ICANN Transcription – Abu Dhabi
GNSO – Internet Service Providers and Connectivity Providers Constituency
(ISPCP) Open Meeting Part 2
Tuesday, 31 October 2017 17:00 GST

Note: The following is the output of transcribing from an audio recording. 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.

On page: https://gnso.icann.org/en/group-activities/calendar

(Roy Arends):   PDF. All right, it's always harder when you do them with pressure. There you go. Okay. (Put it up). My name is (Roy Arends). I am - I met some of you - most of you already yesterday during the ISPCP outreach panel.

And I was asked by several folks to give this presentation about the motivation to delay the rolling of the DNS key for (unintelligible). I apologize beforehand. I'm not 100%. It's nothing contagious but it might be a little bit slower than you normally expect from me.

So when you do (DMX) validation, you need a key to validate. In order to start validating, you need a trust anchor. This trust anchor is nothing else than a (DNS key).

These are cryptographic keys and they shouldn't live forever. Ah, that's perfect. Thank you. And they shouldn't live forever. So in 2010, when we

started doing DNS (sec) we already had an agreement with the community that we would (drop) the key after five years.

Of course, we're now further than five years. We have them - sorry, can you do the next slide? That - okay, make it smaller. Ah, perfect. Thank you. That's great. Thank you.

So we have no way to check if resolvers or validators have the proper key configures. We can't go out and (probe) the world to see if there're proper keys. There is no mechanism to do that.

So we knew this and so we ensued on a three-year or multiyear design and (unintelligible) effort. We had a design team. We had outreach. We had presentation in various venues, plans, vendors. We talked to governments, even, et cetera, et cetera.

So there is a process in place (in order to roll) the key. It's not something we do ad hoc. So the - can you - I don't know how this works. Thank you. So in July 11, 2017, you see a few times the 11th of some quarter, of the first month in the quarter.

And the reason is that we have key ceremonies in place where we generate all the keys for the next quarter. The spots per quarter ten days so that's why we have on July 11, we can introduce a new (unintelligible) 2017.

We did that. We then monitor there any fundamental changes in root server traffic. We have traffic from B, D, F and L and there were no fundamental changes. There were no changes, period.

But if there were, we can always fall back. On 10th of August, and in a minute, you'll see a slide that shows it beautifully, and this is 30 days after the hold (bound) period - I need to explain that a little bit.

To validate this, you will then trust that key, that new key. The key is introduced by the old key and signed by the old key. The validators need to observe this for 30 days in order to configure it (out). And so by that time, it will trust it.

So we can check for any fundamental changes in roots of traffic. There weren't and we (continued it). And then on the 19th of September, the DNS key response size increase because VeriSign are doing their quarterly role.

VeriSign (will roll) the key every three months. They said this day every three months. This is by design. They've been doing that since 2010. And this is completely taken into account.

However, on the 19th of September, for the first time, the DNS key response size was slightly larger than usual. This might be a problem so we look for changes in traffic and there weren't, so we continued.

And I now have a nice draft to show the timeline. It's a little bit difficult to see. The red is the old key, the key we introduced in 2010. And the green is a new key plus the old key.

So red is good. Green is bad. And we introduced - you see the first line, this is where we introduced the key. Not much happens, but then 30 days later you see the swap of the green in the red line.

And this is a slide provided by doing (unintelligible) from VeriSign. So I just said we didn't have any way to probe and to measure if you have the proper key configured or not.

However, there's something named (signally) trust anchor knowledge and DNS extensions. This is a very recent RFC. It was published in April of 2017 and it would arbitrarily signal which keys you have configured, which trust anchor you have configured for the root zone.

By - the (unintelligible) already admitted this since 28th of July 2016 and (inbound does it) and since October the 10th, outbound does it by default. You need to switch it on before it works.

The problem, though, is this RFC is so new, keep in mind we have 4.2 million unique addresses talking to us on a daily basis and only a very, very, very, very small - it really a very small - percentage is signaling this information.

So - and that I want to focus on this thing I circled around in the bottom right corner. That's not 0%. And that's a problem. We didn't - we wanted to know why it wasn't 0%.

We actually wanted - no, it's not that we wanted to know why it's 0%. We wanted to know if there's a problem with the signal, if this is a false signal, or if there's really 5% to 10% of result that's misconfigured.

So after we got this information from VeriSign, we immediately looked at our stuff as well and we had about - and this is information until the 24th of October.

This is when I had to leave for the (right) meeting. Sorry, this is 27,000 out of 4.2 signal this new information. And only a handful - 1600 - would report that it only had the old trust anchor.

So in theory, 1631 would fail. However, the (analysis) is very complicated. In the DNS, we have (forwarders) that validate, pointing to the resolvers that are resolving on behalf of the (forwarders).

So (these are) a lot of IP addresses that are behind this (forwarding resolver). Also what we see a lot is that IP addresses walk around day by day in a single network. That means that every day, using DACP or something else, it will get assigned a new address.

So - and this makes the number look better. So we have a little bit of information. I was doing some research, why validate this report just (KSK). In the first one is when we noticed this, this was slightly annoying.

So there's implementation in bind, and the latest version of find will report the trust anchor even if it's not validating. So we have the trust anchor configured, the old one, and you have no interest in validating at all but it's (unintelligible).

So that's false information. Then we have a very confusing configuration mechanism in (bind) which is trusted key. This is the old way of doing things manually. And we have the managed keys.

And managed keys uses this automated update process called (RFC611), the one with the 30 day hold time. And we can see a little bit through the signal by looking for very small bits that are present in the DNS message.

For instance, if the DO (bit is set), that's an indication that the validator can do validation, that once the (DNS information). If it's not set, and if it does admit this trust anchor, then we know it's not validating so we can dismiss that as well.

So here's the thing - we always knew - we always knew that there were configurations that have an issue but we never had - well, for some form of the (active) data until now so we worried that (boxon) operators were - that (boxon) operate errors were possible but we didn't have any evidence.

So we hired a contractor to basically contact this and we started with a sample of 500 of those IP addresses. Initially we thought about publishing those IP addresses but we immediately realized that's actually a very bad idea because you don't - it's often seen as naming and shaming those who maybe can't - those who don't know they have a problem with their software.

So I'm going to skip this in time because this is so little information. This is basically - we have - of the 500, contact 40% yet. We did contact the other 60% but .8% is resolved which is the next slide.

So of those that are resolved, there's - the yellow circle - the big yellow portion is a result that is basically forwarding. So this is waiting the signal. The other two are basically what we expected.

One couldn't write the journal (final) back to (bind) - back to (this) and it's all very technical. I'm sorry about that. And the other one has a resolver that has a (KSK310) configured manually and didn't know that our RFC611 needed a different statement.

Okay, so back to the plan. So I already said 9th of September, (DNS key) response size, nothing was going on. We had received VeriSign's report and we corroborated with their own data and so we wondered what to do.

We could blindly go forward and roll. But we honestly didn't understand the signal, so we looked at the operational plan and there is a passage in there that says the roots are managing partners - this is VeriSign and I can - but also decide to extend any phase - the phase is this three-month period - for additional quarters.

For example, if new information indicates that the next phase may lead to complications, the current phase would be prolonged. This is referred to as an extend scenario.

So on the 27th of September, our CTO decided that we should kick in with all the information that he has - we should kick in the extend scenario. So we immediately went - after doing the proper internal - how do you call that - proper internal checks, we then went public with this information.

