly, and having people that specialize in particular areas I think is incredibly helpful because nobody can know everything, except Alan, right? And we're losing him.

ALAN GREENBERG: I'll point out, over my career, and it's now almost 12 years, there are relatively few cases where we actually had strongly different opinions across At-Large. There are some, and occasionally an individual disagrees with the vast majority, but there are relatively few where we have been really different. We'll go to the next speaker. David Conrad has joined us, so I'm going to

look at the agenda. We may do some juggling. The next speaker, however, is Eduardo. Again, please be brief.

EDUARDO DIAZ: Briefly, I have some comments. The presentation is very good. I hear about policy advice and policy comments, but I think ALAC also provides comments on other things. For example, there is the fellowship that is asking for comments on fellowship program. Basically, it doesn't do anything with the policy, but I think that's something also that we do. So, we have to take that into perspective.

Also, one of the things that I have noticed when we put policy advice or any advice is that the fact that we do it mostly freely or [inaudible] when you see the final advice, all of them have a different style. I think some of the support that we need is somebody that knows how to write policy advice, takes all the comments and puts them in the right context. Not all of us are English speakers, so I think that's something that we need, [inaudible] for me.

The final thing is I want to get into that policy thing that you have with Olivier. How do I do that? I just call you and say I'm here?

JONATHAN ZUCK: Yes.

EDUARDO DIAZ: Okay, thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG: To note from yesterday from the ICANN bylaws, our mandate is not just restricted to policy. So, I think we have a very strong argument why we care about the fellowship program and why we cared, for instance, about ICANN accountability. Even though there's no direct user connection, there is an indirect one. So, it's not just policy.

We have a queue. We'll close it now. We have Seun and Holly.

JONATHAN ZUCK: I'll say something quickly. Just for a second, I just want to respond to one thing. I think the language issue is something that we should spend some time grappling with. I don't have all the answers. I do know that I'm chairing the CCT Review Team and there were participants that were native speakers of different languages on that team and when it came to drafting, the non-English speakers kind of withdrew from the process. I think finding a way to either let them write a draft that gets cleaned up by somebody or even write a draft in their own

ICANN
POLICY FORUM 62
PANAMA CITY
25–28 June 2018

language and it gets translated as part of these processes is something that we ought to be working toward for sure because we don't want to lose those brains just because they're concerned about what their English writing looks like. That's a shame. That's something that's definitely on my mind to try and work on. I just don't have all the answers yet.

ALAN GREENBERG: We will go through with the queue we have right now. It is closed. We'll probably cancel or defer the travel policy session. I think this one is more important. Next we have Holly. Sorry, Sarah. I'm sorry, Sarah.

SARAH KIDEN: Thank you, Alan; and thank you, Jonathan. That was a very nice presentation. I like the part where you talked about when you work, your work will speak for itself. But, [inaudible] talk about the beginning, how to get the work to speak for yourself. What would you say about that? Thank you.

JONATHAN ZUCK: I'm not sure I understand the question, but I guess what I mean is that the processes in which we are involved when it comes to work groups are usually convened by the GNSO, and in theory, the GNSO are the ones that set policy for ICANN, and in theory,

we are supposed to simply provide advice to the board after that policy is developed. But, in practice, we participate in those work groups and provide input. What I'm saying is the ethos of the community as a whole is such that, if you're in the work group showing up for the calls, doing your homework and actively participating, your opinion gets respected whether you're in the GNSO or not.

ALAN GREENBERG: Holly?

HOLLY RAICHE: Really just a pointer to the fact that we have a policy page. I know you're talking about consistency, but if everybody will just be aware of the fact that Ariel spent a lot of time putting up all of our policies against various topics and so forth. It's really easy to find out what we've said in the past, and if we are talking about consistency, which I really applaud, then in fact let's go back to the policy page. Let's actually understand what we've said in the past, and then either make a decision to support that or make a decision to say, actually, the circumstances have changed. We're changing our policy. And explain why. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG: Hadia?

