

---

ICANN67 | Virtual Community Forum – SSAC Public Meeting  
Wednesday, March 11, 2020 – 15:30 to 17:00 CUN

KATHY SCHNITT: ... 67 Virtual SSAC Public Meeting on Wednesday, the 11<sup>th</sup> of March, 2020. Today's meeting is being recorded. So please remember to state your name and affiliation before speaking. Please keep your phones and microphones on mute when not speaking to avoid any background noise. If you have a question or a comment during today's session, this can be managed in two ways. One, you can raise your hand and you will be called upon during the Q&A portion. Or two, you can type your question or a comment in the chat box and I will be happy to read them out for you. Now I am happy to turn the meeting over to our host, Rod Rasmussen, SSAC Chair. Rod, please go ahead.

ROD RASMUSSEN: Thank you, Kathy. I didn't realize I'm your host as well, so thank you for attending today wherever you may be in the world. So we have 50 participants so far on the line, so we may even outdo our attendance in an in-person meeting here today. Can we get the slide deck up please, Kathy? There we go.

So we're going to... We've got 90 minutes for this meeting. Usually we have an hour, so I think that we can accommodate the virtual format a little easier this way and we actually have a lot of things to cover today. We've been pretty busy. Next slide please, Kathy.

---

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

---

So I'll give the standard overview. Some of you may be new to the SSAC on the Zoom here so we want to cover that and then we'll talk about the various things that we have published or commented on since Montreal and ongoing efforts that we have and the future work we are contemplating. So we'll do that. Next slide.

Background about us. This slide is actually out of date already. We have 109 publications. We have our paper on DNS over TLS and DNS over HTTPS, the implications thereof, which has been finalized since the Board, we published on the ICANN website, I believe tomorrow after it's gone through a 48-hour kind of courtesy period we provide for the Board to review anything we put out. So you can look forward to that. We discussed that yesterday on the ALAC session and it came up again today. We discussed it as well on the DNSSEC work, meetings that went out today. So we'll talk about that as well, obviously, too.

And as you can see, we have an advisory role to the Board and to the community in general around matters dealing with SSR, Security, Stability and Resiliency, and try and bring together people with different backgrounds so that we can cover all the various kinds of issues that affect the ICANN community and the unique labeling names and numbers, systems that we have. Next slide, please.

So just some background on how we actually do our work here. And typically we do things, we have what we call work parties. Those work parties can be very long-term. We have one that's been multiple years at this point, looking at name collisions, for example, and we have some that are very short-term, maybe doing a response for public

---

comment or something like that. But we will create a work party from our members, do some sort of research of our members and have assistance from the staff. Sometimes that assistance is a lot of work from the staff, which we really appreciate. Then there's a review process that we go through that's a formal review process where we have a couple of shots at a preliminary and then a final review. And then finally we'll publish that document of some sort that could be a formal report where it'll be in-depth and typically has some sort of recommendations or we will, maybe a letter or a response to public comment or something like that where we will have a different kind of document for it. But basically, we go through the same process regardless.

And then if we have advice for the Board, there is a formal process that goes through where as you can see, that's on the right on your screen there if you're looking at it, where we have that advice is submitted as it is a process to make sure it is understood properly. And then that advice may be sent along to ICANN Org or other third parties for implementation or consideration. I do have some background noise, I think, if somebody... Make sure you're all muted, please on there. I'm picking up some background from someone.

So that is how that process works. And we also are following along these days trying to [inaudible].

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: [speaking Tamil]

---

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: [speaking Tamil]

ROD RASMUSSEN: It's getting louder. Somebody's conversation is quite loud now. Can we make sure everyone is muted please, if you're on the call?

[RAM MOHAN]: They're even speaking in Tamil.

ROD RASMUSSEN: Can you start translating for us, [Ram]? So yeah, so I was just saying we're trying to keep along with the implementation as well to see that the advice is not just being passed along for implementation but that that implementation follows along with what the original intent of the advice was which can often be a challenge. Next slide, please.

So we have a couple of documents of our big, our larger format that we published since the last meeting we had in Montreal and we'll cover both of those. We also have some of our correspondence series that we will cover as well and there are some various information around where you can find various more info about us. And, of course, we are always going... We are definitely looking to increase our membership. We are down a few members. We're at 34 right now. Typically, we try and keep it up closer to 40 so that is something if we have some time, we will talk about as well today. Can I have the next slide, please?

---

So here's an overview of the current things we are working on or have worked on recently, including we're finishing up hopefully by the end of this week here and shortly thereafter, our own public comments on the SSR2 Review. We have our name collisions project, which we'll talk about more where the status of that is as our longer term project at the moment.

We had an organizational review for SSAC has gone through all its stages, approvals, etc. and at this point, we're just implementing some of the final recommendations into our operating procedures and things like that. Then we have the abuse work party which we'll be talking about in more depth. We have something we kicked off last fall, which was kind of a comprehensive scan of threats to the naming system, the naming and addressing system, which we are working on refining and going through our own process to put together for at least the Board to peruse and we may be doing something with that with the broader community as well, but we're still working internally on that. DNSSEC workshop, if you may have participated in today, we typically have at every ICANN meeting, and we have our own representation at the EPDP and membership. Next slide, please.

Things that we may take a look at here in putting out some sort of recommendations or reports on in the near future include some issues around DS key management for DNSSEC, some of the issues that you run into, particularly when you have multiple DNS providers providing your authoritative DNS, things like that. The hijacking attacks which were about a year ago or so got a lot of notoriety. Those have not... They continue. The scenario of interest where we've already had some

---

things we've talked about but there may be some more there. We actually have... It's more of an active work project around a potential alternate name space for reserving some things under .internal, which there has been some work done on already. Issues around resolving this DNS and then these are some things we might see browsers doing in the near future, taking a look at that.

While we talked about this, I think a little bit in our DoH DoT work, product that we'll be talking about, there is concentration of DNS infrastructure and implications thereof, taking a look at that. And then there's trend and seeking greater and greater privacy of potentially overloading HTTPS protocol. We may have some thoughts about that. So those are some areas with possible new work. One of the things we'll ask for by the end of this presentation is your thoughts on things that we might be interested in covering that you didn't see us talk about here or haven't seen us cover before. Can I have the next slide, please?