So we don't know yet, and a representative just validated this and we're getting more and more information every day. We also noted the validators are not the same as the end-users.

And we're going to try to determine the number of end-users with projects like (Jeff Houston)'s AP mix and Google ad experiment. (Mitigation) is hard. We already had a multi-year complaint with the operators and then implementation specific problems, right.

Every time we have a new release there might be a new problem - doesn't - don't make the problem easier. So the next steps (which is on the key role) until we get more information and understand the situation better.

Due to the process in place with key signing ceremonies, the delay will be at least one quarter. To be fair, it will be at least, that's actually stated wrong. It will be one quarter or more. That might read as four months or so.

Now we have not yet determined how many quarters to delay. And naturally we will try to partially mitigate. We have a contracted check on the first 500 results and it's basically a twofold exercise. We get more information and we help the public to fix their problems.

And data collection continues every day and this is a bullet point I put in. Please do not remove KSK2017. We have had - we have heard some reports that people are now removing the new KSK because we haven't rolled over which is a bad idea. That's it for me. Thank you.

Man1:   Okay, thanks very much, (Roy). So it seems to be - well, it's a (plate) issue between techniques - technical issues and communication issues maybe, so I think we should focus on both sides with questions and maybe suggestions and how to - in the way how we can assist ICANN or how we can better communicate.

So I wonder whether there are comments, questions on that, what (Roy) was presenting here. I see first Tony Holmes, please. Yes.

Tony Holmes   Hi, (Roy). Is there a that you need to get to before you feel it's okay to roll over. You showed at graph. What - I mean it's quite small, 60% or so. But what are you looking to get to so you feel reasonably safe? You're never going to get to zero? So what are you going to get to?

(Roy):   And we had this discussion over and over inside the team. It's rough. At the moment you say a number and you don't ever get there, they you never will. What we always said is we want to understand the signal, not that we want to go down to 5, 4, 3, 2, or 1%. It might be that the 5% that we saw are all false signals, or maybe just handful, maybe a half a percent are real signals.

So after we have the classification we can actually determine the amount. Then we have the addresses that are vulnerable and then we can use maybe Google's - sorry, yes Google's ad network to find out what the population of users are behind. Meanwhile we also try to reach out to them. It's, to me personally, it's not a question of how low can we go but more a question of understanding the signal. And then once we understand it, go forward with that.

Tony Holmes: So just a follow-up question on that. Can you actually really determine the number of users? Is that possible?

(Roy):   Not by looking at B, D, and F and overt data but the way Google does their ad network stuff, they just ask to various people and they have a trick in place that they can actually determine the resolver that these users are using. So a whole lot of users are Google itself but also a whole lot of users are using Comcast, and it's very diverse that information. And we've already had a few matches with that data. So we know we can use that. Still it remains a

sample. I think eventually we'll just have to decide to go further and take the damage for what it is. That's my humble opinion.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: Thanks. Yes. Another question from Chris. Please?

Christian Dawson: Just one quick thing. I'm sorry. My understanding is that before the KSK rollover was pushed, the comms team was working very closely with (Edelman) to do communications using a list of ISPs that (Edelman) had put together, meaning that they have contact information from a number of different players. As ISPs, would it be helpful if we either helped directly communicate with some of these ISPs or wrote some sort of a letter that would be able to put in front of those individuals?

(Roy):   I think that's a very nice offer, a very good question as well. I'll take that to my dear leader, (David Conrad), and I'd just need your name.

Christian Dawson: Sure. Christian Dawson. (David) knows me and how to get a hold of me.

(Roy):   Perfect. Then I'll take that forward to (David) because I am not involved in the communications part. I'm the guy who's looking at the data. Thank you.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: Thanks, Christian and (Roy). But just a question about it. I think, you know, what Christian touched on though - so you have a list of contacts now and to whom you are communicating. So is it updated? Because the role is changing, you know, it's evolving any which way. So it's nice to have direct contact right now but is that enough, you know, or how in which way it could help you, well, to update your contact base or so in order to get the information spread out in a way which is, well, in an updated way.

(Roy):   I think that's a very good idea. A little bit about the process, how we determine to whom this addresses belong to. We basically look it up on the system number. It's not the exact same thing. We have upstream providers, et cetera, et cetera, but we have a pretty good idea who these are. That's a

list of about 130 - sorry, 500 addresses, not 230, up on the system numbers. And I don't remember not from the top of my head what the spread is per region.

But so from the autonomous system number we have contact information naturally. And then the first effort is we try to contact that. And the consultants that we are using, this is (Joe Aby). He used to work at ICANN, is not a root server operator. He's very knowledgeable with many of these autonomous system number operators.

So we - that's the reason why we approached him to do first cut, and from that information we will work forward. But I'll definitely take this idea to the team, and if we can use the ISPCP folks (unintelligible) for an outreach, then that would be brilliant. Thank you.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: Philip, please.

(Philip):   Yes just a couple of comments, and bearing in mind that it's a bit difficult to think without - I can appreciate that there are constraints with regard to distributing IP addresses so it's a bit difficult without being specific. Now on the general point, there are institutions through which we can go to reach out to certain parties, and we've got associations here with - for the major allegedly players in Europe for instance and that could be used if that applies. And again, I'm speaking without knowing the ranges so it's a bit difficult.

One thing, just to pick up on one thing you just said, in certain organizations the contact for the AS, and as you said it can be different in principle, but even in some large organizations those who are contact may not be directly if not indirectly in contact with those who operate the resources. So it may take some time to reach out to those people who are actually impacted and interested in having that information.

(Roy):   Yes we are fully aware of the difficulty to reach the carbon life form behind an IP address. It's very difficult and so we currently have this process in place. I will definitely take your ideas to (David). I think he will be enthusiastic about this, and then if not I'll try to make him enthusiastic because it makes my work easier and we go forward. Thank you.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: Okay. So we have - we can wrap up this session I think. So thank you very much, (Hoy), and stay in contact and if you like we have also (unintelligible) contact me, as you have my contact something I can spread out the information within the constituency as well and we will be supportive, right, as we have pointed out here. Thanks very much.

So where we are with the time? We have 5 o'clock, around that. So we have where we are with the agenda right now. Is (Brian Shilling) here? Not that I know. So because he was keen on also to talk about this with us about - I thought maybe he could show up later on because he may have not been aware about our specific timescale here.

Well it doesn't matter. So we have enough time. Let's do another one, a more easy one maybe, you know, an update for universal acceptance. Would that be good? So Christian or (Lars), who is the front runner on that. So, (Lars), yes? Thanks.

(Lars):   Yes thank you, Wolf-Ulrich. The USG did have at this ICANN meeting one workshop on last Friday, where we gathered for the full day and on Monday we've been given an out - a community update in public. So the objective is just to give a brief update on the current status of the UASG and what are our plans for the next year.

Oh that doesn't help. Okay. I mean we've been giving several updates of the work of the UASG in the past year now in the ISPCP, so I guess most (unintelligible) are familiar with our work. So. And the general idea of universal acceptance is that all applications accept all domain names

regardless of their length, character set, or length of time in the root. And according to that, the e-mail address internationalization, EAI, it's the idea that all domain names regardless of their character sets and all mailbox names, again regardless of their character sets, will - and all e-mail software and services.

So what's the current state of the UASG? Currently we've got 272 members subscribed on our mailing list and those are coming from more than 150 organizations, and 35 members do we have on our EAI mailing list. If you're interested in participating, just use the link here, uasg.tech/subscribe if you want to subscribe to one of our mailing lists and being involved in our work.