ICANN
POLICY FORUM 62
PANAMA CITY
25–28 June 2018

HADIA ELMINIAWI: I have a quick comment. I want to go back to your presentation where you had this funnel and look at where you put the consensus part in. I don't know if we can do that, actually, but anyway, you put the consensus in the funnel that you presented before actually the part in which we embark on drafting the comment itself. I would like to fully support that because I think it's very important make our position first, build up the position of the committee first before we actually embark on drafting the statement.

This is very different than what is actually happening now, because now the penholder, whoever he is, just goes and puts ahead what he thinks and then we go forward from there. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG: If I may respond to that, we always ask for comments on the Wiki way in advance of a penholder writing anything. We rarely get anything. Now, if someone has accepted the responsibility, they meet that responsibility by writing something, and if they have had no input, then it's their ideas and hopefully then other people will at least look at it. But, it's got to work with other people actually participating ahead of time.

ICANN
POLICY FORUM 62
PANAMA CITY
25–28 June 2018

HADIA ELMINIAWI: Totally agree.

JONATHAN ZUCK: I'll just add briefly that I think that a lot of people participate more easily when they can respond to something. So, just being the first one to write a comment about something I think is very difficult for people. But, if you put something up there, it becomes a kind of strawman that people can respond to. So, I think in the policy development process, it might make sense to start with some bullets or something like that to say here's what we're thinking as a policy committee as the natural At-Large position on this. What do people think? Then, people comment on that and then maybe we can start to develop policy from there.

But, I agree with it. A lot of it is timing-based and things, but I think we need to drive that process of reaching consensus. I think we agree completely.

ALAN GREENBERG: I will note that my practice, and I can't force it on other people, is that if I am a penholder and no one else has commented, I will post my draft, as it were, but I'll post it as a comment, not in the

box saying this is now cast in concrete. It's partly a matter of how you present it, even if you are the penholder. Yrjo?

YRJO LANSIPURO: Thank you. I very much support devoting more of our time trying to achieve consensus before we present our points in the working group. That doesn't need to be consensus in a very detailed way. Even if we have just the lowest common denominators among our group, that is better than just a bunch of individual voices.

ALAN GREENBERG: Sorry. I was doing administration. If the question was aimed at me, I missed it.

JONATHAN ZUCK: It wasn't, I don't think. It was aimed at the whole group, which is that we should do the effort of reaching consensus before we send people out into the world in work groups.

ALAN GREENBERG: In an ideal environment, yes.

JONATHAN ZUCK:	That's what we're striving for, Alan. We're striving for ideals. It's like the GDPR that won't truly be enforced on European companies for the next 50 years, but you know.
ALAN GREENBERG:	Alright. David Conrad is already in the room. We've going to move off of this topic onto the KSK. When David is finished, we'll either revert back to the policy one or go to the travel guideline discussion that we were going to have earlier. I again welcome David Conrad who will I think give us an update of where we are, what we now know, and anything else we want to talk about related to KSK.
DAVID CONRAD:	So, where we are is Panama. What we know I'm still trying to figure that out myself. So, thank you for the opportunity to speak to you today. I'm going to give you a brief update on the status of the KSK rollover project. I am, at least I think I still am, David Conrad, the CTO of ICANN. Next slide.
	This is the root KSK rollover schedule as it exists now. Right now, we're in the middle of briefing the community and getting feedback during ICANN 62. We've had a number of presentations already on the current status of the KSK roll.

As you may know, we had postponed the KSK roll back in September of last year, drafted a revised plan and submitted that for public comment, had a community feedback session in Puerto Rico. We ended the comment period. We received, if I remember correctly, a total of 14 comments and have proceeded on with the plan as written.

We had intended on having in May a resolution from the board to move forward. Actually, I guess we did have the resolution as part of the consent agenda, so it went forward other things that we had intended on doing during the board workshop in Vancouver in May actually got deferred because of discussions about GDPR. But we did actually get a resolution from the board to ask RSSAC, SSAC, and the RZERC to review the comments on the plan and provide comments back to us.

That's in process right now. We have received a number of questions from SSAC and a couple of questions from RZERC and we're waiting for the response from those bodies eagerly.

