Transcription ICANN61 San Juan
GNSO: BC 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

Claudia Selli: Okay. The recording has restarted. So we are restarting the meeting. And thank you very much, David, for coming with us today to discuss your - the way you will improve the security system management.

David Conrad: Hello, everyone. Thank you for inviting me to speak today. I have to apologize. My voice has decided that it wanted to stay at the gala last night. And I'm having a bit of a challenge actually speaking very well, so please bear with me.

I don't have any slides for you today. I do have, after a discussion with my team, I can sort of identify about four areas in which, you know, we've been working to try to enhance general security of the system of - ICANN system unique identifiers or the systems upon which they're used.

Those include DAAR, as you know, the Domain Abuse Analytics Reporting tool; root servers; DDoS mitigation, which was a topic that the board has expressed significant interest in over the past three workshops; operational security support, primarily in the area of supporting law enforcement in the

areas of takedowns of botnets and other malware; and sort of more generally, developing - on identifying metrics that are able to be used to try to identify malware and DNS abuse across the Domain Name System.

So, with those, with regards to DAAR, right now, it is essentially in production. We have hired two independent reviewers to look at our methodology; to write up a report on that methodology; to tell us things we're doing well or not doing so well.

The first one of those reviews has been completed. It should be posted within the next couple of days. The second one is almost completed. The intent is, once we've done these reviews, is to take the output of the reviews; provide them to SSAC; to ask SSAC for their input on how we're doing with regards to the methodology associated with DAAR. And the end goal of this is to have a system that the community can rely upon and can trust, as to provide information and data that can inform policy discussions.

We plan, hopefully, within sort of the Panama timeframe to begin issuing monthly reports on statistics associated with DNS abuse, including the names of the registries and registrars - at least the registries, perhaps not the registrars, because we're having some challenges with the registrar - obtaining data for the registrars, but have those reports available around the Panama timeframe to give particularly anti-abuse communities and the registries and registrars more information about what's actually occurring out in the operational world.

As you may know, DAAR uses public information. And we just aggregate that together. So the only thing that we're presenting to the community is sort of an aggregate view of what the anti-abuse community is generating and which network operators are using to make filtering decisions. Any questions on DAAR at this stage?

Denise Michel: Hi. I hope you feel better than you sound. I'm sorry you're sick and thanks for powering through for us. So is this going to be the first and the last DAAR hosting since it appears that ICANN in its own model did not ask for full access for ICANN org to the non-public WHOIS data? I think that's my - yes, I think...

David Conrad: Yes, so DAAR does not - the only part of WHOIS data that DAAR cares about is actually the registrar. And that's not generally considered, as far as I know, private information. That's not personally identifying information, generally. So our hope is that the registrar data that's available within WHOIS will still be made available to us.

However, with that said, as I mentioned, we're having some challenges with the registrar data. Since we're trying to do this via the same mechanisms anyone else can do, so that our results can be reproducible, we are having to contend with the rate-limiting that all the anti-abuse community has to deal with. And as a result, we're not actually able to reliably update the information associated with the registrar's domain names are associated with.

So at least in the first releases of the reports that DAAR are generating, we're going to be focusing on the registries, not both the registries and registrars. This will be a monthly report; at least the current plan is to have the system monthly report. Eventually, we're actually hoping to make it a real-time report. But that's much later down the line. Initially, we're just getting the monthly static report. And that will also go into the open-data initiative, so that people will be able to pull that data via APIs on a monthly basis.

Denise Michel: I have a follow-up, if I may?

David Conrad: Sure.

Denise Michel: It's great to hear that you'll start getting reports out on a monthly basis. I'm really sorry to hear about the difficulty you've had getting data from the

registrars. All I can say is welcome to our world. But my follow-up question is this. Are you going to explicitly include in the ICANN model, non-rate-limited, full bulk access to non-public WHOIS data for ICANN for security and stability and related efforts that would include ODI? That's my first question.

Second question is, when ICANN ultimately has to reopen the RAA, will you or your staff have a seat at the table to ensure that they cannot rate-limit ICANN security staff in the future to provide basic data that the community needs to conduct policy development and other activities and, of course, that ICANN staff needs to ensure security and stability?

David Conrad: So the approach that we've been taking with DAAR, because we wanted to be reproducible, is to not take advantage of the peculiarities of access that we might have internally. As you know, all the registries and registrars would have to escrow data with us. So, in theory, we could -- assuming they're appropriate contractual changes -- gain access to that data, I think - I'm not a lawyer but I think it would fit into some of the clauses associated with their required use.

However, we don't want to do that, at least in the near term, because we want to allow for our results to be reproduced by others. So when we actually move forward with, you know, whatever happens with GDPR, we will - just like any other network abuse researcher apply through whatever accreditation body exists to experience the same thing everyone else does, in order to ensure that we have a much better understanding of what it is the anti-abuse community has to deal with, in order to obtain the data that they need to do their jobs.

Denise Michel: Yes. Personally, I don't agree with that. I think it's much more important that the community has a real understanding of the breadth and depth of abuse that's occurring on the Internet, instead of the ICANN security staff suffering the same slings and arrows (unintelligible) companies and, you know, security services.

What we have been asking for, for years, is real data about DNS abuse. And the fact that it is, to many of our - the services are rate-limited, and they have difficulty getting basic data from registrars, I really don't - I understand your desire to duplicate this data. But what I think is even more important than that is to actually provide the real data on abuse to the communities, so we can make informed decisions.

Alex Deacon: Hi, Alex Deacon for the record. Are you hitting these rate limits after being white-listed? Or have you requested to be white-listed by the registrars that allow for that functionality? Or is this prior to being white-listed?

David Conrad: So, to be clear, we're consuming a service of a third party; iThreat Cyber Group is a contractor we hired to develop this tool on our behalf. And they're the ones that are working with the WHOIS rate-limiting. My understanding of speaking with them is that they do everything they possibly can to get around rate limits where that is possible. So they have to be white-listed. They enter into agreements with registries and registrars to allow for their IP addresses to be white-listed. But they still - you know, as I'm sure everyone here experiences, there's a lot of data, and fetching that data is challenging.

You know, one of the - I'm aware of the desire to have that data available, and that's something that we would - trust me, I get into arguments with my team quite frequently on the topic. But one of the ideas that we have is that by providing the community with sort of an unbiased and unprejudiced view of what a researcher does on their behalf and the struggles that we encounter that will, in and of itself, inform policy discussions to help promote changes in policy that would then be able to impact all the other folks who are trying to do the same thing.

You know, with that said, if there is a request through correspondence or through the policy channels to enable my staff to be able to gain direct access into escrowed data, that's something that I believe would probably

require some sort of contractual amendment. But I can't imagine - I shouldn't say that. That may be possible to implement over time. Any other questions on DAAR? No? Okay. Then, I'll move onto the root-level denial-of-service mitigation efforts.

So, over the past three or four board workshops that I have been involved in, the board, particularly the Board Technical Committee, has expressed concern about the risk associated with denial of service against the root, and has directed my team to provide analysis of options that ICANN, the organization can take to attempt to mitigate those - that particular risk.

So we have done so. We've written a board paper and have given a presentation that outlines essentially six different options that the ICANN org can undertake to try to mitigate, at least to some extent, some of the risks associated with denial of service.