Throughout the last weeks and months we've created new documents or updated several documents. So we updated a few of our case studies. We have updated the quick guides to (linkification). So one of the items we added was a recommendation by (Mark) when it comes to abuse topics in the context of (linkification).

We updated the quick guide to UA. Christian and me contributed a CIO guides to UA, so, where we gave a little bit of guidance to CIOs and a list of software and services that are usually used, especially in - at hosting companies to have an eye on to check if those systems are UA ready or not.

If you take a look at this document and you take a look at this list, and you think, "Huh, there's something missing," please let us know. So this especially one of the documents where we think it's a current - it's a work in progress. So this is one of the documents that will never be finished and never be ready. So if you think there is something missing, please let us know. Also we have contacted a variation of programming languages and those criteria so we can publish it, also recently.

In April we published a whitepaper on universal acceptance, especially focusing on the commercial implications, so what are you missing or what is

the industry in general missing if you don't have an eye on universal acceptance. We recently published a report on browsers and a report on popular websites, and I'll come to the details later. What we are still working is a review on (linkification) and also a review on EAI.

This is what we've done throughout the last weeks and months. I'll go through it a little bit faster. So. We've published a number of blog posts. If you think that one or more of those blog posts would also be suitable to be spread in your organizations or associations or companies or whatsoever, please feel free to use them and spread the word.

Last week Don Hollander and (Ramon) have been involved in an IDG webinar on broccoli issues. So they were topics like DNS Sec, IPC (picks) and universal acceptance being discussed. Christian and I moderated at the last - oh that's - we have a small title, it's work hosting day, and I talked about universal acceptance and we attended several other events. We are currently producing a number of interviews on video. So those are we are calling UA Voices, and those will be published on our website soon as well net to the case studies.

We are also looking for people who would like to set up local initiatives so there have already been proposal by - made by China, India, and Egypt. Argentina also expressed interest in setting up more local initiatives, and (unintelligible) also expressed interest to being more engaged in this. If you're interested in this, there's a document on our website about the requirements and what we are looking for. Take a look at it. If it doesn't refrain you from being engaged, reach out to us.

We are also reaching out to IPF. We still have the login issue form on our website, so when you encounter any UA issue, for instance you can't create a user account at a web service and the form rejects your e-mail address, go to the login issue form on the uasg.tech website and report this to ICANN Global

Support, who will take care of it. Yes, we've updated the layout of our documents. We've got a fresh report design and several other things. .

What we are currently having in the pipeline is doing a mailing and to approximately 300 to 400 ACLs who are currently in preparation of the list to have a paper mailing to reach out to CIOs of the largest companies, especially in the US, to get an idea if this kind of outreach is working. If yes, we will conduct this kind of activity. If no, we'll evaluate the results and reach out to our community if there are measures which would be more effective.

We are also currently working on an agenda for 2018 to attend a number of conferences, where we meet our target audience, and this is something that will follow on the next slides. When it comes to our outreach activities, the message of the Universal Acceptance Steering Group hasn't changed, so I will skip that slide.

As I already said, we developed a lot of content throughout the last month and also already year with the whitepaper and the reports. (Edelman), the communications agency that we hired is still very active on the association engagement to reach out to associations to pass on our articles to engage them to have them published on blogs, websites, newsletters, at associations and organizations. If you're interested in doing this in your community, please feel free to use this material or to reach out to us so that we can tailor something to your audience.

We already have the webinar on our agenda and we are currently updating our website on a regular basis. So what we are doing is we will conduct the CIO outreach. We will continue to reach out to the associations. We will continue to produce new and fresh material. When it comes to the use cases, there's currently one case study in the pipeline that we will produce together with affiliates and develop and publish articles (unintelligible).

When it comes to on the long run, yes, we will continue this set of work that we already have in the pipeline. So when it comes the priorities of the next year, we still have our target audiences, so the developers, media, IT managers, CIOs, board members, and governments. For example, for the next IGF in Germany in the middle of November, we will have a small two-hour event in the (Eco) office in Berlin together with ICANN to reach out to government representatives, because we would like to see more pressure from this side to make UA readiness being a requirement when federal bodies are interested in buying the software and systems, that it's a requirement in the future to have built-in UA readiness.

And we are reaching out to the software vendors who are building e-mail software and the e-mail software service providers to implement UA readiness and EIA readiness.

I already talked about the local initiatives, and when it comes to having all this started, already running, we would also spend some time on the questions on the long run how do we define having our mission accomplished? Because the UASG has nothing we would like to see in 10 or 20 years but we have to see and to define some measurements how we define okay the mission is accomplished, so we have to define certain criteria and numbers we would like to achieve.

And that is something we also have discuss with the community where we have to agree when is the UASG at a certain point where we can say okay to do this degree we can say we achieved our goals. So. But this is still something we have to discuss and we have to define, and you are welcome to join the discussion.

This is something I wanted to skip. Yes, I already mentioned that we had a evaluation of websites. So we checked more than 1,200 websites; 750 of them have been reviewed and tested with our set of e-mail addresses and

web addresses based on several scripts and TLDs. So we have got (unintelligible) ID and Unicode and the whole range.

And the result was the only 7% out of all websites accepted all of our test addresses, 7% accepted nothing, and the general direction is the shorter the better and the more ASCII also the better, which means that we are still in a current position where we still have to heavily promote especially EAI in the support of all scripts. And this is also one of our main focuses.

When it comes to the browsers, we reviewed seven browsers on five different operations systems. And I had also tested several use cases and the result was that only one browser on the market performed as we expected, and that was surprisingly the Internet Explorer. The main issues also here is when you - when different scripts are involved and here especially the Arabic script.

This is too much in detail. Yes, this was the quick version, not taking so much time.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: Very good, very good. Thank you very much, (Lars). Well, it helps us just to follow what's going on in the (unintelligible). They have a big effort, well, to be done over the time, as I fully understand. Tony, you would like to comment, please?

Tony Harris: Yes a couple of things. First of all, (Lars), would it be possible for you, I don't know if other people want to receive it, maybe you could send this presentation to all on the list. Or if nobody's interested, I at least would like to get it and study through it. I think it's a really important update. And then I would, if I can have two minutes, just comment a couple things.

I sat in on the meeting, part of the meeting. I was just off the plane and going to sleep. But I did hear a couple of very interesting things. We had - there was a presentation from somebody from Egypt who had done a study on IDNs in the Arab countries, and one thing he said which caught my attention

was that in his conclusion nobody in the Arab world had any idea that these things existed, which points to a lack of perhaps communication and outreach that these things are available.

And then there was a presentation from Dr. (Ajaya Adata), I think his name was, from India, which I thought was mind blowing because he was talking about EAIs and the fact that in India apparently the project is for every single citizen to have one. In (Rejastan) Province, where he works is the first pilot, from what I understood. So that seems interesting. Anyhow, I thought I'd mention that.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: Thanks, Tony. You wanted to comment, Christian?

Christian Dawson: I just wanted to thank (Lars) because not only has he been great presenting this, and now three times I've watched him present this, in the past couple of months he and I are co-presenters for the - co-conveners for the outreach component of the UASG. And due to other commitments, I've had to scale back a lot of my normal levels of participation in this particular group for the past two months, and he has done a stellar job. I think that the fact that we have multiple people heavily engaged in this important subject is very important, and he's doing great.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: Thank you very much. Just to my memory, so, (Lars), the initiative when did it start, two years ago or so? Because the question is what you put on the slides now, what should be your future effort is, well, to come up with these measures, you know, success measures, you know, on that. So. And I wonder, as I understand, that this things you are recommending, this group is recommended , are being implemented one after the other so it's already going on. It's an ongoing process.