On August 10th, we anticipate having all the feedback from the various committees and we will revise the plan as necessary based on that forward. We'll submit the final plan to the community and are anticipating the board to give us a resolution at their workshop in Brussels in September to move forward.

ICANN
POLICY FORUM 62
PANAMA CITY
25–28 June 2018

Then, if all goes well, we will actually start using the new KSK which actually is already deployed in a large number of resolvers but is not really possible for us to check how many resolvers actually deployed into because of the way DNSSEC works until we actually roll the key on 11 October 2018. Next slide.

So, basically, just went through all of that. I guess one of the things we can say in addition is we are now publishing a daily snapshot of the trust anchor announcements that were seen at the root servers. Almost all of the root servers are now providing data. That's the RFC 8145 data that we are receiving to remind people. The RFC 8145 data is announcements made by resolvers that have implemented a new specification – new as of April of 2017. Most of the open source resolvers support RFC 8145 now. It's notable that Microsoft does not support RFC 8145, and by some measure, Microsoft is the most common resolver on the planet. But the resolvers that we have seen in public domain, BIND, Unbound, CZNIC's Knot resolver, Power DNS all support RFC 8145. Next slide.

As mentioned, we revised, we did a public comment. Public comment is completed. There were 20 comments, not 14. At large, it is supportive. We did have a couple of comments suggesting that we should wait until more information is available. The rollover operational plans were revised to reflect those comments. Next slide.

RFC 8145, if you actually want to see the daily collection of RFC 8145 data, you can go to that URL. We also are collecting the source IP addresses of that data. So, that would be the resolvers that are querying the root servers with the RFC 8145. It's not actually the end user machines, but it is the resolvers that are in front of those end user machines. Next slide.

That graph shows you where we are in terms of the percentage which is the black line of resolvers that are announcing only the old KSK, the KSK 2010. The green line is the number of sources that are reporting trust anchor data. We are up to 180,000 unique IPv4 addresses on a daily basis. The red line is actually the sources that are only reporting KSK 2010. That's around 20,000-ish. Right now, we're around 10% of resolvers appear to be misconfigured, which is a high number. It's actually higher than it was when we decided to postpone, but that isn't as big a concern to us now as it was then, because we have a better handle on what's actually going on. Next slide.

We are doing ongoing communications as much as we can. We continue to do lots of presentations. We've written articles that show up a bunch of other places.

We are at the suggestion of some folks in Japan, [inaudible] in particular. We're actually preparing a readiness survey and we're going to be sending that out to the top 1,000 autonomous

ICANN
POLICY FORUM 62
PANAMA CITY
25–28 June 2018

systems worldwide that have showing validation evidence from data collected by APNIC. The survey we hope, or it would be nice, if we actually get data back, so people actually answer the survey. But that's not actually the primary goal of the survey. The primary goal is just to increase awareness. It's just a way that we're hoping that the DNS administrators who receive that survey will say, "Oh, yeah, I should probably look at that."

As I said, if we do get people answering the survey and get data back, that would be nice, but it's not critical to what we're trying to do now.

We are in the process of investigating and documenting how popular validators react when the trust anchor change, so basically trying to figure out what the timing will be when the validation failures start to occur and how that affects cashing. And we anticipate answering any questions that SSAC, RSSAC, or RZERC ask us with regards to the rollover.

As I mentioned, SSAC has already provided us with some written questions. RZERC has asked a couple of informal questions and we hope to see the revised plan or hope to see the final comments from them in time for revising the plan to be available for the 10th of August. Next slide. That's it? That's the last slide. No worries. Okay. I thought there was one more slide.

So, the reason that we're more comfortable right now from OCTO's perspective for the KSK rollover is that we've done, with the help of others, particularly within the community, a bunch of analysis on why we were seeing the numbers that we were seeing.

It turns out that a good portion of the unique IP addresses that we were seeing were actually the result of a particular VPN implementation that had hardcoded the RFC 2010 into that VPN, so every time anyone who is using that VPN would connect into the network with a unique IP address, if they're connecting from a hotel or something like that, the KSK 2010 announcement would then be sent from that unique IP address.