The problem is that, right now, we're facing -- some board members believe -- we're facing an existential risk associated with denial of service. The most recent attack that has been recorded, a denial-of-service attack, was 1.7 terabits per second against GitHub; 1.7 terabits is likely beyond the capacity of any single root server to be able to withstand.

And if such attack were directed at the root, while it is true that GitHub was actually able to recover from that attack after ten minutes, having the root down for ten minutes would unlikely result - would undoubtedly result in a significant raising of eyebrows in a lot of places where we probably don't want eyebrows to be raised, potentially including things like congressional testimony and demands by the ITU to take over the administration of the Internet and all that sort of fun stuff.

So the approaches that my team wrote up in this board paper were one to expand the capacity of the L-Root. Right now, we have two different approaches with L-Root. One is deploying relatively small capacity servers in

a myriad of places that are hosted by Internet service providers and organizations. This is called the L-Single approach. And we've been fairly aggressive. We now have I think just under 200 instances deployed around the world. And each one of these instances is designed to handle sort of a regional network level of query traffic.

In addition to that, we've deployed L-Clusters. L-Clusters are a set of L-Singles all lumped together, typically Internet exchanges or colocation facilities. They could handle a vast amount of traffic. In fact, one L-Cluster can handle the entire query load of the Internet in its steady state, not including denial of service.

We have three L-Clusters currently; one on the East Coast of the US; one on the West Coast of the US; and one in Prague at the (CZIX). And those three clusters handle an aggregate along with the L-Singles on the order of 200,000 queries per second.

Expanding these, the L-Singles, it's actually a very low-cost option for us because the hosting organization picks up the cost of the hardware, as well as the bandwidth. The only cost to ICANN is the management and administration, which is aggregated across all 200 of the L-Single constellation. That's something that we and my team have recommended that we continue to pursue. And I don't think there's any sort of roadblocks against that.

The L-Clusters, it's a little more expensive because we have to buy on the order of 25 to 30 machines. We have to buy colo facility space. We have to buy bandwidth. And this is relatively a non-trivial expense. We are looking at partners to mitigate some of those expenses, including, you know, people who'll provide bandwidth at low cost; people who'll host us at no cost. The understanding is that, at Prague, we do not pay for the colo facility itself. And most of the bandwidth we get there is provided at no charge to ICANN.

The second or third approach to mitigating these denial-of-service attacks is to promote something called hyperlocal root service. The idea behind the hyperlocal route service is to replicate the root zone close to the resolver itself; in some cases, inside the resolver. This is a known technique. It's been deployed for many years, particularly within the large ISPs, mostly to improve performance and to reduce the amount of DNS traffic.

The idea that we have suggested in our paper is for ICANN to promote the deployment of hyperlocal and to facilitate it by deploying a zone transfer infrastructure to allow hundreds of thousands to millions of resolvers to replicate the root zone down into those resolvers. This would reduce the load on the roots and would also make any resolver that had replicated the root zone immune to an attack against the root. They would continue to operate, just as if the root was not under attack.

The last option, the last real option that we recommended was improving the DNS protocol itself. There's a bunch of ways that the protocol can be made to be more persistent. And that's something that we're encouraging ICANN board to ask the organization to pursue.

These include hardening the protocol itself; changing the transport of the protocol; changing the way resolvers behave under denial-of-service conditions. The challenge with this last approach is that it's very long-term, because changing DNS implementations takes, you know, five years to a decade to get propagated out to a level that would actually impact denial-of-service attacks.

The final two options which were ones that we did not necessarily recommend include adding additional root servers. The historical limit of 13 is not actually a hard and concrete limit. There have been demonstrations that you can have a number - significantly more root servers. The maximum number that the math allows and still keeping a packet within a reasonable

size is on the order of 44 total root servers. So we could have, in theory, 31, without straining too much of the infrastructure.

The problem with this approach is it doesn't actually solve any real problem. You can essentially emulate this approach by just deploying more instances which we would be doing with expanding the L-Root, and the L-Singles and the L-Clusters. So the addition of additional root letters doesn't solve the problem and would create most likely a rather stupendous political set of fireworks, as people - including countries, large organizations, NGOs and pretty much everybody who can install DNS, would decide that they deserve to get a root server.

The other option that we've been - that has been proposed we don't think should be pursued is to start white-listing resolver queries into root servers. So the idea there is that if you're a resolver operator, you would apply to the root servers to allow for the root servers to respond to your queries. The idea behind this is to throw away in jettison all the non-useful queries that are usually associated with denial of service.

The problem with that, while it's likely to be implemented in some cases, is that it changes sort of the way the root service is always provided and moves away from the permissionless model that the Internet has grown so fond of, and which has allowed the innovation to occur on the Internet, so we would see this as sort of a last resort kind of option.

So, of those options, we're recommending to the board that we pursue the L-Single approach immediately because it's essentially low-cost. We will provide to the board an analysis of the cost associated with the L-Cluster, and as well as deploying an additional zone transfer implementation, and to enable the hyperlocal. And we'll continue to pursue improving the protocol in areas like the IETF and elsewhere. Any questions on that?

Jimson Olufuye: Yes. This is Jimson Olufuye. Thank you, David, for that comprehensive presentation. Well I'm just wondering, when the attacks happened, you know, you can see where it's coming from. So what space do you normally take or those ICANN take to ensure those culprits never, you know, attack again? At least, that will reduce, you know, the threshold of attack.

David Conrad: Yes. The problem is that after - from the perspective of the root servers, we don't know where the attacks are coming from. We see a series of IP addresses. But most of those in a denial-of-service situation are spoofed. So they're basically lying to us. And we cannot track down the original sources.

What we do, do in those cases, when a denial of service is hitting us, is we work with our Internet service providers to try to backtrack where the traffic is coming from. Unfortunately, what we're finding more recently is the attack technology has improved; is that people who aren't the botnets that are being used are not sending a very large number of queries. They're just a whole lot of botnet - or zombies out there.

And each zombie is sending a query at a relatively low rate, not - so as to not call attention to themselves. But they're all aggregating in through hundreds of service providers all across the world to focus their attack on specific IP addresses; in the case of the root servers, on the root server IP addresses.

So the challenge here, particularly in the context of denial of service against the root, is that with the deployment of insanely bad implementations of protocols in the IoT devices and just brain-dead implementations of security protocols, that bad guys are able to, you know, harvest huge numbers of machines that they then turn into attack vehicles. And our ability to combat those is quite limited.

Jimson Olufuye: Yes. As a follow-up, I was thinking, perhaps, if we collaborate more with the law enforcement people, really in the new era of IoT, which is going to be massive, I think we need to be proactive to maybe push more for appropriate

regulation, especially with respect to the manufacturers of this equipment that can easily be compromised.

And then, assuring that administrators - you know, we have a database of major administrators, so that information can be provided to them; what they need to do to have in their systems and things like that. So we need to be - I think we need to be proactive to help administrators to block those channels that constitute the root cause of this.

David Conrad: Yes. I would agree, yes.

Denise Michel: So how are you going to backtrack to dismantle botnets that are behind these DDoS attacks, and also phishing malware, other abuses, to identify and confirm that hundreds of domain names are being used to abuse and support this botnet infrastructure after May 25, given the model that ICANN has proposed?

David Conrad: Thank you. So it's an interesting question that - you know, I think my personal view is that the GDPR had a number of unintended consequences. And the folks who proposed GDPR are being made more aware of the implications to things like the anti-abuse community.