Okay, so before I jump into this, I wanted to make sure if there were any questions about the overall makeup of SSAC and how we operate that anybody may have had. I can answer those now. Since we have 90 minutes, I think it would be good after each of the main sections, we could take some questions, one or two questions from the crowd if there are any, so we could break up the thing a bit since there are so many topics to cover. So first up, I'll take any questions that people have. Raise your hand in the chat, in the participants or the chat there, if you have any questions about the SSAC that you didn't feel I covered there and just how we do our operations.

---

KATHY SCHNITT: Rod, I have a question in the chat. This is from [Alec]. How can we contribute to SSAC’s research work?

ROD RASMUSSEN: So... Thank you. I see that now. So there’s... Well, as an SSAC member, obviously, the members have that work as we have in work parties. Typically, we have... The resources we utilize are ICANN staff and we do have ICANN fellows which are research fellows which if you’re a researcher and the like, you can check into that program that ICANN runs. We have access to that. Us and the RSSAC are both taking advantage of that. So that’s a potential way for somebody who’s done a lot of research work to come in and potentially contribute. Occasionally, in a work party, we’ll reach out to outside experts to bring in to some piece of work we’re doing. We’re doing that with our DNS abuse work party, for example, and we’ll talk about that.

Beyond that, if there’s some interesting information that you have around DNS infrastructure, potential attacks or something you think the SSAC should be aware of, we’re always willing to accept somebody sending information to us and calling our attention to that, but that’s... As a way of contributing, that’s, we’re not typically looking to incorporate just general calls from the public to come participate in our work. We do have a pretty... We have a membership process where we make sure to bring in people and put them within a circle of trust to work on these kinds of documents. So it’s not going to open kind of collaborative research with the general public. This is a group

---

that deals with security issues and the like. So there are some sensitivities there that we have to be aware of. So that was a fairly thorough answer to that, I hope. Were there any other questions before I move on?

KATHY SCHNITT: There are no further questions in the chat but we do have someone that raised their hand, [Fabrizio].

ROD RASMUSSEN: Fab.

[FABRIZIO]: Rod, can you hear me?

ROD RASMUSSEN: Mm-hmm.

[FABRIZIO]: Great. So I want to thank you guys for all that you do and just ask the question. We've had a lot of sessions so far this week that have touched on or addressed DNS abuse and I was just wondering how much of the issues that you guys, SSAC, have raised in terms of DNS abuse can legitimately be addressed by the DNS abuse framework that contract parties are presiding. And basically, what's left to address because... And the reason I ask the question is ICANN Org to everything we've stated this week, seems to think that kind of the



---

default answer or solution to everything, lack of compliance, lack of tight agreements, all these kind of things, is just, “Hey, look at what the contract parties are doing with this framework they’ve signed and it's easy to be [inaudible] the server bullet response for ICANN. [Inaudible], I’m just wondering does that legitimately address the things that you were raising or what’s left to cover?”

ROD RASMUSSEN: So let me defer answering to that question until we talk through our DNS work party which is later on in the presentation here.

[FABRIZIO]: Okay.

ROD RASMUSSEN: And some of your questions may be answered by what we have there and some may not, so why don’t we just discuss it there after we’re done there.

[FABRIZIO]: That would be great. Thanks, Rod. Appreciate it.

ROD RASMUSSEN: Cool. Excellent. And I do want to stress the point I made before. The SSAC, well I mentioned that we are sensitive and we work in kind of a closed group because of [inaudible] issues. We are actively looking for new members and it’s not– we are looking to extend our capabilities

---

and our reach, both geographically and experience different types of Internet environment. So we try not to think of ourselves as an ivory tower or something like that. We really want to be interacting with the community and this is one of our opportunities to do so, so we really look forward to your feedback. So for the next session, or section here, talking about SSAC 109 which is the new one we've got, I'm going to turn that over to Barry Leiba and Suzanne. I think, Barry, you were going to take the lead on the next few slides.

BARRY LEIBA:

Sure, I'll do that. Go on to the next slide. As Rod said, we are in the last stages of publishing SSAC109 which is our analysis of DNS over HTTPS and DNS over TLS, two protocols that have been developed by the Internet Engineering Task Force to improve privacy of DNS queries and responses by using encryption. The report will give a brief technical explanation of what the protocols do. It's pretty light there because there's so much out there explaining the protocols themselves. What the report really is aimed at is looking at the effects of these protocols and their implementation on different people entities, let's say, yeah entities with different perspectives. And the focus of the paper is looking at the different perspectives, what they need, what they are thinking about, what they are concerned about and what the protocols, what effect the protocols have on them. So we are looking at, for instance, parents who are interested in filtering of DNS enterprise network managers, Internet Service Providers who may need to do similar sorts of filtering, Internet Service Providers who may be interested in collecting information about the queries that

---

people are making, governments versus dissidents and protestors and the different views that they have on the effects of DNS encrypted.

There is also a significant aspect of having applications now with DNS over HTTPS. There is a lot more emphasis on the application choosing the recursive resolver to use and more likelihood that different applications would use different recursive resolvers. So it examines the effects that the application making the choice of resolvers rather than having the operating system make that choice, what implications arise from those decisions and possible implications on the name space if DNS resolvers give different responses to different applications having the overall effects of that stub resolution moving into the applications and what that could do to the view of the DNS name space. Next slide, please.

What we don't do in the paper is say "This is right" and "This is wrong". The issues are nuanced and that's why the focus is on what the perspectives are from different entities with different views. So it's not really possible to say there are right ways to do this and there are wrong ways to do this in general. We're looking at the balance, the trade-offs, the give and take that are needed here. We aren't making strong statements like "More privacy is always better" or "More encryption is always better" because the fact is that not all parties agree on those points and there are valid arguments on different sides of these issues.

We do talk about trust models. We aren't making strong statements about it that we can't agree with because we all have different

---

perspectives, but we are pointing out where the changes and trust boundaries are affecting the different perspectives. And this is not a paper with recommendations to the ICANN Board. The recommendations to the community are merely to the point of giving an understanding of what the issues are and trying to help people understand where each other are coming from when these discussions come up. Next slide, please.