So if you have anything - did you have any reaction at the time being now, you know, from the members of this group, also who are closer to what's happening outside, so what the effect could be or what kind of success they

had in mind or had - did they have any reactions, positive reactions, you know, from the outside world with regards to the work you have done so far?

(Lars): Yes thank you, Wolf, for that question. Of course we've got a number of examples where we already succeeded to convince people to take care of this, but on the other hand it's - in most parts it's a chicken and egg problem. So even when you reach out to people and find the right contact person, the usual question is what's in it for me.

And when it comes to the implementation for EAI for example, when you talk to people from Europe or from North America, for them it's usually something that's a little bit far away. Even when you talk to large e-mail service providers about how much traffic do you have with EAI e-mail addresses, they say really none. So for them it's not a high priority on the list and so it is still a chicken and egg problem for us to convince them.

On the other hand, in the long run, yes, we are carving stone. And we have this - these very good examples from Thailand and also from India that show that it doesn't need that much effort to change something. And then when we have those good examples and also like in India with Mr. (Data) and who also provides support to companies in other countries that use different scripts, this can really be a door opener for us.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: Thanks very much, (Lars). So let's finish this agenda item. So we have - I really would like to finish the meeting on time, even before if possible, but we still a positive agenda to go. Let me just summarize which points we have.

We have to talk about outreach, well, something brought up from yesterday and looking to the future with regards to outreach, and something regarding the activities (unintelligible) council meeting tomorrow but which could be short. And a - yes, questions regarding the next intersessional meeting in early 2018, how to organize that. Then we have AOB. Then we have had around so the question of the (unintelligible) and the question with regard to

the community resource consultation. Well, I think that is - we should cover it as well.

So let's try now to be - to focus on the various points and be brief so that we can cope with our timeline here. So next time - the next point would be outreach. Outreach just looking back a little bit, what happened yesterday, are there any ideas, are there overwhelming let me say consensus on that we could be happy with that event yesterday. What could be, from your point of view, could be improved with regards to such events in terms of timing, in terms of preparation, in terms of implementation of those things. And then afterwards, we will - should talk about future events and how to engage in the future.

So I would like to open the floor to anything. Let me just, well, as the master of, let me say, of pleasure yesterday, so from my point of view, I have a truth with regards to the preparation. I have more doubt, you know, about success of the event yesterday. So that is one point, but yesterday itself. But I'm - so I didn't expect, you know, that much, you know, participation. That was something. And also the flow of the discussion seemed to be very good. Also we had really (unintelligible) preparation.

So we had to lose Tony as a moderator because of his infection, yes? And then we had to lose, you know, the welcome speaker or the keynote speaker, and all these things. So from the (rapator) point of view, it was a mess, I would like to say. But then, you know, from the event itself I would say it was success, well, not to be - I cannot judge on how it comes out with let me say with new members or applications with that, but that may come. So I really would like to hear from you. I see first Christian and then Tony Holmes. Christian, please.

Christian Dawson: So I guess many aspects of what it is we pulled together with this event are great. The even that was in Hyderabad was also excellent. Each of them generated a registration list that provided us with contact information for

individuals who have been interested enough to come see us. Moreover, we've got a very active and I think going pretty well program where we have an outreach vehicle to send members to events. At those events we meet people who might be of interest to the organization.

I think the maturation that needs to happen in outreach right now is we need to come up with a lead list, an outreach list, and I think that we need to rely upon secretariats for - to do that. Take our RSVP lists and the lists of the people that we gather at the events that we do, we put them in a list and when we come out with a new one of these, we send it to them. We can send them occasional reminders that if they're interested in joining the ISPCP they can do so. Maybe that will be at the footer of these.

But the fact is that I am very pleased with over the past couple of years what we have been able to achieve with regards to outreach and with regards to events. But we haven't capitalized on those things long term. And having a lead list that we drip information out to over time is the way that we achieve that.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: Tony, please.

Tony Holmes: Thanks. I think it - we need to make our mind up what we want from these events, because certainly yesterday I thought the level of discussion was really good. The involvement of the audience, as well as the speakers was really good. And having been alongside you as we were preparing this, Wolf-Ulrich, it was a bit of a challenge at time. We did have some worries.

For me the event in Hyderabad was far more successful for us because, for me, it is about outreach and we made some significant inroads at that event. We didn't do that yesterday in the same way and that was always my fear. And it's because in this particular region, the makeup of the industry and the involvement of ISPs is different. It's a lot more challenging for us here than it would have been in India.

So if we are going to make our mind up that we focus on outreach, we need to think about where we have future events. And I am in favor of having future events because I think it does two things. Ideally it will help with outreach but also it helps this constituency focus on things that we should be talking about, not just ICANN policy, but far broader than that. And I think that's part of our role.

So we need to think about where we target the next one. There's got to be, for me, a place where we can pick up a number of new members, new ISPs, and that should have a bearing in any future decision that we have. I don't think we should be complacent either, because I know that the next annual meeting is in - scheduled for Barcelona. And whilst we're not doing bad for Europeans, we haven't got it all covered, so there's still fertile ground there.

But I think we need a discussion as to what the real objective is and, if it is outreach, then we need to target the next events with that in mind rather than just have what was a really successful event yesterday but I'm not sure how long ICANN will be prepared to underwrite an event like that without any real payout for us.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: Thanks very much. For other comments, Tony Harris and then (Philip).

Tony Harris: Yes. I agree with what Christian said and also Tony. First we got the questions and comments I think long term. One impression I have is we're getting new members to join but they sort of vanish into the mists afterwards because how do we engage them if they can't come to meetings? And I think that's a challenge we have to think about because otherwise they're on the list but what, you know, what life is there in it for them? I don't know if you agree with that, Christian.

And to Tony's comments, I really thought yesterday was a successful event even with all the difficulties we had putting it together. I was a little surprised

to arrive at the event and find that there was no podium and no table so we were all pushing chairs around and screaming for a table and then I had to go and scream for coffee, things like that.

But the people who were there, I counted - we ended up with 33 people in the room, which was pretty good because people tend to drift away during a long meeting, and everybody stayed in their place practically. And we had a couple of turbans there, which was interesting. I mean Arabs with their full dress, who were very participative. And, well, just that.

Christian Dawson: Just in response to that, one thing to note about the logistics is that a lot of that comes down to (Chris Mondini) falling ill right before the event. I think all this simply would have been taken care of appropriately had it been staffed the way it was supposed to. (Chris) has been very good to us and I kind of think that if he was here it would have been fine.

Tony Holmes: I'd like to follow up on Tony's point as well, and I agree with Christian. I think that some of it did come down to the fact that we at the end were without (Chris). So you're right on that.

But on Tony's point about the further engagement from some of these people that come on the list. I still think there are real benefits in that, and some of those benefits are things like we mentioned to the board today. When we want to have contacts to get key messages out there for ICANN on things like universal acceptance, on things like KSK, even if they're not coming along to meetings, having those contacts is really essential and it's a real help to us. So I still benefit from that.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: Thank you. Now, (Philip), please.