From my point of view, the problem isn't with the model that ICANN is proposing for GDPR. The problem is the GDPR exists. And it has basically destroyed WHOIS. And we're now trying to resurrect what we can out of the ashes of the aftermath of GDPR to enable people to continue to operate networks in a way that helps prevent attacks of one form or another.

So, you know, one of the areas that we're trying to focus on right now is identify the sort of the information that we need, you know, within the context of DAAR to try to identify, you know, the registries and the registrars that are being subjected to the DNS abuse that results in the propagation of malware and the botnet commanding - controlling those sorts of things.

So, you know, from OCTO's point of view, you know, we're looking for answers just like everyone else in the anti-abuse community. And, you know, unfortunately, the reality that we see is that we have to figure out how to operate in a world where the tools that we used to have, have just become illegal.

Denise Michel: I said I don't want to make you talk anymore and feel free to follow up on e-mail if you'd like. But - so I don't quite understand how you are relying on the DAAR data to help you understand what you need to chase botnets, if the DAAR data is incomplete because of rate-limiting and because of your commitment not to get abuse data that other entities can't get. I think that's one question.

I think the second question then is since OCTO is ICANN, and ICANN is proposing the model, what's the responsibility of OCTO or the CTO of ICANN to, I guess, evolve the model that ICANN or augment the model that ICANN has proposed to ensure that there is a workable non-public access for allowable legitimate purposes like cyber-security and chasing DDoS and botnets to this data? I think, are you in action to actually create the systems you need and that your cyber-security colleagues across the world need to continue to probe - you know, to address these security concerns?

David Conrad: So, you know, with respect to DAAR, the information that we obtained through DAAR at the registry level doesn't actually require WHOIS access. We get the domain names, and the domain names have obviously the top-level domains associated with them. Where the WHOIS information is required is in tracking the registrar from which or who had sold the domain name that has then become abusive in one way or the other.

So at the registry level, we can provide information to the community that says, "This registry, for whatever reason, is being abused more than that registry," or "This registry has, you know, of whatever reason, has

significantly less abuse," and with, you know, the hope that that information can then be used by the community to tailor policies and processes to reduce the amount of abuse.

With regards to, you know, obviously, if we have more information, if we have specifically the registrar through which the domain name purchase was made, and they can - are able to make that information available, then that information can also be applied in the context of registrars. And we can talk to - you know, the policies and processes of the registrars could be adjusted to try to combat the abuse.

In the case of OCTO providing input into the models that ICANN have been proposing, you know, I am involved in the discussions about the models that ICANN have been proposing and have been making it clear that the anti-abuse world is sort of a wildly varied beast, with different individuals and different organizations all playing different roles, and trying to encourage, you know, an acceptance which I think has been widely acknowledged within the models that there isn't going to be a one-size-fits-all approach and that we're going to need to come up with codes of conduct somehow.

And we're likely going to need to come up with accreditation mechanisms that will allow for actors that may seem non-traditional in one way or another. I do - within the context of my team we have been looking at how an accreditation system may actually be implemented.

And that's actually quite challenging because it is sort of a unique beast in the sense that you need to be able to authenticate individuals from around the world who are identified by either law enforcement or other government-nominated entities, or anti-abuse folks who are nominated by some other third party to over 2000 registries and registrars.

So clearly, some sort of federated mechanism will probably need to be deployed, or there will be some sort of centralized clearing house approach

that will have to be explored. None of these are going to be particularly easy to implement. And there are concerns about the timeliness, particularly given we have, what, about 70 days left before the May 25 deadline.

Denise Michel: A quick follow-up, I just - yes, I wanted to let you know that we've submitted, just a little bit ago, an accreditation and access model. We being a few of the companies got together; brainstormed; put the model together. We've asked, you know, Akram to get - make sure we've got staff; focus staff support, so we can keep building this out; get it in place before the May deadline. And clearly, your staff would be really critical in helping with that too, I think.

David Conrad: Definitely, we'll take a look at it.

Alex Deacon: Yes, just quickly, Alex speaking again. So I agree. It's not an easy task. But it's the technology exists; that has been deployed elsewhere. And so, you know, I think once we get kind of a policy around who gets credential and why, then kind of architecting this solution with an eye toward what RDAP protocol supports, which, as you know, has been developed in such a way to support, you know, with some forethought, to support our needs. I think it is definitely doable. Whether it can be done by May, I don't know. But I'm more optimistic than I think that you are there.

David Conrad: Yes. One of the considerations - in previous lives, I've worked with law enforcement. I've also worked at registries. And I've seen, from both sides of the fence, the challenges that exist when it comes to actually implementing things. And I have a certain level of skepticism that it will be possible for either law enforcement, or not so much to the anti-abuse community because they tend to be quite technical, but in particular, law enforcement, in deploying the necessary tools to facilitate a federated access model.

And I also have some concerns on the imposition of new federated access models into the contracted parties and how they will be able to implement that in a timely fashion. So I agree that the tools do exist. I have actually

implemented them myself and seeing how, perhaps, Western production-ready, some of the tools have been in the past. I haven't looked at them recently. But hopefully, they've done a lot better than they used to be.

Claudia Selli: Thank you very much, David. And it's a very passionate discussion. I'm sure we'll continue this conversation in the next meeting. But I wanted to thank you very much for your time and also to be here with us, regardless of your voice. And I hope you can recover soon. Thank you.

David Conrad: Yes. I'm hoping my voice will be better by the next BC meeting. Thank you all. Bye-bye.

Claudia Selli: And thank you, Erika, for being so passionate with us and for taking the time to come to the meeting and share with us a little bit of your work in the auction proceeds. Sure. Can we get up to...? Marika is here as well and Sam Eisner from the Legal Team. So we have a small team who are all working on this topic. And Marilyn is somewhere. I don't know where she is. She's part of our group as well.

So what I want to show you, it's just very few slides, and then talk about the issues where you might want to get maybe involved in all the issues which are more relevant for you right now. How much time do we have? How much time do you have...?

Erika Mann: No, I mean tell me how much you have. I'm fine. Okay.

Claudia Selli: According to the...

Erika Mann: Okay. I can make this quite short. Just please continue the slides. So we are working on it for quite a while. And we have this Cross Community Working Group. And we started first in a preface which is, if I'm remembering, two years ago already? And now, we are more in the phase where we're really looking at the particular environment, how this future fund

or foundation, whatever it is going to become, how it might look like. And I want to show you this because I think it is the most important one. Can we have a look at...? Yes, just continue the slides.

So when you see, there are different issues which we look and, like I said, just look at Point 4. So we started in January 2017, and we started then looking into the (unintelligible) which are the most relevant what we call charter questions which will define practically the framework of our work. So can we see this, please, the slide?

And then, here you see the members. How many are members? How many are participants and observers? It's a relatively small group; quite active group; very stable group. We haven't seen much changes, which I think it's good. And the members which are there are all committed to work hard in this particular group. Can we get the next one?

Yes. So, this is again all framing the debate. I don't think that it's really relevant to talk much about it. Can I see the next one; and the next one? So this is how, you know, conflict of interest is identified and how this whole working environment is defined. I don't think that we need to look into it so much.

Back again to the six steps? Yes. These are the six steps we identified. We are now in Point 4. And you see we have two more ahead of us. So we will have to review all the chartering questions, which we identified at the beginning, which define this particular environment. So we have to go back to them. But right now, we are in one of the most interesting phases where I really would like your attention and to pay attention to it. Read the document, and maybe to participate, if you have a particular interest.