The conclusions of the paper involve evaluations of DoH and DoT. That evaluations of DoH and DoT rely on the perspective of the evaluator and the questions that we bring up is how are the protocols being implemented, how are they deployed, what are the configuration settings, and who is using the different, the DoH and DoT and unencrypted DNS, who collects the information, what resolvers are being used, those kinds of issues. Regardless of the perspective that you have, the deployment of these protocols is going to change things. It's going to change, not the way we resolve the NS but the way we approach that resolution. Who does the resolution? Who gets the information that's involved? Who gets to do filtering? A question that often comes up is "How will I protect people from malware and pornography and other inappropriate content when I can't do the filtering? When, say if I'm the government, I can't instruct the Internet Service Providers to do the filtering?" So there's a lot of these issues that are being discussed in the document and they don't come directly from the protocols themselves, but from the implementation and deployment of those protocols and the policies that are involved. Next slide.

---

We spend a bit of time looking at application specific DNS resolution. What are the effects of different applications making different choices? And what are the challenges there? What are the effects on the applications themselves and the operating systems, the networks, the end points, who gets the data, how is user privacy protected by not having as much data available to some parties but the balance of having other parties collecting that information and how can service providers and enterprises protect and manage their networks, a question that often comes up is how to do that and the broad answer is we need to start thinking about new ways to do this filtering and protection as the old ways don't work. The paper, as I said, doesn't give rights and wrongs, but lays out the issues for people. So I think that's where we are. The work party is finished. You should start looking for the paper any day now and please read it. Questions?

KATHY SCHNITT: Thank you, Barry. If you have a question for Barry and/or Suzanne, please raise your hand or type it into the chat. And at this time, it looks like no questions. Rod, I'll hand it back over to you.

ROD RASMUSSEN: Okay, let's go to the next topic.

KATHY SCHNITT: Actually Rod, we do have a question.

---

ROD RASMUSSEN: Oh.

KATHY SCHNITT: Zarko, please go ahead.

ZARKO KECIC: Yes. Thank you. Can you hear me?

KATHY SCHNITT: Yes, we can.

ROD RASMUSSEN: Yes, we can hear you.

ZARKO KECIC: Okay, thank you. You were mentioning a couple of times, different perspectives but you haven't mentioned SSR perspective that I expected to hear from SSAC. And in my understanding of the presentation, I would like to see and I expected to see analysis of the difference between DoH and DoT. And especially from the deployment and security perspective on how to get protected from abusive use of those protocols. And my personal view is that this is the biggest challenge so far to DNS we know so far. So can you explain how much SSR perspective is in this document?

---

BARRY LEIBA: Okay, thanks for the question. The paper does talk about the differences between the two protocols and the different effects that implementing the two protocols have on the system as a whole and on the different perspectives that we talk about. There is some discussion of SSR issues in the paper. There isn't a lot because, frankly, our consensus as we built the paper was that there is not a lot of effect on SSR that we can see at this point. It's early and part of it will be looking at how it is actually implemented and how it is actually deployed. And we may need to do a reevaluation of SSR issues later. Our initial analysis is that there's a minimal effect. The effect is mostly on policy issues rather than SSR issues.

ZARKO KECIC: May I comment to your answer?

BARRY LEIBA: Sure.

ZARKO KECIC: If we allow application of doing DNS and as end users, we cannot track actually [inaudible] with more technical skills. It is very difficult to track where those DNS queries are going. The developer who developed that application can lead us to abusive DNS server. So that's one of the ways.

---

BARRY LEIBA: Yes. The way things are today—well, I should say the way things were yesterday before we had these protocols—an abusive application could still lead you to abusive websites. There’s the fact that the query is encrypted doesn’t change that.

ZARKO KECIC: It’s changed in the way that we can track [inaudible] text but we cannot track anything which is encrypted and hidden [in] DNS traffic which is, I don’t know, 80% or 90% of all traffic that we see.

BARRY LEIBA: Yes. You can track what IP addresses the application contacts. Well, I think we’re starting to get beyond the scope of a Q&A here. I’m happy to have more of this conversation with you if you would like to take this to e-mail.

ROD RASMUSSEN: Let me also add that it’s probably best to read the paper first.

BARRY LEIBA: Well, that too, yes. And Suzanne had her hand up so maybe she has a comment to follow up here.

ROD RASMUSSEN: Yeah.



---

SUZANNE WOOLF:

Yeah. Just appreciate the question and the discussion because this is exactly the sort of discussion we should be having around the deployment of new technologies. Just a couple of things to keep in mind here. One is that part of what we're pointing out here is the DoH and DoT, particularly DoH do not in fact... are, in fact, complimentary to the need to authenticate DNS answers and, in fact, in some ways because of that lost visibility and the less feasible fact of trusting a resolver, I think that in some ways DoH will, in fact, strengthen the case. It will, in fact, strengthen the use case for DNSSEC.

Another thing that we discovered though, in the course of discussing this and sort of one of the nuances about it once we get past the discussion of the specific technical attributes is that a great deal of the impact of these technologies on security and stability in sort of the casual sense rather than the technical sense, it depends on how they're configured, on how they're used, on how network managers choose to log them and deploy them. And one of the areas that's been extremely active is ISPs and implementers and network operators and so on, discussing and working through how these technologies can be deployed and configured so as to protect both... well, many sets of legitimately contending interests. But that was actually why this paper ended up taking quite a while is that there is a lot of nuance and a lot of balancing and a lot of decision making around how to configure them so that the new, any new technology is going to be disruptive. Any of these things are going to be disruptive, particularly any security technology has the risk of disrupting because it changes who can do what to whom and a lot of what has to resolve those tensions over

---

who benefits and where risks move around has to come out of experience and has to come out of choices of configuration. So that's actually an important point and thanks for engaging on it.

KATHY SCHNITT: There are no further questions at this time.

ROD RASMUSSEN: Okay. Thanks. Again, a lot of the discussion we just had is covered in the paper and we definitely had similar conversations in the work party and we tried to do a really good job of balancing out the pros, cons and make sure to explain the effects and where there are going to be tensions depending on how these things get deployed, so your feedback on how we did would be much appreciated. And we will look forward to getting that.