So, we were seeing evidence – what we were seeing largely … Not largely, but a good proportion was actually evidence of this VPN being deployed across the planet. Actually, if you go back to the graph slide, around May of 2018 the vendor actually deployed a new version of the software and we began to see a significant downtick in the number of unique IP addresses that were querying the root servers with the RFC 8145 data.

Another reason that we're more comfortable now is working with APNIC we actually sat down and tried to correlate the queriers for 8145 data that we were seeing at the root with the information that the folks at APNIC collect using their Google

Ads based research platform. And based on the analysis done by Geoff Huston which is published on the APNIC website, I believe, or at least the [inaudible] website that Geoff maintains, it indicates with some extrapolation that approximately .05% of resolvers today would be negatively impacted by the rollover.

The community, when they prepared the guidelines for the rollover, indicated that an expected or acceptable level of failure would be .1% of end users. So, .05% is obviously less than 1%, so at least from that perspective, we're underneath the criteria that the community guidelines had come up with when the original key roll plan had actually moved forward.

There is also a belief that the resolver that are currently configured with KSK 2010 are not fronting a large number of end users because it turns out, looking at again the data that Geoff Huston has been collecting, that the vast majority of DNSSEC end users are actually using the large scale resolvers operated – public DNS-type resolvers operated by Google or Cloud Flare or Quad9 or Verisign or Cisco, and all of those folks we are confident will be able to handle the rollover effectively.

So, that's sort of where we are right now. As I mentioned, we're waiting on input back from SSAC, RSSAC, and RZERC, which we will then take, reroll the plan to move forward, submit that to the board for board resolution. Then if all goes well, the Internet

ICANN
POLICY FORUM 62
PANAMA CITY
25–28 June 2018

won't break on the 11th of October 2018. I'm happy to answer any questions anyone might have.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you very much. That is a far less scary story than we heard a few months ago. So, thank you. I have one very brief question. You said Microsoft has not implemented 8145. There's lots of Microsoft people here, including some senior ones. Has anyone talked to them?

DAVID CONRAD: So, we had some discussions at an operational level. The problem is that the Microsoft release trains take a very long time to get out of the station. The stuff that they're doing now is intended, as we were told, for deployment in like 18 months from now. So, even if they went out and implemented something immediately, it wouldn't come out for 18 months.

ALAN GREENBERG: There's no way to treat this as a bug?

DAVID CONRAD: The folks at Microsoft were reluctant to review it that way.

ALAN GREENBERG: We won't press the matter then. Queue. I see Ricardo and I see John. Ricardo?

RICARDO HOLMQUIST: If you don't mind, I will do my question in Spanish.

ALAN GREENBERG: No timers, but let's try to keep it to one minute. Thank you.

RICARDO HOLMQUIST: I have four questions for you. The first one is what can we do as end users, and the ones that we represent, what can ALS do to help compliance or to contribute to compliance with this?

You said 0.5% of end users. That might be 20 million users, for example. That would represent the whole population of my country, so I believe that might be a problem. That's why I would like to make a relationship. I mean, if we are talking about end users, servers.

The third question is you said that we say that we use Google or many other tools, but we are increasingly using mobile phones. When you see mobile phones, it gets really complicated to change their resolver. So, we do depend on the company, the mobile phone company.

ICANN POLICY FORUM 62
PANAMA CITY
25–28 June 2018

I believe, in my country, we have 15 million users. We will have problems. How can we reach out to those companies? These are my questions. Thank you.

DAVID CONRAD: For the percentage, it's actually .05, not .5. It's less than 1% and that's based on the analysis done by APNIC and some extrapolations. What end users can do, unfortunately, is quite limited. The challenge right now is that there isn't any mechanism by which an end user can query the state of the DNSSEC configuration in a resolver.

There is a proposal that's winding its way through the IETF right now, something called KSK sentinel, that would allow for an end user to be able to send a query to resolvers to get back information associated with the KSK configuration of that resolver, but that is not generally available yet. The standard has not yet been completed. It is available in a couple of bleeding-edge resolvers but has not seen any significant deployment at this stage. It most likely will not see significant deployment for at least a year, more likely two.