So we are having interviews with outside experts because we identified four models which we want to investigate. We call these models mechanism; and

their typical funding environment, you call them models. And I would love to see them, so that we - everybody can have a look at these four models.

So we are in Phase 4. And, right now, we are having discussion and debate with the outside experts concerning these various models. Can I see them, please, the slide with the four models? I think you have to go back. Yes. Yes. One more. The four models, please. No. No. Okay. There they are. So here they are. So one model is - and you can review this all on the slide. So one model, which we identified, it's to - how about in-sourcing and creating a new department inside of ICANN, which then would oversee the projects, and would review them, and would identify the most valuable projects.

The second would be a kind of merger. So ICANN - it would have to be in probably a new department as well; would work with another entity. And they together would control this particular funding environment. That's one mechanism. Another one would be that we would ask an existing fund practically to run it but - or a foundation, but ICANN would still control and would have the oversight.

So these are the various models which we are debating. And we have identified outside experts. We sent out a list, if I remember this, to 24 experts or 25, with a questionnaire which we asked them, "Please, to review." And so far, we have received, if I remember this correctly, five answers. We have more with experts we are in discussion with. And we hope they will send their replies relatively soon.

We then will select, based on these four models which we identified. We want to have at least from each group, one expert, we will have on a call. So we can have a more intensive debate and discussion because, otherwise, if you just receive written answers, and you can't go back, it's a little bit difficult. So we want to do this.

And then, we will have to come to a conclusion. Hopefully, we can do this - finalize the - if you remember, these six steps, which I saw you, hopefully, be able to finalize five and six until Panama - so that in Panama, we can come together and can get a final understanding about all of the topics. And then, we can hopefully, after Panama, prepare the - or we will hopefully can do it before - prepare the recommendation, which will then have to go out for public comment.

So what has been the biggest challenge so far and which might continue to be a challenge, independent, when you look at this model, independent from these models? And this is the, I would say, maybe the bigger - or maybe there are two, but the number-one topic was the question, "How shall the mission statement frame the granting for funding in the future; the criteria?" And that's a difficult one because when you read the mission statement, it is a quite narrow understanding.

Man: On purpose.

Erika Mann: On purpose. And it's important. And it is important. But we have the discussion on - we might have achieved some understanding about it now, at least with the board and inside the members which are participating in this workgroup, that we would be happy with the formulation; would not extend the understanding about your mission understanding but would shape it in a little bit different way, which would allow more flexibility in the future when future evaluators will have to evaluate the projects, so they would have a little bit more flexibility.

Still, it falls within the mission. So the understanding is that we might use the term Serves the Mission and/or it's In Service of the Mission or is Supporting the Mission. So it's a little bit broader and would allow a bit more flexibility. That's the debate we still will have to work on.

And Marilyn is nodding. It's not something which is, I would say, already, you know, how much in stone. But I see a good direction of where can go forward. So that's a quick summary, just to give you the basic, maybe the basics of what we have debated so far and where we are. Marilyn, would you want to add something?

Marilyn Cade: Marilyn Cade speaking. Thank you, Erika. And I think I see Marika and others back there. I just want to really complement. I didn't come into the Auction Proceeds Working Group until Meeting '17. And I came in because we realized that, at that point, we hadn't been able to have consistent regular attendance.

So since then, Tola and I both actively participate. And I think I'm competing to be one of your most active members. But I want to compliment the terrific staff support work that we're getting, and also to note that Xavier and Sam -- oh, I didn't see you Sam -- are always on the calls with us and available and have just been a terrific resource.

And I think that's important for everyone to know because they'll - I will - my observation, I read all of the transcripts before I join the group because I feel like you need to know the background. This is a group that originally I think was filled with people who may have joined with certain aspirations, aspirational understandings of what could be done with the auction proceeds, and who - not all of them.

Some of them, particularly in the observer category, where they're not speaking, but they joined because they wanted to learn about how they might apply for the money. So I think the group has really matured. I've certainly seen that. And we are - I think we're making really good progress.

The one thing we didn't do at this meeting, that Erika, and Sam, and Marika are doing differently, we were going to have an open meeting. And you may remember, I originally told you that; and then, I had to untell you that. But I

think, actually, the smaller meetings are much more effective. So I really want to say thank you as well for doing that.

I'm available to answer further BC questions. There's extremely limited expertise within ICANN to consider taking an active role and actually during the evaluations of the proposals or et cetera.

It's not that there's not expertise in creating segregation of funds. But I think one of the discussions that we'll now have is, how do you protect the organization which has to maintain a certain amount of oversight over the entity that's dispersing the funds, to make sure they're doing their job, so that the dispersal is in accordance with - in service to the mission, and then, that the entity is doing the annual review and preparing the appropriate reports?

I supported AT&T Foundation and several companies. So you have foundations, and you know how complicated the interaction is. So I think there's - you know, I think our next discussion is really trying to understand which of the mechanisms is best for ICANN the community and safest for ICANN the community. And there are people who don't at all understand that they could really be creating some risk for the organization with one decision or the other.

Erika Mann: Yes. I think you described some of the debates quite well. There's another topic which we want to look into, and again, where your guidance and help will be more than welcome, and this is for very big projects. Keep in mind we're talking about an amount, quite substantial amount, so more than 200 million, if all of it would be - would fall in this basket.

Now, I'm always very careful here because some is still under legal dispute, as you know all too well, from one of the auctions. So, one has to be careful. One can't talk about the whole amount or one shouldn't do it. But nonetheless, it's in total a big amount.

And certainly, it would be good to use it well, so not for purely operational purposes, I think we all do understand this, but for value for money which really supports not just the mission but the organization on the domain name.

The basis of the Domain Name System, in particular, when you look at the discussion that you just have a few minutes ago, you know, there are interesting (unintelligible) updates which need to be made, which would support, you know, the technical part of the organization quite well.

But you need - that's why it is so important to have the definition right; to be certain that there are no legal challenges coming to the organization. So there are many things one has to be very careful in evaluating the path. And Steve?

Steve DelBianco: Just a quick question, Erika. So there's 230 in there (unintelligible) 130 that's WEB; may or may not come in; that would leave - that's 100. And we just saw the presentation by the board to take 36 as a shot for the reserve fund, leaving 64. So it could be as low as 64. But if you add back the WEB proceeds, it's back up to roughly 200, right? So it's a substantial sum of money.

Do you believe the carve-out for replenishing reserves, do you think that, time-wise, that would happen prior to this entire group being formed? Or would this group have to decide - I'm sorry, participate in whether the 36 should go to the reserve fund?

Erika Mann: No. No. I think it is a decision that really falls in the responsibility of the board because they have the legal and fiduciary responsibilities. But I always argue, and I want to be super careful here, to be very careful in using the auction proceed for reserve fund purposes.

I'm not arguing against it. But I think you have to get the arguments really correct, because of the - I mean because of arguments ICANN used in

certain legal cases; how the reserve fund or the auction proceed money can be used. So I think you want to be super cautious and careful. But the organization knows this well and the legal team knows it well.

Steve DelBianco: That surprised me then because the public comment period just started for a proposal from the board which does say, "Take 36 from auction proceeds." So I would have assumed, before ICANN publish that, it had already gone by Legal? Legal is nodding yes that it had?