Moving on, we have had several public comments and I'm sure you all know that from various parts of ICANN over the past few months that have taken a bunch of time. We will go over those in this section. Next slide, please.

First, we have the IANA Proposal on KSK Rollovers. Jacques, are you available to run through that one? I'm not hearing Jacques, so I'll go ahead and take it then. He was on. Oh, he disappeared. He was on here earlier. Next slide, please.

So we have commented in the past, and you can see other references there, obviously several times on what was going on with the KSK Roll.

---

It's a fairly short document that we put out after we looked through the IANA proposal. And believe that in general, it's a pretty good eye level plan. There wasn't a reason to delay planning for subsequent rolls over anything in that paper. We raised a few concerns, minor concerns—and I stress minor—for some of the items and wanted some further detail to be put out. But we expect that detail would be taken care of in a more... in a final plan that would have those kinds of comprehensive details in it that we would hope to see prior to the next KSK Roll so that that could be commented on.

The object of this exercise for IANA, we took as “Here's the high level exercise, how we plan on going about it. Does this look good to you guys? If so, then we'll move ahead with getting those detailed plans together before we do the next roll.” So that's the basics on that. Happy to take any questions that folks had about our comment there before I move on to the next one. Just scroll up here. Okay, not seeing any, let's move on to the next one.

This was we made a comment on the gTLD auction proceeds and I don't know if John made it onto the call or not.

KATHY SCHNITT: I have not seen him on as of yet, Rod.

ROD RASMUSSEN: Okay. I pinged him privately and I didn't hear back from him, so I will take this one too.

---

So as many of you... As hopefully most of you know, the Auction Proceeds Cross-Community Working Group has been together for a very long time trying to figure out how to move forward dealing with the large amount of money raised during the new gTLD auctions. We've had a couple of our own members taking place in that. I see John is on the call now. John, did you want to run through this since you've been our rep on that? Or I could continue.

JOHN LEVINE: Why don't you continue? Yes. I'm in the midst of a context switch from an IETF thing. So go ahead.

ROD RASMUSSEN: Okay, no worries. Glad you could make it and if I screw anything up, you can just chime in.

So as you can see from the first two bullets, we didn't have any objections to the 12 recommendations. They were pretty generic and kind of no-brainers I guess you would say. And we support getting this done and so that the work can actually be concluded from this cross-community working group.

The important thing from our perspective is going forward, to have outside expertise brought in that's put these kinds of things together, take the inputs that the CCWG put together as a basis for an actual implementation plan and design for making this go forward. It's definitely well past time for this to have happened and this has not been... It's not like this hasn't been done by lots of other organizations

---

including ones like ISOC that are very closely related to ICANN as it is. So thank you to the CCWG for your thoughts and guidance and let's get some folks in to actually make it... and get it done here with some alacrity and roll it out with oversight, obviously, from the Board and the community.

That was our feedback for the auction proceeds. Do we have any questions on that? Robert, you were also involved. I see your hand up.

ROBERT GUERRA:

Yeah. I just... I think you've summarized it well. I think just to echo I think what you said is the pace of the discussions were a bit slow for John and I and others. And I think given that other institutions and organizations have similarly funded the space and I think though we want this process to move forward, we want to make sure that there is a recognition of best practices and finding ways to move this forward. There is great potential that can be done with this and there is, as we see that's happening with Coronavirus, if you delay things then things can get worse. And so same thing with this is that if it can be done at an adequate speed, then great things can be funded and if we wait too long, that can open up a whole set of other issues as well.

JOHN LEVINE:

I would express our concerns a little more strongly. The CCWG has used up an enormous amount of volunteer time and has not accomplished a whole lot, so I would want to focus on finding people who have the specific skills needed to create a funding process which

---

is, as Rod said, it's not exotic. This is a large-ish amount of money but it's certainly not... But there are plenty of other groups as big as us. There are plenty of other groups funding stuff in sort of the same area. This is the time to find the qualified experts, put something concrete together and then ICANN can get moving because sitting on a pool of money this large for this long and not doing anything with it is starting to have reputational problems.

ROD RASMUSSEN:

All right, thank you gentlemen and thank you for the long amount of time you put onto that CCWG from your own personal volunteer time. It was much appreciated by the rest of us.

Okay, I'm not seeing any other hands so let's move on to the next one. Oh yeah, there is another slide for that one. That's okay. We're good. Julie, I'm going to turn it over to you to talk about the ATRT3.

JULIE HAMMER:

Thanks, Rod and some of the things on the second slide associated with auction proceeds, we actually reiterate here. So the ATRT3 draft report was a fairly substantial document. Again, I'm sure you've all looked at it and seen how much work has gone into it by a pretty large team and we certainly thank them for their efforts. They had some specific issues that they wanted our feedback on, that is, the whole community, and they were related to how to prioritize recommendations and also a couple of specific proposals for specific reviews and organizational reviews that they wanted our thoughts on.

---

But before providing our feedback on those, we also prefaced our comment with some very general comments and these are the same as we made on the auction proceeds. Firstly, we all recognize that there is a massive amount of volunteer overload and burnout at the moment on community members and it's significantly increased in recent years. We recognize that the number of recommendations coming out of many reviews is very, very large and we made the comment that we feel that all recommendations must be looked at very carefully for their absolute necessity and practicality and cost effectiveness before any review team proposes them and we feel that realistically only fewer reviews and CCWGs will be the solution to reducing the burden on volunteers but that's a very big issue that's not just related to this review. We also recognize that hand in hand with overload on volunteers, there's a massive overload on ICANN Org to manage all of this and implement recommendations. Next slide, please.