Unfortunately, at this point in time, the only way that it is possible to establish whether a resolver has the proper key signing key configured is to actually look at the configuration of that resolver which is not generally possible by end users.

ICANN
POLICY FORUM 62
PANAMA CITY
25–28 June 2018

At one point, we had considered and had planned on suggesting to end users that simply call up their ISPs to ask the ISPs to check if the right KSK was configured, but folks within the ISP community suggested to us that that would be seen as highly antagonistic because it would result in them getting lots and lots of phone calls that would result in increased expense associated with their support centers for no good reason.

We then thought about, well, if we could reduce it to only the folks who are turning on DNSSEC, who have turned on DNSSEC, and there are ways that end users can establish whether their resolver is using DNSSEC, but the same community folks suggested that if we did that, then we'd be penalizing the folks who are doing the right thing and turning on DNSSEC because what they would almost instantaneously do when they started receiving calls from people asking for them to turn on or to make sure the KSK was configured correctly is they'd simply turn off DNSSEC to stop the phone calls.

So, until something like KSK Sentinel is available, it's unlikely that there will be anything that end users could constructively do. Unfortunately, this is seen by many as a flaw in the way DNSSEC was actually deployed.

But, at this stage, the approaches that we're taking in trying to get the word out, end users could encourage their ISPs to

ICANN
POLICY FORUM 62
PANAMA CITY
25–28 June 2018

participate in DNSSEC-related activities just to be aware of DNSSEC. I say that with a little reluctance, because as mentioned, the ISP community gets very nervous when you tell end users to actually talk to the ISPs.

The third question, yes, in many cases, cell phone devices, end user devices, use their ISPs configured resolvers and the ISP has control over that, and it can be difficult in many cases to change the resolver of those devices.

It's worth nothing that, right now, the actual number of folks who have enabled DNSSEC is relatively low, although the number of end users impacted by turning on DNSSEC is around 25%. The number of resolvers that have enabled DNSSEC is relatively low. It just turns out that there are a small number of very, very large resolvers that have enabled DNSSEC, so the percentages are sort of artificially high.

There is a domain name that you can query that if you get an answer back, it indicates that DNSSEC validation is on. And if you can do that on your cell phone or your raspberry pie device or whatever, then you can know whether or not the resolver that you're actually using has DNSSEC enabled, and I can provide that domain name somehow. Maybe e-mail.

ALAN GREENBERG: You said if you get an answer back, DNSSEC is enabled.

DAVID CONRAD: Sorry, it's the opposite. If you get an answer back, DNSSEC is not enabled. I think the domain name is – what is it? DNSSEC-fail.org or something like that. I'll get that domain name.

ALAN GREENBERG: We've distributed that widely in our last discussion.

DAVID CONRAD: If you are using a device that indicate its using DNSSEC, then hopefully in the case of large-scale telephone companies, since they will be using DNSSEC, they will undoubtedly receive this survey so it at least will inform them, hopefully, that the KSK is rolling if they weren't already aware and they will take appropriate steps.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you. We have the queue closed. We have John and Tijani in it. John?

JOHN LAPRISE: Thank you, David, for your presentation. Back in the last ICANN meeting, we were talking about at that time the unbounded risk

ICANN
POLICY FORUM 62
PANAMA CITY
25–28 June 2018

because we didn't understand what was going on. From what I gather from your presentation and from what SSAC has said previously, the risk has been bounded and that is gratifying and it definitely satisfies some of my concerns regarding this. So, thank you very much.

DAVID CONRAD: I'll just say that the risk is more bounded than it was. I don't want to say we fully bounded everything, but we have a better understanding now of the universe in which we're operating and some of the very odd things that occur within that universe.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you. Just for those who are arithmetically – don't do arithmetic well, .05% of four billion users, assuming the .05 has some validity, is two million and that's distributed around the world. So, there's not too many countries that are going to be the whole country affected. Tijani?

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Thank you very much. David, I have two questions. One of them is stupid, but I have to ask it. Let's start by this question. You just said that there is no way for the end user to know if the resolver is using, is updated to accommodate the resolver. I was told earlier that there is a very simple tool that was put at the

ICANN POLICY FORUM 62
PANAMA CITY
25–28 June 2018

disposal of people to know if the resolver is up to date. Now you say this doesn't exist, so I am a little bit confused. This is a stupid question.