Sam Eisner: It's gone by (unintelligible).

Steve DelBianco: Okay. So that ICANN is comfortable with 36 coming out of the auction proceeds. And the 36 number is completely unrelated. It just happens to be what we used for the transition. It's not in any way related to the gTLD. Thank you very much.

Erika Mann: Yes. And there's a legal argument which you can use, because it was a one-off exercise IANA. It wasn't purely, you know, operational purpose. They're good arguments; why you can use those arguments.

Sam Eisner: Thanks. I'm Sam Eisner with ICANN Legal. Just to confirm, from the perspective of ICANN Legal, we haven't really talked about the amount or whatever reservation a board might have put in or related to that comment. But we are comfortable that an allocation of the auction proceeds, the reserve fund could be a legitimate use of them. And so, we didn't have concerns on that level.

Denise Michel: Thank you. Hi, Denise Michel, on Facebook. Thank you very much, Erika, for this really useful presentation. I'm still trying to puzzle through the - using the auction proceeds to plus-up the reserve fund. So if the auction proceed serves the use - distribution of the auction proceeds are to be guided by this decision-making process and we're bypassing this decision-making process

to add money to the reserve fund for fiscal year '18, now is that not what's happening?

Sam Eisner: So, as I understand it, there's been no decision or any bypassing. This is part of the conversation and it's part of the community conversation. There hasn't been any determination of allocation. This is part of kind of trying to marry parts of the reserve fund conversation with the auction proceeds conversation.

Denise Michel: And so, this is a one-time payment into the reserve fund rather than...?

Steve DelBianco: That's right. That's (unintelligible).

Denise Michel: And so, if I can, again, has a shortfall in its revenue, as it did last year, and many constituencies are concerned that its revenue projections are, again, this year, way too optimistic. This seems like a potential reoccurring cycle? No?

Erika Mann: No. That's why I'm making the reference. And I'm pretty sure, some of the supporters, you have to read really the legal wording ICANN used in legal cases concerning the auction proceed. And I think there's a clear understanding it can't be used for operational purposes. Now, that's why you can make the argument for IANA. It wasn't operational.

Steve DelBianco: (Unintelligible).

Erika Mann: No, but for future, it would be for operational then. No?

Steve DelBianco: No. It would be for (the) reserve fund but it's also...

Erika Mann: Oh, you talk about, again, reserve fund. Yes, if you granted one for reserve fund, you would have a case for future reserve funds. I would say, yes. At

least, you have a case. It doesn't mean you will do it. Yes. I misunderstood you. Sorry, Denise.

Jimson Olufuye: Yes. This is Jimson speaking. And I also - maybe a case that really we have the empowered community. Okay. So the scenario of the time period of IANA is different from now.

Steve DelBianco: (Unintelligible).

Jimson Olufuye: No. But we can - the budget issue and the empowered community? The empowered community, there's no...

Steve DelBianco: (Unintelligible).

Jimson Olufuye: In terms of oversight.

Steve DelBianco: (Unintelligible).

Erika Mann: I mean it's a good case to look into. It's a good argument. And so, just review the debate about the reserve fund and, you know, how - what kind of questions you want to raise in this context. It's certainly a good question to raise.

Claudia Selli: Thank you very much, Erika, for your time and for being flexible. The whole team, Sam and Erika, everybody.

Erika Mann: Yes, absolutely.

Claudia Selli: Thank you so much.

Erika Mann: Thank you.

Claudia Selli: Cheryl, we're happy also if you can (give us)...

Cheryl Miller: (Unintelligible).

Claudia Selli: Yes, of course.

Andrew Mack: Claudia? Could I just - I have to go because my - I'm moving to an Airbnb because of my hotel. I just wanted to thank everybody who came on Saturday for our outreach event. It was really great. We had great representation from XCOM and from the Outreach Committee. And we had a really good meeting and a really good briefing under some very difficult conditions.

I know that everybody from the Puerto Rican Chamber was very impressed with the BC. And we're very pleased that we showed up, and that we were consistent, and that we really worked hard to accommodate them and to work with them. And I appreciate everyone's understanding of the technical difficulties and the challenges that they're facing. And, you know, everyone asked wonderful questions, so thanks very much for that.

Cheryl Miller: So I can go ahead and start - I know Zahid has a formal presentation. He's finishing up with his meeting. I think there was ALAC right now. The main thing that we've been focused on is really having better coordination and communication with the different groups within the community this year and also focusing on different improvements that we can make.

Not only to the process but in terms of getting out information, in terms of being able to get candidates that are going to be really great board members, and making sure that we're understanding not only the needs of the board but the needs of the community.

So we set up a couple of different subcommittees at the beginning of the term. And I actually chaired two of them. So one subcommittee (unintelligible) and really looked at the entire application itself, the application

process, and reviewed, from a candidate's point of view, "Okay, well, as I tried to go through this process, what was it like for me?"

Members of the committee also talked to people who have gone through the process to see what we could improve upon. So, for example, there were some candidates that we found, "Well, perhaps, their information should have gone further along in the process," or "Why were they not selected?" and "What was difficult for them?" You know, for some candidates, language barriers, et cetera. So we went through, and we have a new application process that will be kicked off this term.

Another item that we looked at was making sure that it's understood what's required of board members. And we thought that it would be best to really communicate with members of the board to understand, "Okay, as you've - you've had this job, and you've had to fulfill these duties, what in your own words would you describe are some of the things that you think folks will need, in terms of being good board members?"

Also, we've looked at the board as a whole. And so, we understand that the board is always in transition, as people are coming off and coming on. And so, with each candidate, they have different skill sets. So some candidates are very seeped into understanding financials, for example. Some candidates have strong technical background.

Some candidates are members that, I guess, you would qualify them as being ICANN "outsiders", although I really do hate the term Outsider. But they're members who have not served in the community as long as, perhaps, some other board members.

So I've really looked at the board as a whole and asked them, "Okay, well, you're already a strong board. But, you know, if you have the option, what would you tell us that you're really lacking?" So the Job Description Committee has gone through sort of an intensive process. And we had

several calls with different board members; did some other independent research and also worked with the ICANN staff.

And you will see, up on the NomCom site now, we have an actual job description that's up. We've tried to make the process extremely friendly, not only for members within the ICANN community, but we've really tried to keep an eye forward in understanding, "Okay, if you're someone who is not as familiar with ICANN but you have really strong board experience, and you have these either financial skills or other skills that many boards need, could you possibly get up to speed and become a good board member?"

And so, that's one process that we've launched. Also, we've been really focusing on communication out to the community. So, as you know, I think it's probably a frustration for the BC and many other constituencies as well, a lot of things we "can't talk about", because it's such a confidential process. And so, we've been really trying to work on enhancing transparency. And so, we have some ideas in the funnel for doing that.

One other item that we've also worked on is a video. So we've interviewed many of the different board members. And we have a video that's going to be available for not only the community but also for people who are interested in coming onto the board, in their own words, talking about what is important about the board; what - you know, why - what they think would make good candidates to come on; why they enjoy being a member of the ICANN board, et cetera.

We're looking to do other NomCom videos and possibly video summaries of the different meetings at the end of each meeting, so people can kind of have an understanding of some of the improvements that have moved forward. He does have an answer to your earlier question, Steve, in terms of the real details of the process. But leadership has been working more with that group. So when he comes in, you know, he can give you some background on that.