So in relation to the specific issues that the Review Team sought feedback on, we mentioned that we were concerned with the large disparity between the self-assessment of the implementation of ATRT2 recommendations and the assessments of the Review Team. ICANN had advised that they believed almost all of the recommendations had been implemented and the Review Team felt that that was not quite the case and we saw a similar situation arise in SSR1 and SSR2 which is currently out for public comment. But more specifically to this review, in relation to the question about how do we deal with prioritizing recommendations of specific reviews for their

---

implementation, the Review Team proposed a community group of volunteers to actually be formed to undertake this process to both develop a framework and a process for doing that prioritization and for doing the prioritization itself. And while SSAC supports a community-led process, we actually feel that the SO/AC leaders are in a better position to undertake that role rather than volunteers from within each of the SO/ACs and we discussed this with the other SO/AC leaders earlier in the year and there was general agreement to that as a potential way forward here simply because the SO/AC leaders are in a position to know the priorities both within their own stakeholder groups, but also right across the organization. Next slide, please.

We also provided feedback on some of the proposals from the ATRT3 who put on the table a number of options for how to proceed with the specific reviews and with organizational reviews. They propose that there be an independent accountability office to oversight the implementation of Review Team recommendations and the SSAC has mixed views on this and really would like to explore the details of such a proposal in greater depth before saying whether we think that may be a good way to go or not because we're very conscious that we don't want to impose yet another resource layer that would be simply additive.

With regard to proposing that organizational reviews be undertaken in a three to five day workshop of self-inspection, we didn't really support that approach because we feel that an organizational review benefits from external comment on how an SO/AC is performing as well as their own self-inspection. So we weren't supportive of that



---

proposal. We do feel that there's merit in seeking to combine the scope of some of the specific reviews and even considering very seriously whether some aspects of these reviews are required at all. And we do, we certainly understand that that is a bylaws issue and that this is not a simple issue to raise, but we do, and that these were issues that were agreed as part of the CCWG stewardship and the CCWG accountability. But we do think that given the experience of the last few years, these are worth revisiting and having a serious discussion about.

In particular, with regard to SSR2 which we're all currently working on, we think that there would be great benefit in an external appropriately skilled consultant being engaged to undertake that review and with potentially a review team reviewing the product of the work rather than undertaking work itself. So that was our thought there. Next slide, please.

And finally, we just note that our comment due are in line with previously published comments on short-term and long-term options for reviews that were provided back in mid-2019. Thanks, Rod. Any questions?

KATHY SCHNITT:

Again, if you have a question, you can raise your hand or type it in the chat. And it looks like at this time, there are no questions.

---

ROD RASMUSSEN: All right. Let's move on to the next one. This is SSAC107 which is we had a comment to NIST on quantum cryptography algorithms. John, you want to have a... give us a quick overview of that?

JOHN LEVINE: Yeah, sure. If pod computers ever work, all the existing cryptographic schemes that people use for TLS and DNSSEC will break. And although that doesn't seem likely, sort of out of an abundance of caution and also realizing that some keys need to last a very long time, NIST is putting together some candidate algorithms that will do cryptography in ways that will not be particularly sped up by quantum computers. And our particular concern about it is that some of the keys and some of the signatures are enormous, hundreds of thousands of bits. And it occurs to us that some of those, signatures that large and keys that large will not fit in a DNSSEC packet since the DNS has a hard limit of 64KB on a packet completely.

So what we did was we wrote up a couple of notes and sent them off to NIST and just said, "These are some size limits. These are hard size limits that would be very hard for us to change so when you're looking at your algorithms, please keep in mind that it would be really nice if the stuff were small enough that it fit."

And they were very early in the process. And they wrote back and they said, "Oh, good point. Thanks for pointing it out." And then then they're continuing to work on it.

---

So I think it wasn't a big deal but it was very successful and I think it was useful because until they heard from us and they got a similar message from [MOG], the only cryptography they'd been looking at was TLS web certificates which have somewhat different issues.

ROD RASMUSSEN:

Thank you, John. Any questions? Somebody's got to have a crypto or quant-crypto question. All right. Göran's not on the call, is he? No. He always has a quant-crypto question for us. All right. Moving on then. I'll give you a little bit of an update on where we are on our overall, or overview or scan of threats to naming and addressing. Next slide, please.

So just for those of you who many not be familiar, last fall, our annual workshop, or actually just before our annual workshop, we actually took advantage of our staff and our ICANN Fellows to put together a pretty comprehensive document where we tried to take a new fresh holistic view of all the different things that maybe SSR threats to naming a number and the things that ICANN and the ICANN community has responsibility over and looked at it from all angles. Many of these things we've already written about. This was just to kind of take a fresh look just to see if we've actually covered things that need covering, if we need to update things that we may have covered in the past that need to be refreshed for updates to the threats or changes and then things that we may have missed or things that have been emerging, or that may be emergent in the near future.

---

So we took a look at that and we broke it down in the categories you can see there in the bullet points and brought that all together and tried to assess all of these things using a couple of different exercises that you use when you get a group together and just try and do strategic planning and things like that or risk analysis, and then took that thinking. We've had some conversations with the ICANN Board's BTC, the Board Technical Committee, because they went through a similar exercise more focused on ICANN Org and we shared some thoughts back and forth with them on where we had identified gaps and what they were doing and what we were doing. We did that over the course of the winter.

And so we're continuing that work. And we recently had our staff did some more categorization work, which we're following through on and we're going to continue with a small team within SSAC members to review that and then put together, hopefully, a baseline document that we can use internally and then put work product together to share both with the Board and then potentially with the broader community. We still have to work out how exactly that ladder, if we did something more publicly, how that would look because we, at this point, we have a lot about the risks but not necessarily a lot about how it's already been mitigated and we don't want to put something out there talking about a lot of risks without balancing that with how things have been mitigated already and where there may be further opportunity for better mitigation to that which represents a lot more work that has to be done.

---

So we don't want to promise something that we aren't sure how long it's going to take us to do because this is kind of an ongoing project that we're looking at as a long-term thing for us to be able to develop and then maintain and then look at ways that we can do a good job of sharing that. Obviously, we use it internally so we know we're tracking against things that we should be and that our members, especially who bring in new members, are aware of where we have looked at things and prioritized the various threats and things that we have identified so that they can be brought up to speed as one of the other uses for it.

So that's the one slide I have on this. Were there any questions or comments from folks on the call? All right, I am not seeing any so let's move on to the next bit.