(Philip): Thank you. Yes, I very much agree with what's been said. A couple of points that I wanted to highlight. I think it'd be good if there were key messages to convey to the potential new members. The - what's came out of yesterday's

event was interesting in terms of addressing the general issue on our KPIs for instance.

But if I were a participant to the event expecting some information as to what it would matter for me to become a member, I might have needed more information. I don't know whether that was provided offline to them. It might be relevant to provide it now maybe. But it very much depends on KPI that we exercise, whether that's a matter for the event to reach out to the ICANN community or whether we do want to target these people.

And if you want to do that, if you want the latter, then we want to demonstrate that a membership, it's free, it's not that common. It wouldn't matter to them to have information about the KSK rollover information about PDPs, but whatever, but something that would help them understand why it would be important for them to become a member.

For example, I was wondering whether the people from (unintelligible) expressed an interest in becoming a member because that's typically the sort of participant that could be interested in becoming a member and the sort of information they might need to consider that.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: You would like to comment?

Tony Holmes: Just in defense of that, I don't think there was that many that we anticipated to be potentially members for us yesterday. So that's why we didn't go down that path. There were a few but there weren't that many. If it's a softer target then we should definitely do that without a doubt.

One other thing that I thought would have been useful yesterday --I don't know whether we can chat to (Chris) about this -- but I thought it would have been worth recording part of that, video recording part of that as well and having that - a link to that from our website. They had some good discussions yesterday on some good things and that's the sort of thing that will engage

with potential new members as well. So maybe that's a discussion we can have.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: Okay. Christian?

Christian Dawson: I do recommend one specific takeaway, whether we see clear targets out of yesterday's event or not, because it's a good exercise for the types of things that we're going to do moving forward. A letter from the chair to the people that register for the event that says ISPCP is proud that you registered for our event. This is - these are the reasons why we think that it's important to be a member of the ISPCP. If you either are interested in membership or know an organization that should be a member, here's the information on how to engage.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: Yes thanks for all these comments. Yes I also learned yesterday a lesson, you know, in moderating the session in part, you know, that it might be too late, you know, to come up with a statement about, you know, the mission of the ISPCP and what we are doing in the end, you know, so that is because the audience is going to change an hour after that. So I was also thinking in between I would have been better, well, to start with it.

It is a little bit hard to do so because, well, if you go to such a region where you have VIP guests for example at the beginning, you have a keynote speaker and you have a specific guest delivering a welcoming speech and so their behavior they don't care about these things, you know. And if you start at first, well, it would be deliver this kind of message so it may send a signal okay so I'm of less clear priority here, is that what they are saying here. So this is a little bit - so we have to think about - I'm with you, you know, really. So. Because we have a target to get members on board here.

I think what one thing could be, I've seen today there is just a follow-up message from ICANN engagement, you know, that was sent out to all participants who have has registered, I understand that, just, well, thanking

them for participation in general. So we could follow up as well, you know, with a specific, more specific thing ISPCP related, you know. So I'll have a think about that and then maybe Tony and me both we can draft something so and then bring it out to the list of (Chris Mondini). So. And that could be a follow up I think.

(Philip): Yes. And it again it depends on your KPI. It was really good I found but it depends on the target and the goal you had set. Yes I think it was (Chris) who mentioned that maybe the survey or the thing that they sent, maybe they sent it already, to the participants to have their feedback could be used as a follow up as you said or included within the survey, that'd be useful. I leave that to the ICANN staff but that could be a way to do it.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: Okay. I have a question, coming back to Christian. Well, you were mentioning the necessity for having a list or so an outreach list, yes, so I wonder how we could manage this list, you know, in terms of, well, which kind of criteria would be - should we put on the list or which kind of information we put on the list and should it be run on this list and updated by the secretariat. So I'm really open to that. So do we have a specific suggestion on how to shape this list?

Christian Dawson: Well the system that we use that I administer along with Chantelle for our website is more than a website. It is a - it's called member clicks and it can be used for way more than we're using it for. It can be - we can manage membership through it. We can set up accounts for every single individual that is a member and allow them to go in and get member-only things.

We could eventually set it up to charge dues through. But there is certainly a section of the website that is involved with setting up prospects. And then we can mail prospects through the website as well. It's got that system. So structurally we have everything that we need. What we need to be is aligned with a focus because, you know, we'll need to ask the secretariat to do very specific things to get those things set up.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: Good. Let's talk about, you know, what we have - we may have in the pipe for the next future or potential outreach to do. So Tony mentioned already, you know, next year's AGM in Barcelona. That could be something. I would suggest that we put ideas together, you know, and then decide or talk about on our - one of our next calls, well, and decide how to implement that and how to discuss it with ICANN and then - because it's - in the end it's about funding, you know, so how to deal with that, what could be done.

Yesterday I also got some requests from people from the audience, well, why not to participate in the, what is it, African Summit for example. That is something. Then in (Damenok) there our colleague here from the region is active, you know, in (Ripe), you know, which is when they have meetings here. That could be something, well, to put together. Are there any other ideas from your side directly so which - what we should put just on a list and then just cast the next time? Are there any ideas?

Tony Holmes: We should probably have that discussion on our (unintelligible) I think in terms of forming a list and doing it that way.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: I put something together in a draft for the next call.

Man: But I'm aware that -- well, we should treat the CROP stuff totally separate but I'm aware that with the pressure on ICANN funding, whilst that was a really successful event, we need to make our mind up what it's focused on and if it's focused on outreach, we need to make sure that we meet some target and we get something back out of it. Otherwise, it will be questioned.

Having said that, I've long been of the view that ISP should run more of a tech day and in line with what the CCTLDs did. So that's just another discussion we need to have at some time.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: So we can close this time. Thanks very much. Move over to the GNSO (unintelligible).

Man: Okay, we're going to do this quickly. It's sort of a quiet meeting. Not much going on. They even canceled the prep meeting today. There's not much to prep for, for the meeting tomorrow. In the first part, we have a council vote, which is the appointment of the next GNSO liaison to the GAC and the person who is being nominated, the only one is (Joel Calsingius) and it's just going to be a formality of voting him for this position.

The guy who is stepping down is Carlos Gutierrez. Then we have a lot of discussions but no more votes in the first part. And in the second part, the new councilors will take their seat. That means Filippo will be replacing Wolf-Ulrich on the Council and there is one voting item, which is voting for the new chair, selection of the chair, and the person nominated there, I guess everybody knows, is Heather Forrest. There's no other candidate so that too will be a formality.

And then there isn't much else really remarkable. No, nothing else that would interest you right now. That's it.

Tony Holmes: Are we voting on vice chair tomorrow as well?

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: No, this is (unintelligible) different, Tony, thing. The vice chair is up to the house, not to the council because it's (unintelligible) decide on their vice chair. So we have already decided. I sent around a message and it was Rafik. He was accepted also by (unintelligible) constituency so Rafik is the vice chair for the non-contracted parties house for the next year. For Heather's election, there is nothing surprising to expect. The nomination of the GAC election, the GAC liaison is following an internal process, which makes -- comes out (unintelligible) nomination. There were no more candidates. I think there were three candidates. We had also candidate from (unintelligible) and that was then sorted out by the SSC, these standing

committee on selection, standing selection committee who is dealing with all selections the council is in charge of. So it was (unintelligible) name came up with committee recommendations to nominate Julf Helsingius and the only question is for us here can we follow this nomination or is there any remark, any concern with regard to that. Tony, please.