But I just want to pause and see if there's anything in particular for the BC. We are actively seeking candidates. There are two open seats on the full board. And I will tell you, the one region that is really lacking, and we are, by the bylaws, we are meant to really include diversity in our search, and geographic diversity is one of those areas.

We are really lacking in candidates from the Latin America region. So I would really encourage you, if you know of someone that you think would be a good candidate, and not only just from Latin America because as we get these candidate names, we can use them in the next cycle or the next cycle. And so, it's really important, I think, that each constituency sort of have a good group of people that could possibly be representatives of the board. Yes, Marilyn?

Marilyn Cade: And I apologize. I've got a (unintelligible) meeting.

Cheryl Miller: Go ahead.

Marilyn Cade: But my question is specific to the comments you're making right now. Yes, I think one of the historical things we've seen is that sometimes, Cheryl, the workload related to the board selection imposes into the amount of time that you have to focus on the other appointments.

And I just wanted to ask that, you know, because if you get 200 board candidates -- I'm just being hypothetical -- then the - and the other appointments are also very important to us. You know, are you seeing that as a potential time tension that you guys will have to deal with?

Cheryl Miller: I am really glad that you asked that question. That was something - so as many of you may know, I came onto NomCom at the end of last year, sort of the last minute. And that was something that I noticed. We spent a lot of time on the full board but not a lot of time on the other leadership position.

And we had some issues with that. So that is something that we're addressing on the front end.

And one improvement that we have suggested is to actually have additional face-to-face meetings. And so, the reason for this is that, in the past, many of our decisions have been made over the phone. And I am sorry to say that sometimes the phone networks don't work so well. I work for an (IFP, so sorry to have to say that, but things happen with technology.

And it's also really difficult to talk about someone's skills over the phone. You know, when you're in a room, you can really gauge a room and have an adequate discussion. So we have requested for an extra intersessional. We originally requested two. I think we're in the process where it looks likely that we may have one. I think that this will really help with that. It will be a few days where we're locked in a room again. And we can really kind of whittle down and really give appropriate, really intensive review to each and every candidate.

My personal goal is really to make sure that no one gets lost through the cracks, because I think that, genuinely, we have some really great people. And when it gets down to the end, it's sometimes really - it's really difficult. And so, we've really tried to communicate with the communities as well -- so ccNSO; others -- to make sure we understand their particular needs for their particular leaders. So I'll pause there. I don't know if anyone - does that answer your question? Oh my God. I got a perfect from Marilyn. I can end my ICANN61. Yes?

Waudo Siganga: Thank you. Waudo Siganga for the record. I'm wondering. I would like to suggest that, maybe not for this cycle of the NomCom because you've already made the call for the candidates, but maybe you could give it as a suggestion that can be handed over to the upcoming and future NomComs, that this idea about the needs of the board, particularly the boards, of the board candidates, the needs of the board changing over time.

Every year, it's not always the same, in terms of the skill sets of the new candidates that are required. Perhaps, you can be incorporating that need in the actual call for candidates by indicating specific skills for that particular year, rather than just a general call. Is it already being done?

Cheryl Miller: We do, do that. And the board actually writes us a formal letter that gives advice. Now, we are not required to do what the board asks. We are independent. But we do really appreciate the input that we do receive from them. We also meet with them. And we've been meeting with them even more than other NomComs have in the past.

And, as I mentioned, we really drove down the job description. It's something that we really worked with very closely, in terms of getting board input. So when we sit down, and it gets closer to the final decision-making, we have something that we can look at as a roadmap, to really understand, are we making sure we're taking in...?

Steve DelBianco: But he's asking whether...

Waudo Siganga: At the beginning. Right at the beginning, the initial call for candidates. You know, it's going to help us to also focus, so that you get a compact set of candidates rather than just a big candidate pool of people that might not actually be meeting the skill set that you'll eventually need.

Cheryl Miller: So some of that is in there. I think some of the reluctance in putting in very specific things as we also want - we want to get as many candidates as possible, to be able to have in the filter for the future as well. So we have highlighted certain things like technical. So this year, technical capability is one because, you have to remember, we lost Steve Crocker.

And in terms of history, technical capability, et cetera, we also have a younger board, in terms of - many of the members are newcomers. They've

come on only in the past few years, where we've had board members who are really more seeped into the community in the past. And so, we have some folks who have not had as much experience with ICANN. So that's also something to really take into consideration.

Waudo Siganga: Yes. I'm sorry. It's Waudo again. This idea of having a big candidate pool for purposes of maybe rolling over to other years, in your experience, does it help? Are there any candidates that you actually get from previous applications that, you know, you consider on a serious note?

Cheryl Miller: Yes. So one last year had applied before and made it down to the final round.

Waudo Siganga: And didn't apply in the year that you considered him or her?

Cheryl Miller: Exactly.

Waudo Siganga: Okay.

Cheryl Miller: I think we're just about to close. Were there any other questions?

Zahid Jamil: The NCSG got very angry at us. Are you happy about that?

Cheryl Miller: Who was it?

Zahid Jamil: The NCSG. We were in the NCSG's room. So we just went on and on until we were - because - we'll discuss it offline. I am a member of the BC. So I can openly speak about this. It's interesting. And we should discuss why. But generally speaking, they were upset. Maybe you want to think about why that is.

Anyway, the Nominating Committee this year has made a lot of changes. And we're getting a lot of flak from the NCSG about, "Why are you making

these changes? These are not good changes. These changes are screwing things up for us or other people. And you need to think about what that means for you and others and the community."

We have - so I'll just - because I know I have like maybe one minute, is that right? Okay. We are getting a lot of flak from folks, so going around, undermining us for this purpose. It's really important. And I'm coming to you as a friend because this is my home. Help us. Reach out to the board. Reach out to the community. And we can discuss what it is that we've done; and why we think it's right; and why you think you can help us defend ourselves because we're under attack by that. Thank you very much.

Cheryl Miller: But hey, Zahid, could you post something to the BC list, because I don't think I'm the only one who doesn't really know what's going on.

Man: I have no idea.

Zahid Jamil: Okay. All right. And I know that. And if the people have time, maybe in the evening, et cetera, whatever to discuss, let me know, because...

Man: Oh, just one other thing, she's awesome. And where's Jay? Where's Jay? They're awesome. Thank you.

Claudia Selli: Thank you. Steve, back to you, and thank you.

Steve DelBianco: Hey, Steve DelBianco, thank you, Claudia. We have a lot to cover. But we'll do it. And we will finish at 6:30 on time. When we suspend it, we were talking about the board member integrity process. That has been done. And I got volunteers. Let me jump to number five and then the policy calendar. This is under five of public comments that are open. It's the Reserve Fund comment which came out on last week.

We've already discussed it enough. I only need to ask for volunteers to help the BC respond to the idea of replenishing the reserve fund, including by the use of 36 million auction proceeds. This comment is not due until April 25. We have a lot of time.

Can I have a couple of volunteers? I knew Jimson. I had looked at you first. Thank you, Jimson. That will be the first. Any others? Any other volunteers? Waudo, you're the best. I appreciate it. I only have one more open public comment. It's number four on my list which was the SSAC. Ozan.

Ozan Sahin: John had a hand raised in the AC room. But he lowered his hand.

Steve DelBianco: Thank you. John Berard? You were volunteering John, right? Answer us in the chat, if you don't mind. Okay. So he said, "I did." So he did volunteer. I'll take that. Okay. The other one is number four on my list, which is the SSAC Draft Plan for Collision Analysis.