Okay. Now we're going to talk about ongoing work parties. First on up is NCAP and I think, Jim, I've got you lined up to run through the next few slides and give a status update on where we are.

JAMES GALVIN:

Yes. Thank you, Rod. I welcome my Co-Chair, Patrik Fältström, who I believe is with us here, and we'll see in a moment here in our update that we had another Co-Chair. So next slide, please.

Just as a reminder and a baseline here for folks, you know SSAC was asked to conduct some studies on behalf of the Board. There were two resolutions and they had, essentially, ten questions, if you will, ten issues that they asked for us to explore and look at carefully. And we

---

are now deep into that process moving along. One of the things that was an important requirement for us was making sure that these reports were conducted in a thorough and inclusive way. So unlike ordinary SSAC work parties, we've gone outside of our usual way of working and we've created a broader work party, invited people to step up and join the discussion group and be an active part of the analysis that's going on in this group.

So we currently have 24 discussion group members of which only 13 are actual SSAC work party members and we have 22 community observers and so we consider that a pretty good success as far as that's concerned in being done in an inclusive way.

The key point here to raise is one of our goals originally was always to have a third co-chair who was drawn from the community. Patrik and I are both SSAC members and it's been a while. We kind of waited until things got going and it was clear who was actively involved and was going to be able to contribute in [inaudible] way for us. And Matt Thomas is that person. He is from Verisign and he volunteered and was willing to step up. And so we welcome him as part of our leadership team so that Patrik and I and Matt will now be equal co-chairs in moving this work forward. Matt is a significant part of Verisign's research team, is very active in their data analysis or in all of the work that they do in that space. So I think he's going to make a nice addition to this team. Next slide, please.

Again, as a little bit of a reminder, there are three main phases or studies, if you will, that are part of the SSAC group. Study One is the

---

Gap Analysis, is what it's been called. There are two essential products that come out of this particular study. The first one is actually already out for public comment and the public comment will close on March 31<sup>st</sup>. ICANN had issued a call for an RFP for consultants and we've had an excellent bit of work done by Karen Scarfone who has stepped up to, essentially, catalogue everything that we know about that's been done related to name collisions since 2012, the 2012 timeframe when we had the last round and all of this kind of bubbled to the surface and became an urgent issue that had to be dealt with at that time.

It's been quite a bit of work. She's done a fabulous job. We've collected inputs from people who gave it to us and she's also done a fair amount of research work in looking for and identifying all kinds of related work. So there haven't been any comments yet on that draft. On the one hand, not really expecting any comments. It really is a bibliography of known work so the kinds of comments we would like to get if they're out there, of course, is anything that we've missed that wasn't included. So please, if there is anything else that you know about, please let us know about that.

A second piece of the Study One is that there will be a smaller work product that will become a recommendation to the Board about whether or not there are gaps that can be filled by funding some data analysis work in Study Two and the mitigation analysis in Study Three. So there is, as part of the overall project plan we proposed, recall a great deal of study that we had asked to be done and had asked for some funding for that to proceed. The Board will, of course, do checkpoints along the way. So at the end of this gap analysis and a

---

recommendation from the work party, as well as from Karen, from her analysis and her studies, and of course, OCTO as a project sponsor, the Office of the CTO with Matt Larsen there who's really the project sponsor on ICANN's behalf, will contribute to all of that. And then the Board will make its decision.

I think the important thing to take away from this is SSAC is going to go forward as best it can with its analysis regardless of whether the additional studies are funded. We have an obligation to answer and respond to the Board's request and we will do that anyway. And in fact, some initial work on Study Two and some initial analysis considerations are already being opened up in the discussion group. The important point here is that we're going to continue that work in parallel while the public comment period is closed, the Board gets its package. It gets to do its deliberations and make a decision. We're not going to serialize this. We are looking to try and move things along as smartly as possible while the rest of the process catches up. So that's a good thing from the point of view of the community. Next slide.

And this is just a review of the timeline. Again, the last bullet is probably the most notable at the moment. The Study One draft report is out for public comment. Please, if you're aware of any other research or article, anything relevant that might have been published about name collisions, please do let us know. And of course, consider this an advertisement for joining the discussion group. As is standard ICANN policy, you can go to the community Wiki. The project has a site. There are some links there for joining. There is a Statement of Interest that you have to make sure you have on file or submit one.



---

This is ordinary ICANN process for cross-community working groups. And there is a handful of additional questions that have to be included in your Statement of Interest, again, as an ordinary part of ICANN policy and we have incorporated that into the way that SSAC does its work parties so the community can participate. And that's it from me. Thanks.

ROD RASMUSSEN:

All right. Thanks, Jim. Any questions or comments on NCAP? All right. Not seeing anything. Again, that's out for public comment and I do highly encourage you, if you've studied this at all or had a chance to chime in on information that you might know about, about previous work that's been done or studies or any information on past collision events that's been reported, we definitely would like to gather that up.

All right, so let's move on to the next bit. All right. We have... I guess that slide, we should have had earlier because NCAP's a current work party. But let's move on to the next one. There we go.

Right. So we got three more work parties that we'll talk about here and then we'll open up for other questions.

The first one of the three is our standing work party that's supporting our representatives to the EPDP. Basically, we've articulated several things in prior SSAC documents around access to RDS data for various security related purposes, law enforcement, cyber security practitioners, etc. Hopefully, you're all familiar with those and are positions that we've had there on various parts of how some of these

---

things may be delivered and data handled. So we've been trying to represent those within the group and provide, where we can, input on some of the technical issues that have come up.

Right now, the work party is drafting public comment's response to the phase 2 initial report, taking a look at... There are, I believe, something like 19 recommendations or something like that if I remember right. Many of those we probably won't have many comments on. Some we definitely will. There's a couple of areas that we're concerned have not really been addressed that we have brought up multiple times, particular things like distinguishing between natural persons and legal persons and how that gets done and what the status of moving that forward are.

I want to make sure that the work that's being done is actually fulfilling the charter of the working group. We have some concerns that we maybe have drifted off in a couple of areas, not covering some and going into areas that may not be actually within the charters. So we will try and bang that out and have that out for the input to the EPDP to help inform it going forward towards a final conclusion, hopefully in the not too distant future. So any questions on this work party? All right. I'm not seeing anything so let's move on to the next one which is DNS abuse.