Tony Holmes: Because Osvaldo was conflicted, I sat on that committee and it's frustrating for me what happened because Julf is really capable. He'll do a good job. No doubt about that but so would Osvaldo and there was -- well, just share with you, there was very little between them and unfortunately, if we had coordinated from that election within our house, it would only have gone one way and we would have seen Osvaldo elected. There is absolutely no doubt about that.

So there's a lesson there. When we have these elections in future, let's make sure we have a discussion within our house because that really did impact that result and I've got nothing against Julf, but two really good candidates.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: Thanks for sending Osvaldo. I think, anyway, so it's good for the positive (unintelligible) we have candidates here and shows as we have candidates who are pivotal to take over these jobs now. Thanks very much. Part of the agenda. We have still while the next meeting, which is of interest of ours and we have to prepare -- be prepared for that is the so-called non-contracted party's house intercessional meeting, which will take place beginning of February in Los Angeles.

So we have already decided on who is going to participate. I think it's either five or seven slots we have for each constituency to participate. It is a lot of things to be prepared. I think there shall be a call after the ICANN meeting, a prep call for this meeting. It's usually then going down the path asking from which side because it's CSG and plus NCSG going to meet and it's going to be who will -- who has which interest from the different constituencies within the CSG to which items should be brought up. I think one bigger issue will

the review, the structural review, potential review and future of the GNSO as we have started out in the past discussed that there will be on the agenda. The question is what is our interest, which items we would like to have on the agenda that I could -- and I think also Tony, you'll have -- you'll be on the team for preparation of that. And (unintelligible) the call and then the question is what we could come up with.

I'm not sure whether there are ideas right now, which we could share here or whether they should just put information out here and on the list, and ask the colleagues for input just before the next call for that. I think that would be helpful because if it comes close around to that meeting or to these prep calls. So people are more aware about that and we should ask and have an exchange on the potential items.

Are there any comments on that? Tony, please.

Tony Holmes: Yes, one item I think we should put on that agenda is ICANN meetings and I've had this conversation here actually with some people who are in the other house and they share the frustration around that. So what really happened was we moved to a structure where there was the A, B, and C meetings. I don't think any of us paid enough attention to what was coming out of that review team when it happened and there's a level of frustration now, because for these shorter meetings, we're trying to cram in a full program into less days.

We are guilty of adding things on the end and the beginning of those meetings. It's not particularly working well. The intention was that we may be able to go to other parts of the world where they couldn't host a big ICANN meeting. That was a part of the drive. I don't think it's really happened. Those meetings are almost as big as the other -- as the normal (unintelligible). It's time to stand back and have a look at that and maybe the start of that would be to have some discussion with our counterparts in the

other house who really are suffering from the same sort of problems that we have.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: I think we just put it on the list and then when it comes to prep calls, we will apply that and we'll see what kind of issue we put to the agenda then. Any further comment to that? No, thank you. Next point, we should have -- Osvaldo (unintelligible) and Christian also, you were volunteering on the first draft answer to this questionnaire with regard to the community resource consultation. You may remember that ICANN, I think it's the ICANN engagement team. They put out a survey on the question of expenditures and ICANN is doing with regards to community resources in context with meetings, in context with support of the ICANN community.

And there are figures in that showing how many people are funded for travels over the years. I don't know, was it over the last five years or so, and what the development could be. In total, so Jurgen was saying, so in total at the time being they are spending $10 million per year for ICANN meetings in total, the arrangements, funding, travel arrangements, everything. So the question is with regards what shall we do with this questionnaire because they are expecting from us answers.

Osvaldo Novoa: The question was basically on travel support, on the policy. I'm afraid they are aiming to try to restrict travel support. I don't have the (unintelligible) for this year but last year, it was around almost $1.8 million for around 400 persons. So it was at least less than 400, it was another adjust $3,000 per person. So I don't think it's that much and I think they should put more money because we need to bring more people to the -- at least some (unintelligible) money to get people.

I started a first draft of the answers but I couldn't get too far on because I was traveling but I think we have to be very careful and think about the answers and prepare a (unintelligible).

Tony Holmes: My understanding of that, I thought it was Osvaldo, Christian, and me that
were looking at that and I agree, we need to be really careful of the answers.
For me, I had a slightly different (unintelligible) from Osvaldo because I sat in
that budget meeting at the last ICANN meeting when the question was asked
of Sally (unintelligible) about outreach and they pay for a lot of people to
come here under different schemes now. And she was asked how many
people that they brought to meetings, and maybe they'd brought them once
or twice. They're not the constituencies that were under the spotlight. How
many of those stay on? How many of those then come and join in ICANN
and pay themselves? And her answer was I don't have any figures for that.

Well, she should have figures and there should be a measure there as to how
many come and we need to go back I think on a response like that, that there
needs to be some assessment of how successful those programs are
because it's one thing paying for people that come here and actually work.
It's another thing paying for people who come for a free lunch to a couple of
meetings and you never see them again.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: Thanks. Before I had over to Christian, with regards to this
question, I have seen Osvaldo your first draft answers as well. So would it be
possible to come up with the rest of the draft answers? Yes, and because I
think it's expected to send it out after this meeting.

Christian Dawson: So yes, this will be finished. Osvaldo did a very good job of completing a first
draft of the five questions that were posed to the group. Some of the things
we've talked about at the last intercessional surrounding problems with
communicating with ICANN community travel support and meeting the travel
support guidelines, Osvaldo put into the documentation.

What I believe we need to add but I think we need to talk it through first, and
then I can quickly add it, building on what Osvaldo already did with his very
good work, is exactly what Tony said, discussing the accountability of the
programs moving forward. Because yes, they probably are looking to tamp

down on travel support but I don't think the goal is just to try and save money. I think the goal is trying to ensure that they're getting good value of this money that they're spending.

In this constituency, nobody gets travel support unless they're actively participating. And so if we build metrics for participation, we've got no problems and no risk of losing funding. And so saying going into this that we support metrics, saying that we support them gathering information to prove that when they put money into the system, we are getting value out I think is a worthwhile thing to do to add to the work that Osvaldo has already done.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: Good point. Thanks, Christian. Tony?

Tony Holmes: I think there is a real issue that they're looking to reduce personally because if you look at all of the finance figures, now that we've got through the GTLD program, they're all starting to go down the ICANN budget in terms of what it's pulling in is reducing. It's only just over the curve at the moment but the signs are that's trend is going to continue and they're going to have to look at their spend. They're going to have to look at how they spend money and this is really going to come under the spotlight. So I think we could be cognizant of that as we move forward on this project.

Christian Dawson: I guess I agree with you. I just am saying that they're not looking to cut active participants. They're looking to cut all the people that are coming here on a cruise.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: (Unintelligible) take out the lead on that I would say around just a draft (unintelligible) and coordinate with you and then bring it up to us?

Christian Dawson: It's on my desktop right now and I need to write maybe six or seven sentences on top of what Osvaldo has already done and send it to the two of them. I can do it tomorrow. I'll do it tomorrow.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: Yes, okay. Thanks very much. Very helpful. So we're coming down to AOB and I would like to leave because we have two people in the room (unintelligible) so (unintelligible) AOBs and I would start with bringing up your point and then we can continue, first.

Man: I'd like to discuss the point that Tony raised.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: Okay, that's coming (unintelligible) that. (Esteban)?