DAVID CONRAD: So, there's no way an end user can determine whether or not the new KSK has been configured into the resolver. The way DNSSEC works is the ZSK which is signed by the KSK is used to sign the root zone. There's only one set of signatures that are allowed because of size restrictions in the response.

There is a way that you can determine whether or not DNSSEC is enabled on the resolver, which may have been what the idea was, but there's no way currently to establish what the trust anchor is configured within the resolver, unless you have access to the configuration of that resolver.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Thank you. The second question is about the .05%. I came late, so perhaps you addressed it. How did you manage to have this figure? I know that several months ago we are saying that we will never be able to define any kind of figure to say this is the number of resolvers that will not be enabled for the new KSK rollover.

DAVID CONRAD: Basically, what happened was Geoff Huston and George Michelson at APNIC who run this Google Ad-based test research platform, sat down with my team and we actually compared notes. We actually looked at the source IP addresses that they were seeing in their tests and compared it to the 8145 data that we were seeing in our tests and actually were able to come up with an extrapolation based on those numbers to derive the .05%, end user impact value.

Geoff wrote up this analysis in a paper that's published on … At least I know it's published on his personal website. I'll make sure that's available to you all if you're interested in that.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you very much.

DAVID CONRAD: My pleasure and thank you for the time.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you. We have 10-12 minutes before our break right now. We can go back to the policy. We can spend 10 minutes on travel. Is there any feeling of which we way should go? If we don't do travel now, we will try to fit it in some other time. It may or may not show up. There is a Wiki space that is open and we

are accepting comments. Desire? Anyone? Whoever speaks first gets their way. Policy or travel? Travel. Two people said travel. Travel it is.

To summarize, a new draft set of travel guidelines has been published. It is open for public comment. It is not very different from the previous one. There are some changes. There's a lot of clarifications because the previous one was so old, much of it didn't apply anymore.   I have made some comments. I know Judith has made some comments. There may be someone else who has added some.

We complain an awful lot in this group and most groups in ICANN, volunteer groups, about problems with travel. This is the opportunity to say something. Whether we will get something changed because of a comment is not 100% clear, but like anything else – and we've said this with regard to policy issues – if we don't make our comments known now, we have no grounds on which to complain later.

So, if you are finding that something related to travel, even if it's not mentioned in the guidelines is something that is either annoying to you or causes significant problems, this is the opportunity to fix it.

There are some things that are outside of our control. ICANN puts a fair amount of effort, for instance, into visas right now. I

think we can say with a high level of assurance, these problems will increase. They are not going to get better. There are going to be more and more restrictions. That's just the way the world is going right now. Maybe 30 years from now, that will be different. I don't predict it in the next few years.

ICANN can't fix that. We can't say let's not go to any countries where there are no visa problems. I don't think there are any countries where there are no visa problems. But that doesn't mean we can't comment if we think there's something substantive that ICANN can do about it.

So, I strongly encourage you, that if something annoys you about travel practices, say so. If we don't say it now, we have no grounds to complain later. I'll open the floor to specific comments. Hadia?

HADIA ELMINIAWI: So, actually, I don't want to speak about anything that's annoying me. I don't have the document right now in front of me, but as I recall, I had some comments with regard, for example, when they're talking about the visas. Then it says that the applicant should have a visa like two weeks prior to the meeting, then if he or she has an approval from the embassy like that we will get it one week before the travel, then they actually can go.

Actually, this is not what happens. Usually, we have attendees or participants acquiring their visas like a day or two before the meeting. This is a fact. For example, I know for sure about two participants attending this meeting, they got their visas just two days before the travel. I know many people traveling from some countries, especially African countries, and maybe some other areas that I'm not aware of, but I'm speaking about Africa, it's difficult for them most of the time to acquire visas.

It's just about the logistics and the constraints that are put in there, that if applied, but they're not applied, if really applied will restrict the participation.