So this just came out. I went to a session on it yesterday. The board had asked the SSAC to reevaluate the notion of collisions and how this should inform the next round. They're going to do - they did a project plan which we have to comment on. It has three elements in it. They're going to do a study of the current state of collisions. They're going to do a study of brute causes and the impact of collisions; and finally, a study on mitigation options.

They're going to boil all that into a final report. It will take two years in total to finish all that. They're going to stop at each stage when the studies are ready, and do a workshop and analysis, and give us the chance to comment on the reports. That is brand new for the SSAC to do any revelation on their mid-stream progress.

There was some pushback when they announced the plan since - if it's seen as critical path for the next round, it would potentially get in the way of having a new round for two years. They assured us that that is not the way it will be

structured. The analysis that they're doing will hopefully be structured in a way that it wouldn't become the gating determinant to delay the next round.

This is about things like .CORP, .MAIL, right, .HOME, things that affect corporate IT networks. And the business constituency was a big player in the collisions discussion several years ago, and the BC is in a unique position of tapping into our corporate IT departments, to be sure that they are aware of the analyses and studies that are going on. When it comes out, we'll have to be sure that we push it into our IT departments.

Do I have any volunteers who will help look at this project plan? You don't have to know anything about collisions. You just have to know a little something about managing projects with multiple studies. I'll put another call out for volunteers the next time we have a call. It's April 18 they close; so this one is relatively soon. We're going to need some help on that.

I have one other item. And then, we'll jump to council. A GDPR-compliant model for WHOIS has been a hot topic. The only thing I'll say about it, is this afternoon, Denise Michel circulated a draft report - sorry, a draft proposal for how we might do an accreditation system. I have asked the BC to consider it today. But you've only had a few hours to look at it. Denise and the group of companies that have worked on this include many BC members. And they've already sent the report onto ICANN. But Denise, tell us a little bit about what we can do to help move that along right now.

Denise Michel: Thanks. So several, I think mostly BC members, got together, in an effort to jumpstart the development of an accreditation and access model for non-public data, non-public WHOIS data. And so, we've shared it with the CEO and the head of the GAC; have also asked that ICANN undertake a very focused and expedited effort to work with the community to develop this framework and implement it by the May 25 deadline.

So I've sent you a copy of the cover letter that was sent to Göran and (Manal) and included - attached the draft. It is intended, again, to jumpstart its first draft. And we think it gives a good foundation for the community to come together to provide the tiered or gated access to WHOIS data, particularly for cyber-security and IP and consumer protection.

Steve DelBianco: Thank you, Denise. Thanks to (unintelligible), DomainTools, BC-member Facebook, BC-member LegitScript, MarkMonitor, Microsoft, all of which are BC members. So you're right. All of you, who contributed to that effort, thank you very much.

Denise Michel: And so, it would be great for members to take a look at the cover letter.

Man: (Unintelligible).

Denise Michel: And it's a little - obviously, it's a very quick turnaround to look at the - and work through the model. But I think what we can all easily agree on and what's in line with the BC's position with respect to GDPR is that we need to work out how tiered access will work. And we need to do it when ICANN's model goes live. So we'd continue to have the cyber-security and brand and consumer protection access that's so critical for our members.

And so, what would be helpful to hear from the BC is not an endorsement of the model per se, although that, you know, you can certainly work through that. But what would be really helpful is an endorsement that this is a critical step that ICANN needs to take.

You heard Akram this morning. This has not been something they focused on at all. Aside from some RDAP discussions with registrars and registries, this is not on their radar. And this is really critical for our constituencies and other non-contracted entities. So getting ICANN staff to focus on this, work with the community to stand it up by May, I think would be a really helpful statement from the BC.

Steve DelBianco: Thanks, Denise. The real question I have is that - what we are asking ICANN to do with what you submitted. Think about this a second. Everything we've heard in the last 24 hours is that they don't do anything unless the DPAs are proven. And in fact, they have this, I think - I hope that DPAs would write back to ICANN at some time in March and tell them how the accreditation system should work. We don't - none of us believe that will happen.

So it's my guess that the first thing they'll do with us, before they lift a finger to implement, is to send it over. Göran promised us, everything he gets from us, he sends it over. So we didn't anticipate that in the cover letter that they would send it to DPAs and wait for them to react. So presumably, that's a decision you made on purpose, when you composed that cover letter. And I'm curious about how - what would you expect for real to happen with this?

Margie Milam: I think it's the follow-up of what -- this is Margie -- what we were talking about in getting a group together. It's meant to be a straw man. I mean I'm not even - you know, we were trying to get something out quickly. So that like, you know, community could comment on it.

Maybe it's something that Susan and our BC counselors can bring up at the GNSO level to jumpstart the review of it. It's not - I don't think it's a comment to accept it because, you know, it's a framework that, you know, we put out there for discussion purposes. Does that make sense?

Steve DelBianco: It does. But don't you anticipate that ICANN will immediately forward it to DPAs, like they do with everything else, expecting they get feedback.

Denise Michel: It's hard to know what ICANN - it's hard to know what ICANN is actually doing. We really just don't have transparency on that. It seems nonsensical that they would send such an early work product that the community has not actually, you know, developed to the DPAs. And I can't imagine what Göran thinks the DPAs are going to do with an initial framework.

But what I am certain of is, if collectively, as a community, we don't start now actually building something that will give us tiered access, we have - there is no chance that we'll be ready by the deadline. And I think that's an important focus. And I really think ICANN CEO needs to commit resources and start focusing on this. Yes.

Steve DelBianco: And I pressed them on that this morning in the meeting to say that, "Put your tech team on it right away to understand the intersection with RDAP, because I'm pretty sure the contract party is going to make this all about RDAP and not about the current."

So we have a meeting, I think, tomorrow with the Contract Party House. And that would be a super time to make this the agenda item. Instead of moaning and groaning over the interim model, let's see if we can focus exclusively - sorry, at least initially on this, in a discussion with the registries and registrars, think how much more positive that would be and let them add color to it; but what works well; what doesn't work; what's the interplay with RDAP.

Any objections to that, because we don't have an agenda yet for that session? Claudia, can you manage that then with Graham and with Paul; Paul Diaz and Graham?

Claudia Selli: Sure.

Steve DelBianco: So that - please attend, all of you, especially those of you who worked on it. Please make sure we attend that meeting. Margie?

Margie Milam: And also, I don't think they have a copy of it, actually, right? Denise, I don't know where - it's been shared on the IPC list and the BC list. Correct.

Denise Michel: Can I forward?

Margie Milam: So I think sharing it actually to all the SO/AC leaders is probably a good thing.

Steve DelBianco: Yes. Share it with them all; but a note to Graham; special note to Graham and Paul. It should specifically say, "We'd like to make this the first and primary - the first topic of discussion when we meet with you." It makes sense? Any other questions from BC members? Tim Chen?

Timothy Chen: Tim Chen from DomainTools. First, I just wanted to acknowledge Denise. She's done an enormous amount of work on this; a true champion for this issue on behalf of the BC. And so, I personally appreciate it. And I hope everyone is aware of how much work you put in.

My question is - I had heard that possibly there was going to be some thought into drafting around a purpose statement as well. And is that a relevant conversation for you here or possibly for the session tomorrow? And if not, then we could skip it.