(Esteban):   Yes, my issue is related with outreach and also with -- because I want to share with you that I was working on behalf of our constituency in the community on (unintelligible). I don't know how many of you know this program. This program began before Helsinki meeting as a pilot that at the time was managed by the fellowship coordinator (unintelligible). I remind that (Janice) stuck with Tony Harris and me. And then this program evolved as a full program. The objective is to fill the gap between newcomers and the effective or active participants inside each constituency. That is why this is an outreach and engagement program.

The actions done were face-to-face meetings on every ICANN meeting in Helsinki. There were many conference calls and also we work on creating modeling materials. In our case, it's information about the ISPCP constituency that is published in the ICANN community wiki. The program is a cross-community program because it has the participation of people from almost every constituency. As for example, the GAC at large, CCNSAO, the IPC, the NCUC, the NPOC and our constituency.

The system of this program is to have a mentor and a mentee and now, there were three people, (Osama Tamimi) from Palestine, me, and in many of these meetings, and in now (Suman Lalpram) from Nepal. The next steps for this program is to generate and I can learn of course about the ISP constituency and its role into ICANN. Well, just for you to know about this

program and of course, to invite all who want to be interested in taking part in the program facing Puerto Rico meeting and the following one. Thank you.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: Thanks very much. So this is good information. Is that information also be shared for the fellowship or the newcomers program?

(Esteban):   Yes, because in some ways, the program began as initiative in the fellowship program but now it's more a community driven program, but the frictions and all (unintelligible) and that is why each community has to refine the people who is taking part into the program and I think that it tend to be very useful because there is a program in the consistent. There is a lot of people new coming but all that people is not then is not continuing in the engagement into the different constituency. And it's a common problem inside ICANN.

That is why this in some way, the ICANN staff I think that's working with the at large people defined the stakeholder (unintelligible) that if in some way the trip that you have to make from a newcomer or a (unintelligible) to a leadership position. That is not a complete process but the idea is how to engage and how to involve in active participation the people who is interested in ICANN issues. That is why this program is important but needs the support of the community and also the participation from each constituency.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: Okay. Thank you. Do we have to take some action with regards to that?

(Esteban):   From my point of view, the action is -- I requested collaboration for you. I am in (unintelligible) my compromise is to develop this ICANN led program that is just the material we provide as a document now to combat this document in (unintelligible) course that will be online for whoa wants to know and to have information about that in that course. And the constituency, we have to finish the program that ICANN managed and I will need the final approval and the support and I am open to assistance and modifications.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: To fully understand, (Esteban), so I think I remember you have sent around some documentation. You have started out to and so you commented on that. This is one thing. But to implement it and let's just say online or whatever, who should do that? Is that our constituency or is that supported by ICANN engagement?

(Esteban):   It's a persona from ICANN staff with Betsy Andrews. I think that's in charge of ICANN (unintelligible) and I am in touch with her and she ask me to provide the information on Word document and she will transform that in a pilot course for ICANN then that we have to correct and to accept in order to have a final course.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: Any comments here from the floor? Tony, please.

Tony Holmes: I would suggest when we get to the stage for our next meeting where we have to request rooms for that, we mark some time down, maybe a couple of hours where we could sit with (Esteban) and go through that stuff and try and help him. So let's spend a couple of hours at the next meeting trying to make sure that (Esteban) has got all the material that he needs to do that. It will be time well spent for us.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: Do we have time to wait for the next meeting?

(Esteban):   Yes, there is no deadline because we are in the fiscal year 2018 and then we can work -- from my point of view, I want to make some advance on some improvements before Puerto Rico maybe to have a draft of the learning course. I can work with all the interested people by email and it's no problem. And maybe we can target to have the final course after our meeting in Puerto Rico could be a good deadline.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: That would be great. If you could target that. Either give me the contact so that we can convey this information (unintelligible) for that, that

would be helpful and then we can continue with that. Thank you. Thanks very much. (Phillip), on that?

(Phillip): I for one would be interested in reviewing the material and I think it's -- as a general comment, I think that population of those who will come here and who might desert or go away in the future, it may be a separate target but also to reach out to them. We never know how they end up. They might possibly end up in an ISP and get back to us in due time. So I think that's not a waste of time at all.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: So I understand is you would like to help (unintelligible) document that would be -- thank you. So the very last point, Tony, information on the session this morning.

Tony Holmes: I wanted to cover that off because we kicked off the discussion around DOA, which led ultimately to the CTO to go down that path of providing workshops and focusing on new identifiers. They've gone a bit further than we asked because the ask that we had, and we wrote two letters to the Board and the asks were specifically for them to make sure the community was aware of some of the development around these new identifiers and it was driven by the fact that there were lots of myths and stories about DOA and what it was and what it wasn't, and how it was going to impact the internet.

So the first workshop that they had was fine, it did that. This was a follow on workshop that looked more at block chain and DOA to a degree in detail. But actually, the CTO had also done some development as well on what they were terming it DOA. What came out this morning was there's a lot of activity on block chain and that's something I think a lot of people here will have an interest in.

But my particular focus was what was happening on the DOA stuff. And they gave a presentation. It was apparent that the development that they had, which was looking towards using a form of DOA but doing it in a different way

and that was basically resolving it in the DNS. And the danger is that using that terminology, DOA, when it isn't really applicable, there isn't really a common understanding of what DOA is other than what's being pushed through the INCU.

So what they were looking at was another form of identities as well. And I believe now that having had that conversation with (Elan Duran) that they're going to basically go back and they're going to use terminology that refers to persistent identifiers for that sort of approach, that methodology that they developed. And this will be of interest to you, Tony, I know because you're lads were involved in this. But if we can move away from using DOA for that sort of thing and use persistent identifiers, of which it is one form of realizing persistent identifiers, whether you do it through the DNS or not, then it solves alto of the problems and the concerns we had around these mythical DOA that was being pursued.

So it was good news in a way. What they've done in conjunction with the labs that Tony had a hand in putting them forward to use is good development, but it's about persistent identifiers. It is not about DOA and I think if we can get that accepted then a lot of the concerns that we had within the constituency that initiated that letter to the CTO and the Board has been dealt with. So I felt it was worthwhile this morning.

I don't know whether anyone that was there. (Phillipe) was there but…

(Phillipe):   Thanks, just a (unintelligible) with what you said and the depiction of the section. One last thing I'd like to add. My understanding is that once this is done -- once we move from the DOA specific approach to a more generic technology, I understand that more or less that topic is closed and the focus will shift towards block chain in that initiative of investigating new technologies, resolution technologies I should call them. That's my understanding that it's going to be closed. Inasmuch as anything could be closed but that's the idea.

Tony Holmes: That was what was stated.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: We have a question from an esteemed person on this chat here. The question who is interested to participate in the next ICANN meeting. The question is from Mark McFadden. Is there likely to be another session at the next public meeting, ICANN meeting on emerging identifiers?

Tony Holmes: Possibly. Yes. Because the discussion this morning around block chain focused potentially on some of its uses and it also looked into the debate we had yesterday in our workshop where we had Asher was saying about how you couldn't use block chain for basically giving authentication, validation mechanisms as well.

So there's a lot going on in that area and that would be something worthwhile. So the answer I think should be yes. It depends what comes out of the CTO's further studies but in terms of DOA, as (Philippe) said, that should be it. Nothing else. And there's a draft RFC out there now, which refers to DOA. The hope is that that will just die away but the next version of that will refer to persistent identifiers, not DOA.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: Thanks, Tony. (Malcolm) (unintelligible).