ALAN GREENBERG: Careful what you wish for. The words are there, and as many of us know, we started planning Sarah's trip on Saturday. We started talking about it on Friday, admittedly, but didn't start getting planned until Saturday. Yes. If we put in as long as you get your visa a day before the meeting starts, we'll get you there, then everyone will be sure to get their visa the day before the meeting starts. They put in realistic targets. We're starting early, early. There's an agenda item on Thursday's meeting to talk about travel to Barcelona and identifying the right people.

The fact that they are being really flexible and paying exorbitantly high air fares to get some people to meetings when

ICANN
POLICY FORUM 62
PANAMA CITY
25–28 June 2018

the visas don't come through for whatever reason, I think we should be thankful for. You really want to be careful what you ask for.

HADIA ELMINIAWI: I totally agree with you. I started my conversation by saying that's not really applied but it's in there. I don't know a solution for that, but yes, I do understand. So, there are some things like that, that maybe it has to be there.

ALAN GREENBERG: The problem, Hadia, is although we put those words there, many people do ignore them and do not start intentionally until much, much later and that does cause significant problems. Next. We had several people say they wanted to talk about travel. I see no cards up. Okay. Alberto, and then we'll go back to policy for another five minutes.

ALBERTO SOTO: I don't know if this is going to be related to travel or not, but this has to do with those travels through the CROP Program. The thing is that ICANN [inaudible] time of these trips. The thing is accommodation and per diem. The hotel booking and per diem. I don't know if this is going to be considered because usually there are certain countries where the per diem is not enough

because we are staying at very expensive hotels, and that's okay. That's wonderful. But I would like to be, for example, in a less expensive hotel and to, for example, be able to eat better because sometimes you cannot spend the money having lunch or dinner at those hotels because they're really expensive.

ALAN GREENBERG: [inaudible] can make it but not related to the travel guidelines. Judith?

JUDITH HELLERSTEIN: I do think that we also might be able to better … Maybe having the information better explained to people so that they know the travel summary should be listed, easily found. But also, I wanted to comment on I think there also should be a timeline on visas. If a visa can't be obtained in a certain amount of time, they should be able to within the same region give it to someone else, so that way … There's oftentimes when people come to meetings and they cancelled last minute and ICANN loses the money. There should be a time limit to when the visas or that type of thing get ended.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you. I don't have statistics in front of me, but I cannot recall many cases when we did not manage to redeploy a travel slot if a visa wasn't available.

JUDITH HELLERSTEIN: It's not necessarily At-Large wide. This is happening throughout the other things. Maybe it would just be common on the policy that might be able to do that.

ALAN GREENBERG: If we do that, some of our travelers who we really want here may not show up, if we set a much earlier deadline. As I said, I don't recall many times when someone cancelled at such a late time that we couldn't reuse it for a valid, useful traveler. Again, we could comment on that. I'm not sure it will be helpful for us if we do.

We only have three minutes left. I'm not sure we want to reopen the policy issue right now, so we'll break for lunch three minutes early. Thank you. We reconvene here at 1:30, I believe. There is an event over lunch, if I remember correctly.

GISELLA GRUBER: Correct. Alan, the LACRALO open house is here over lunch from 12:15 to 1:15. Then we reconvene here at 1:30 for the working

ICANN POLICY FORUM 62
PANAMA CITY
25–28 June 2018

session part 5. The sandwiches that are out there, for now we're just going to wait for more LACRALO people to be arriving. Hopefully, we'll have quite a few arriving at 12:15, but please do join us.

ALAN GREENBERG: Who is invited?

GISELLA GRUBER: For the sandwiches or for the meeting?

ALAN GREENBERG: Both. You may give two answers. Can we have clarity, however, who is supposed to not go over and take a sandwich?

GISELLA GRUBER: I'll try to be very subtle, but I'll be a little bit more direct, then. If we could maybe just wait for LACRALO folk to arrive in the meeting room. It is under their sponsorship. It is initially for the LACRALO, but it is an open event. So, sandwiches if we could just wait for LACRALO people to come. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you. We all have thick skins. Thank you, Gisella. Thank you, everyone. We'll see you here in a few minutes again, if you choose to stay, and see you back reconvened at 1:30.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]