So we've been talking about this for a while. We have formed a work party. We have our SSAC members. We have also invited some external folks to help flesh out our expertise, especially in operational areas, whether it's some of the folks dealing directly with abuse that

---

traditional contracted parties or DNS providers, platform providers and then NCA is a National Crime... A is Association, whatever is the British... National Crime Agency, there we go, agency. Sorry about that.

So we have law enforcement as well that we've actually brought in some more folks to help us with that work, add some perspective, also hopefully add capability for us to work with some of these communities a little more collaboratively on this particular project since this is one where we're trying to collab... The whole ICANN community all seems to be working on this at once, so we think it's a good idea to be as collaborative as possible so that we can come up with solutions, recommendations, etc. that have had some pre-vetting and hopefully good buy-in on so we don't spend time everybody putting out things from their own silos and then arguing about that rather than trying to work together to come up with common solutions to some of these things.

We have a lot of areas that we've got in the potential hopper to deal with, including things like some studies underlying data, causes, things like that. Those will probably be done a little bit further out. What we want to try and concentrate on in the near term, so it's going to be useful to the community, is to look at providing a road map. We're handling abuse across various parties, a framework if you will, without getting into some of the nitty-gritty, trying to define every little piece of abuse one way or another, but provide a useful framework for being able to talk about abuse issues in a way that allows you to assign responsibilities for dealing with those types of

---

things to the appropriate parties, so trying to look at it scientifically and who's got authority and capability and potentially the liability to take care of some of these issues and create that framework/roadmap that then people can look at.

And to tie that end of the question, Fab asked earlier. I think there's some overlap with what some of the contracted parties have put out as their framework. We also have taken on, as part of the input, not only that but several other documents, letters, requests, etc. that have been flying around in the ICANN space mainly towards the Board from various constituencies. The BC, the GAC, ALAC, off the top of my head, have all sent in requests or questions to the Board around DNS abuse and how to deal with it and where the tools that ICANN Org needs, particularly in compliance, but other areas as well because it's not just a compliance issue potentially that we're talking about. There's other places where structurally, there may be some things that we would want to look at.

So those are all basically inputs for this work party to consider and try and make some sense out of and normalize and see where the common issues are on some of the common solutions that have been proposed to try and craft something that will be useful. Some of the areas that we think that will be fruitful for doing that are taking a look at what works and what doesn't work when it comes to dealing with different forms of abuse and where people have had difficulties with getting... so kind of different levels of things, getting acceptance that something is abusive, getting people to respond to things, getting people to actually do something about things, getting accountability

---

for when folks do or do not do things, making sure people don't take it too far and take things down that shouldn't be, for example. Make sure that all these things are looked at holistically and balanced, but with the eye towards where can abuse be dealt with in a way that's most effective, and if we're dealing with exactly the problems that are manifesting and where things lie within ICANN's remit and where they don't and where they don't, where potentially the proper places for them to be dealt with would be.

And that's when I say "ICANN world", that could be ICANN Org, that could be various parties that play in this space, whether that's contracted parties or others that are law enforcement and security folks as well. Or getting into various other issues that come up when it comes to people using the DNS to affect other people in negative ways—put it that way—is a very high level generic.

And then we definitely want to take a look at where people have put things in terms of service and actual boots on the ground practices that the contracted parties have used to good effect. There have been some very good programs that various parties have put in place. Where can those be taken and expanded out and used as best practices or potentially even requirements to implement at some point? So that's what we're trying to get into. There's obviously quite a bit of work to do there. I think the good news is a lot of work has already been done and a lot of what we're going to be doing is collating things, having some discussions about where things, what different kind of boundaries things fall into, where those boundaries are and then making a proposal or set of proposals around that.

---

So any questions or feedback on that?

Okay. Not seeing anything on that so let's move on to the next one. Final work party that we have ongoing right now for what I would call content related stuff is we are putting together a public comment on the SSR2 preliminary report, the draft report, and we're trying to provide... The main thing we're trying to do is provide some useful feedback for the SSR2 team to take on board for getting towards the final document as we realize they themselves have been saying this is a draft where they know it's an incomplete product and they want some guidance from the community on how to best finish it out and provide some useful, hopefully actionable, things.

We are concerned with just the huge number of recommendations if you take the 27 high level ones and go to the sub-bullets, there's over 108, is what we counted, component recommendations, some of which seem to be kind of overcome to some extent. I think our publication, the DoH DoT thing was something that was one of the recommendations if I remember right. So taking a look at how they're put together, if they're measurable, if they're actionable and measurable and providing some feedback on that, and making sure that if there's a recommendation, it's well justified within the confines of the report itself. It's important that if there is going to be a recommendation for ICANN, the Org, or ICANN, the community, or some entity to need to undertake that's clear as to the why and wherefore of why that's there. So we're trying to provide some constructive feedback there and make sure that the outcomes that are sought—which is kind of the higher level, right?—the outcomes that are

---

desired from these recommendations are clearly articulated so we're not... I think some of our analysis, and this is... They may have gotten a little muddled and we'll try and provide some feedback as to where that might be... where we're confused at least, if nothing else, and where things may be contradictory as well. So that... We're trying to get that out by the end of this week or early next week and provide that and look forward to continuing to provide input into that team. This is really an important area as far as the SSAC is concerned given this is the same remit area we're working in, not necessarily 100% overlap but it's pretty darn close. So we want to make sure this is successful and useful for ICANN moving forward.

Any questions on that? Okay. That is the last of our prepared slides other than opening up to questions. Julie, did you want to sneak? We've got a little bit of time. Do you want to sneak in a little bit about membership?

JULIE HAMMER:

Yeah. Thanks, Rod. We are going to be instituting a new approach to membership this year where, as a result of their environmental scam, we're actually looking at the skills or the work that we're going to be doing in the upcoming next couple of years and analyzing the skills we need to do that work. And from that, deriving some, if you like, some targets for the type of skills that we want to be seeing out in new members.