(Malcolm):   Unfortunately because of the scheduling path I missed most of the presentation that they did this morning, but I did speak with Alan last week, where he made a point of trying to promote that they were doing this and so forth, which is I why I mentioned it in our meeting this morning in advance. And certainly, the way that he put that to me in the goal for that was (unintelligible) a (unintelligible) project not together. It was really slightly at odds with the way that the way you're presenting the sort of getting away from the persistent identifier thing. But in line with the overall policy ambition if you like, or political ambition, is that the goal of this project was to show that yes, you can do DOA if you want to and there's nothing magical, and you

don't need to invent a whole bunch of new stuff and you can stick it in the DNS and it will -- that kind of record in the DNS and it will work fine. The DNS already supports it. You don't have to go in and invent a whole new infrastructure. You certainly don't have to go in and invent a whole new governance system over in the ICU and all that sort of thing. There's no need for any of that. This is a technological approach that supports certain use case for particular things. It's not necessarily useful for all case but if you want it, you can do it with everything now. Take the excitement out of this whole thing around DOA. There's nothing particularly special here. It does something for some people and it's already there, now move along. There is no need to suddenly to try to hype it up to some sort of replacement technology or next generation of anything.

Tony Holmes: If I can respond to that, you're absolutely right. Everything you said was true until today and the discussion we had today is what is DOA and if you look at all the work that's gone on in DOA, it relates to donor foundation. It relates to the handle system forming the backbone of that in a certain topology that's been set out through the donor foundation where you actually allocate, if you like, top level registries, NPAs, the whole thing is structured around those ideas.

But there isn't an accepted definition of what DOA is. So what (Elan) was doing was basically showing that the capability that that provides you could do a different way. Exactly what you said, (Malcolm). But if you have a debate about it as DOA, you're really in a difficulty that everyone is going to relate that back. Oh now, we've got two options of DOA. There are other issues around that as well. For instance, from an ITU perspective, they're going to be pretty fed up when they suddenly get an idea that the IGF or ICANN or whoever is now stealing their idea of DOA and doing it a different way.

So there isn't this definition of DOA that's accepted so DOA relates to donor. That's what we've all known it as. Leave it there. This is another way of

providing that capability but it's through persistent identifiers. It is not DOA and that was the conversation we had with (Elan) earlier.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: Okay. (Phillipe)?

(Phillipe):   Just a couple of other things. We haven't mentioned a white paper for those of you who weren't there, there's the draft paper, which was sent to -- given at the request of the ICCP among others was to have a risk analysis of that system. The ICANN staff did precisely that and they drafted a white paper. It's not been published yet but it was sent to CNRI for review and (unintelligible) have their feedback. So the idea was that they analyze the risks of the system, both the technical risks as well as the government's risk, et cetera, of transparency and they sent it out to CNRI to have their feedback.

It was sent back I think a few days ago as I understand it. That white paper will be published, the final version, that would accommodate these comments as much as possible. But I just wanted people to know that in addition to the extension of DNS, there was that exercise that has been initiated about the staff and that should conclude in a few days hopefully.

Tony Holmes: I don't want to cut in front of (Andy) but if he allows me, I will because that really is another point for (Malcolm's) point that that risk analysis that they did on DOA was exactly on the DOA scheme that was promoted by the ITU. It didn't take account of (Elan's) alternative, which we claim isn't DOA. But it focuses on that and part of that risk was in the assessment that they did. It was pretty substantial. We've yet to see what comes back from CNRI but that just provides the link, (Malcolm), that if you talk about DOA that's what they were talking about that. It was entirely that, not the alternative that (Elan) was working on, which we now want to use the other terminology on.

(Malcolm):   Can I ask then about the (unintelligible)?

((Crosstalk))

(Andy): This question really back to (Tony) to say when this comes up again in ICU area, can we use this demo as a way of -- or maybe the demo or the updated RFC to say when they talk about DOA, there is this method that's been demonstrated that is a persistent identifier.

Man: The answer to that from my perspective should be no because I don't believe it is DOA and…

Man: That was part of the problem. The arguments -- well, the background for this is that in the ICU, they have pushed this one solution to basically solve every problem in the world. Maybe that's stretching it a little bit but it's their answer to everything and it's one solution. And the arguments we've had (unintelligible) that is that we've got no problems in finding solutions to problems but in saying this, you should take a generic approach. You shouldn't just push one particularly proprietary solution as the answer and that's a debate we've had. And if you go down the path of accepting that now there's another version of DOA, they'll say, well, it isn't proprietary. You can do it two ways.

It won't change their view that you have to do it their way. So I don't think you can use that argument. It's not the same thing.

Man: So I'm trying to understand the strategy here. Because if we say, oh, well, what (unintelligible) DOA because DOA is only the donor version of DOA. If that's the approach that you're recommending then I'm wondering where that leaves us with the larger escalating body of statements in the ITU that DOA is like the one true way magic pixie dust. Are you suggesting that what we should be doing now is an effort to try and convert all those statements in ITU documents into statements in favor of persistent identifiers more generically?

Tony Holmes: The approach should be that you do not promote one proprietary approach to standards. What we have…

((Crosstalk))

Tony Holmes: What you have is on the one hand, DOA can solve in their mind, these problems but the risk analysis shows that there are potential problems with doing that. There is another system that is not DOA that can resolve that problem in a different way. It is not another DOA.

Man: That's what I meant, (Tony).

Tony Holmes: (Unintelligible) a problem. You can do that -- in your eyes, you can do it through using DOA. There are alternatives and there's always been alternatives. You can do it other ways and what standards should be doing is looking to promote -- to resolve the capability without saying you have to do it using this proprietary system.

Man: Right, so the strategy then, if I'm understanding what you're saying correctly, is to say that ITU documents that are currently promoting DOA should stop doing so because DOA is a proprietary technology of the donor foundation, and instead using the generic term, participant identifiers, of which DOA is only one version and not a good one.

Tony Holmes: Yes.

Man: As a branding exercise, this is basically what this is. If we take that then as saying that DOA only refers to the donor foundation's implementation of the persistent identifier system and then that leaves us in the position of the existing body of stuff and/or the sort of brand awareness, if you like, that there is within the ITU, we're now left to try and turn that around. Is that the easiest way to go about addressing this issue rather than to assert that -- accept the assertion from donor foundation that DOA is a generic term and to say that it should not be -- the ITU should not be supporting the governance model for that system that the donor foundation are doing.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: May I just intercede here, colleagues. It's a very interesting
discussion and you could continue this discussion just going downstairs.
There shall be a very important event, which we shouldn't miss.

Man: I second it.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: And you can join this (Steve Crooker) on that. That would be
really great.

Tony Holmes: There is no other way to do it.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: So if you don't mind, really, so we should really all finish here and
this space for people.

Tony Holmes: The two minute version was that it was a good workshop and the DOA stuff is
done in ICANN.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: Thanks very much (Tony). So having that (unintelligible) so I
would like just to thank you all to keep your space for such a long meeting
here staying here. So (unintelligible) so I will try to (unintelligible) after that
and come back with some action items. So left, you know, and then we can
follow-up on our next call for that. So thank you very much and we will see all
of us, thank you, downstairs. Well, there's very last announcement from last
night.

Lars: I was just reminded that I should remind you that the entrance of A and B are
closed now and that you have to take the long way back to the (Aleph) Hotel
and there are also golf cart shuttle service. Thank you.

END