Margie Milam: If I could, this is Margie. Yes, we were moving really fast in trying to get the accreditation proposal out first. And I believe there's final tweaks to it. And we'll try to circulate that as well because both of them are important. And so, it's just we were moving fast and haven't gotten to the point of finishing it.

Barbara Wanner: This is Barbara; just a clarifying question. So the purpose statement would sort of complement - serve as a complement? Okay.

Steve DelBianco: As your policy chair, I would say that it doesn't make sense for me to ask BC members, especially if it's only a fraction of us are in this room to endorse the specifics of the model.

Denise Michel: No.

Steve DelBianco: Particularly, that's going to change in the next couple of hours and with our discussion with Contract Party House. But what I will be able to say is that

the BC can endorse the taking of action with a specific effort, engaging with ICANN staff at the technical and legal level, to move this to the quickest of flushing out the details and obtaining some sort of indication of acceptance by DPAs.

So I think the BC will want to go on record for that. And if it would be helpful, I can draft something like that for tomorrow, okay, without going after the specifics. All right. Great. And thanks again to Facebook, Alex Deacon, Tim, and those of you who worked on this. And Microsoft has already left the room.

I'd like to go next to the Channel 2 which is support for our councilors, because don't forget that Susan and Marie have a council meeting all day tomorrow. Ozan is pushing it up on the Adobe. And then, we'll turn it over to Susan and Marie.

Susan Kawaguchi: Susan Kawaguchi for the record. We have no - nothing to vote on tomorrow. It's all discussion. So it's going to be a lightweight meeting tomorrow, hopefully. But I will make a mention of the model and accreditation model, and hopefully, that will spark some interest in that.

The only other thing that I am concerned will come up in AOB is Göran, when he met with the board, met with the GNSO Council on Sunday, he was really talking to everyone about opening up the bylaws because of the reviews. And so, I could imagine that that will come up as a topic. Some of you may bring it up, if we have time to talk about it. If not, GDPR may take the air out of the room. Who knows?

So it would be good to know I have my personal opinion on revising bylaws at this point. I think there's other ways. Steve mentioned some good ways of managing the reviews. But it would be interesting to know what the BC as a whole thinks about that.

Margie Milam: Hello, this is Margie. If the bylaws were open, I'm not sure I know - have a position, you know, whether it should or not, that it wouldn't just be the schedule. And I think some of the board action that's happened and trying to suspend, you know, the SSR and some other - you know, like really clarifying the independence of - reviews would be really important, I would think.

Steve DelBianco: Susan, keep in mind that we've already modified the bylaws subsequent to the transition. We did so this summer. And it was a relatively minor item, with regard to the board committees. So the bylaws don't get opened up for free form. A proposal for a specific edit to the bylaws has to actually make its way through this whole process, and the community has the opportunity to either block it or approve it, in the case of being fundamental bylaws. And these are not in the Fundamental Bylaws section.

So you don't open it up wildly. There has to be a very specific proposal. But I would agree. It's way premature for that. I fully believe that if you look at the timing from the date of a final report to the beginning of the next review, that's five years. But there's quite a bit of flexibility, I think, to gradually, over the next few years, get us down to two or three reviews per year, instead of seven in this year. This year is an anomaly. You don't change the bylaws over an anomaly year.

Margie Milam: I absolutely agree with you, so.

Alex Deacon: I have a question on a separate topic, if we're ready to move on? So if I'm not mistaken, in the CSG board meeting, I think it was Becky who mentioned that the board was going to approach the GNSO Council regarding some thoughts that they have around the RDS Working Group and the interim model and et cetera. Do we know - do we have more details there? Are they going to wait until it's finalized? Are they going to reach out to the RDS Working Group?

Susan Kawaguchi: You're on leadership on that working group.

Alex Deacon: Yes. But I've been (pinging) people that they don't know what's going on.

Susan Kawaguchi: I don't think so. So, on Sunday morning, we met with all the - GNSO Council met with all the PDP leadership in trying to re-envision and figure out some issues with PDPs. So I think, in the spirit of that discussion, it makes - people are thinking about, "How do we really use PDPs? And do we restructure them that we do have some other options in the bylaws to structure PDP differently or create a task force instead of a PDP?" And so, it could be going that direction. I don't know what the board is thinking.

Alex Deacon: I thought it was specific to the work around the interim model for the GDPR.

Susan Kawaguchi: I think the board is throwing out a lot of things that they don't understand at this time.

Steve DelBianco: Hey, if nothing further, go to Channel 3. And it's over to Barbara Wanner.

Barbara Wanner: Thank you. This is Barbara Wanner for the record. I'll be very brief. At the intersessional meeting, in February in LA, and I provided you with a report of that a while back. It was discussion about putting down on paper; having text that outlines the process for the selection of Board Seat 14. This process, it would be between the CSG and the NCSG. We will have a meeting this week at 7:30 am on March 15 to just sort of walk through that text and hopefully approve it.

There is one element of the text that offers a role for the NomCom, if there's some sort of disagreement which, of course, perhaps based on what Zahid just mentioned, the NCSG has a problem with. So we'll have - hopefully we can resolve that during this Thursday meeting, so we have something approved, and we're ready to go. That's it.

Steve DelBianco: So that clarifies it. It might be the fact that we may not agree with the NCSG, that the NomCom appointee gets to vote on the board member. So it's not about going back to the NomCom. It's whether the NomCom appointee has voting power over our next director.

Claudia Selli: So I have just one point under AOB, I don't know, Jimson, then I will give you the floor, but I just wanted to bring this up. I wanted to discuss very briefly and see how BC members feel concerning the GNSO future chair. In fact, we understand that Keith Drazek from VeriSign has manifested interest to step in as future chair when Heather Forrest's term comes to an end.

The BC Excomm unanimously would support that candidature. But I wanted to see if there would be any objection from BC member to that. I see that everyone agrees, so thank you. We are coming to the end of the meeting. I don't know if Jimson, do you want to give any update but, really, in one minute? Yes.

Jimson Olufuye: Yes. This is Jimson speaking. Actually, I wanted to use this period. There's a lot of people (at the back) at that time. I wanted to introduce. We have some new people; Andrew Mack; talked to so many people out; spoke to many people; just introduce them and let them know how to join the BC and the magazine.

Yes. You know what? The point is that (you're welcomed) but so - okay. So everything is covered. And just to apologize, I won't be at the meeting - I'm meeting with the Contractor Party tomorrow. I'll be chairing the African Strategy Session at the same time.

Claudia Selli: And for anyone who would be interested, we had one person locking in the Finance Committee, so just to make that clear. I will, in any case, send the information over mail. Steve, do you have any...?

Steve DelBianco: We'll see everybody at 9:30 tomorrow in Ballroom A for a continuation on this discussion of GDPR and WHOIS. And I've sent around - it's Göran, JJ and Becky Burr; and let's be sure the three of them have the accreditation draft in hand. I know Göran was on your original distro list, right?

Claudia Selli: It was sent to him, yes.

Steve DelBianco: Okay. So we know they have it. And I hope that they will be teed up as a discussion tomorrow at 9:30. Then, we were thanking Microsoft earlier for the role you played in helping to develop the accreditation straw man. Thank you very much.

Man: And I've just been in the GAC session. So I've sent my own notes to the BC of what I've just said.

Claudia Selli: Thank you very much. And the meeting is adjourned. Thank you, everybody.

END