We're also looking at our diversity characteristics within the SSAC and also targeting some diversity factors. So some of the things that Rod's

---

already mentioned is that we really do want to seek out some experts from Asia, from Africa, from Latin America, from those sorts of regions to actually give us a broader perspective on many of the issues that we want to comment on. And we're still refining the types of technical skills that we not necessarily feel we're lacking, but that we would like more of. We're trying to pull that together into some messaging that we want to get out to the community. Unfortunately, we've been working with the ICANN CommsTeam on this and the unfortunate bit is that they've, of course, been completely distracted by having to revamp this whole meeting, and therefore, haven't had time to support us on getting some of that messaging out.

So we do want to reach out to the community with some messages about the sort of people that we would like to see apply for SSAC and we want to engage in a process where we consider applications in, if you like, as a grouping so that we can make better decisions about the types or the candidates who would best support our future work. And I see Donna's got her hand up. Donna.

DONNA AUSTIN:

Thanks, Julie. Donna Austin from Neustar and also Chair of the Registry Stakeholder Group. Could you elaborate a little bit on the process more generally for applying for an SSAC position? Because from memory, I don't think you do an open call for new members. So I'm just interested to understand what that process is.



---

JULIE HAMMER:

Yeah. Donna, that... Great question and thanks for asking. We haven't had a really formal process in the past. We haven't ever done a call and in a sense, we're not really going to be doing that. What we are going to be doing is sort of reaching out with our target goals, both through our own members, through engagement at ICANN meetings. Sadly, we were going to do that a bit in Cancun, and through ICANN's regional engagement staff. But the process is to seek appropriately skilled and qualified people to apply and the application process is that they provide us with a Statement of Interest, they undertake our skill survey, which we've also just revamped and hopefully it's a lot more user friendly now, and they provide us with their bio or CV and also some pointers to recently published writings. And I don't mean academic works necessarily, but just things that they have either written themselves or been part of the writing team to produce.

That information is then considered by our five membership committee, which I chair, but I do not vote on. And should a candidate be considered worthy of further consideration, then they'll be invited for a telephone interview and the membership committee will then provide a recommendation to the SSAC about if they consider that that candidate should be offered membership, recognizing that the offer of membership, of course, is subject to the Board concurrence and appointing the member because all members are appointed by the Board. So that's our process briefly.

---

ROD RASMUSSEN: Julie, let me just add we always have an open process because we actually will take applications from the ICANN website. So it is open to anyone [inaudible].

JULIE HAMMER: Absolutely.

ROD RASMUSSEN: I just want to make sure that's clear.

JULIE HAMMER: Yeah. Thank you. Thanks.

KATHY SCHNITT: Julie, we do have a question in chat. This is from Denise. And considering your solicitation for new members, can you speak to the value add of SSAC? For example, do you have any data on the acceptance, implementation of [SACs] by ICANN?

JULIE HAMMER: What a great question, Denise. We're actually working on, if you like, a value statement at the moment in conjunction with the Comms people because we want to try and explain what is the value that SSAC is delivering and why would anyone want to devote their time to it and be part of it. So we are working on trying to capture a series of statements that will convince everyone that they want to be on SSAC.

---

As far as acceptance implementation of SSAC recommendations, again, that's something that we've done a huge amount of work on in the last couple of years, and in particular, our Board liaisons, [Rahm] when he was on the Board, and since then, [Medica], have put in a huge amount of effort with staff in going back through all previous SSAC reports and their recommendations, and working with ICANN staff and with the Board to gauge whether there are any outstanding recommendations, whether they were implemented, whether we were comfortable with the way in which they were implemented.

But you've raised a really good point in that from that process, what we should also try and capture is, as a result of that implementation, what is the value that we see SSAC has added and I think your point is well made. We would do well to try and express that to the community in a very clear way. Thank you.

KATHY SCHNITT:

And we have another question from Denise. What's the ETA on the SAC implementation analysis?

JULIE HAMMER:

The implementation of recommendations doesn't have an ETA simply because it's ongoing. We continually put out reports and they're continually being implemented and we can continually get advice back from ICANN staff and from the Board about the status of various recommendations. So I would say right at the moment, we are up to date in the sense that we know where every recommendation is in its

---

consideration and implementation, but that doesn't necessarily mean that everything's implemented. So it's something that'll never be finished.

ROD RASMUSSEN: I think, Julie, this actually brings up a separate point which is do we publish a scorecard or something like that.

JULIE HAMMER: Right.

ROD RASMUSSEN: So we do have the Board advice tracker, whatever the advice they are, which I believe is public, right?

JULIE HAMMER: Yeah, it is.

ROD RASMUSSEN: The question there, and then this is something we had discussion with ICANN implementation team is that takes it through the acceptance of the Board that what is publicly published. Then there is a question of implementation and what is published there. That's actually a good point. That might be something to actually expose maybe some just overall statistics about, which we haven't done. We haven't sat there and said, "Well, here's the number. Here's the percentages that made it through. Here's the percentages that were rejected. Here's the

---

percentages that were overcome by events, things like that.” That actually might be useful. I think we’ll take that one [inaudible].

JULIE HAMMER:

And Danielle has just done what I was about to ask her to do. Thanks so much, Danielle. She’s put the link to the Board advice checker in the chat.

ROD RASMUSSEN:

Yeah, and that’s a good starting point for figuring out where things are with various advice, not just from us. I believe that has other advice as well from ALAC, in particular.

All right. Any other general questions? Any feedback or input as to what other topics you’d like us to be talking about or working on?

Not seeing any hands and I don’t see any questions have been added. So okay, and we’re about at the top of the hour. Thank you to everybody who joined the call. The highest number I saw was 77, which I think is a pretty darn good crowd. It’s nice to have things not conflicted, as they have at meetings all the time. So that probably was helpful in getting things here.

Thanks to all the SSAC members who spoke and listened today. And definitely thank you to all the members of the community who came and provided interesting questions and we will look forward to hopefully seeing you in Kuala Lumpur should we have that meeting, or at some point down the line when we next get together.

---

So with that, I think we'll close the meeting. Thank you, everybody.  
We're adjourned.

KATHY SCHNITT: Thank you, everyone.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: [The recording has stopped.]

**[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]**