ICANN76 | CF – Joint Session: ICANN Board and SSAC
Thursday, March 16, 2023 – 09:00 to 10:00 CUN

[KATHY SCHNITT]: Hello, and welcome to the joint session of the ICANN Board and the SSAC. This session is a discussion between the SSAC members and the ICANN Board and we'll only be talking questions from the SSAC members. Attendees in the Zoom are welcome to chat among yourselves.

To view the real-time transcription, please click on the Closed Caption button in the Zoom toolbar, and please note that the chat sessions are being archived and are governed by the ICANN expected standards of behavior.

A reminder to the speakers: please state your name for the record every time you speak, and please speak slowly and clearly for the scribes and interpreters.

And with that, I had it over to James Galvin, who will be chairing this session from the Board side. James?

JIM GALVIN: Thank you. And welcome. Good morning from Cancun. I'm Jim Galvin, the SSAC liaison to the ICANN Board. And it is my pleasure and honor to welcome SSAC members and the ICANN Board here together for an interactive discussion.

I do want to remind you that, even if you are sitting in the audience and unfortunately not at the table, SSAC members and Board members who want to speak, we do have a mic available. Just raise your hand, and we'll be happy to bring one over to you so that you can add to the conversation.

This is, in many ways, not unusual for SSAC. SSAC has a way of always starting at the first meeting of the day. It has always been our history, it seems, and—

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: On the last day.

JIM GALVIN: Yeah, on the last day. It's unusual for the joint meeting with the Board to be in this spot, but often our public meeting has always been in this spot. But we're very happy to be here and glad to have this opportunity.

So at this point, I'm going to ask if the screen can bring up the SSAC question. So, yeah, we're going to swap the order of these two here.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: No.

JIM GALVIN: Oh. No, I'm sorry. That is the right question. And let me turn it over to Rod Rasmussen, Chair of the SSAC, for a few opening words. And he'll lead us right into the discussion with the question. Thanks.

ROD RASMUSSEN: Great. Thank you, Jim. And thanks to the Board for meeting with us. Always our pleasure to do so. My name is Rod Rasmussen. I'm the Chair of the SSAC. And we're going to have a conversation.

And speaking of that, if there are other SSAC members or Board members in the audience, there are a few seats up here. I would highly encourage you to come up here so we can engage in a conversation. It's a little easier from here probably than with the roving mic.

We have two questions—one from the SSAC to the Board, and one the Board asked us. We're going to start with our question because it's our meeting, I guess. And it's the technical side of things, which is the fun part for us. So we look forward to engaging on that. And we had some pre-discussions on this, but I'm looking forward to a good discussion around DNSSEC as a strategic priority. That's going to be what we're going to be talking about first. And then we're going to be, on the second part, delving into the way that our advice and work we do is disseminated and communicated throughout the community and made more effective. I think that's our goals for this morning.

So let's start with that first question. I'll just read it off here. "As the Board is preparing the community for the FY26-30 strategic plan, how does the Board view the importance of promoting [drawing] the use of DNSSEC as part of ICANN's strategic objectives? And how could the SSAC assist in this area?"

And I want to give a little bit of framing on this and some inputs before we get into the back-and-forth, hopefully, on that a bit and talk a bit about history and save some of our members chime in on things that

are going on, both that SSAC are doing and that are happening throughout the community, the industry, and the Internet.

So we're looking at DNSSEC as an enabling technology for many things. It obviously has some security implications and has been a major emphasis for ICANN the organization and our greater community to have put a lot of time, effort, energy, resources, and money into. It's a fundamental part of what ICANN Org with their root key, all the ceremonies, maintaining all that, the security of all that, and then the dissemination and promotion of that, lots and lots of training, capacity-building, etc., that has gone over the course of many years. We have had some really interesting developments as far as how it has been deployed and how it's being used and how the uptake on that has changed. We have talked about that a little bit, but it's very positive in recent years and going the right way as far as if you're looking to deploy it and have it being used.

But we have questions about where is going from here, what are the factors of two buckets? One of them is, what are the challenges and gaps and things that need to be overcome for adoption and usage to be further enhanced and those kind of things that are maybe holding things back or making people reluctant to use it. How can those be addressed? And the other bucket is, what are the uses and the strategic opportunities for this enabling technology going forward? And what are some of the things that are going on out in the world, where people are taking a look at this as really a key potential factor in enabling new uses of the Internet and technology?

In regard to the challenges, etc., the SSAC has, over the course of our existence, looked at various factors and all kinds of issues and challenges with technology, and DNSSEC is no exception. We currently have a work party that is looking at some of the challenges around automating the updates around DNSSEC that challenge folks with their nameservers and being able to move them and manage them efficiently. So we actually have active work going on there even right now, and we're looking at things like that.

On the flipside, we also have an open work party looking at how the evolution of DNS resolution is being changed over time and maybe affecting the future. So we actually have active work here.

But the question, when you bring this back together with the strategic plan for ICANN, especially when you combine what we're doing with all the work the organization is doing, is, how do we think about this from a holistic strategic goal perspective and encapsulate this into the work plan for the next five-year strategic plan and call this out, especially given all the energy that has gone into this? And then how can the SSAC and other parts of the community help with putting those things together?

So I want to call on a couple of my fellow SSAC members to just give a little bit of color on some of the things we're doing and some of the things we're thinking about and things we've seen going on in the industry, just to add to what I had outlined here. I wanted to start probably with the work we're doing in the DS automation.

Peter, would you like to just say a few words about what we're doing there in just a really high-level nutshell on that? And please announce your name when you …

PETER THOMASSEN: Sure. Hi. So as everybody knows, I guess the deployment of DNSSEC on the validation side is higher than on the side where the delegations are secured, right? So there's much less DS records globally deployed than would be desirable if you think the DNSSEC is a goal. The rate seems to be around 7%. And it appears that the process of getting the DNS records initialized in the parent is often one that requires manual interaction with the registrant. And the registrant may not be aware that the process even exists or may not be very knowledgeable about these technical things.

So it appears that perhaps some automation would be useful when it turns out that the zone is already signed and the only thing that's missing is that DS step. So the SSAC work party is evaluating this problem space. And you probably are also aware of the interactions that we've had with ICANN Org on certain questions about this. And it has turned out that there are some technical questions that are useful to approach across consistently across TLDs. For example, if you do automatic DS provisioning based on what the DNS operator of the child publishes in the so-called CDS records, for example, it would be interesting to see how that interacts with other updates that are sent via EPP or, when the delegation has an update lock, whether that should affect the DS maintenance or not.

So we're looking into these things, and I think it is good to have all these things in a public space to discuss and to settle as much as possible on some kind of consensus strategy on how to approach these issues and then later have a recommendation on how the community ideally, from a technical and security perspective, could proceed.

ROD RASMUSSEN: Great. Thank you, Peter. So that's a very specific example of some of the things we're looking at from a technical challenge that also has policy implications when you think about it as to how things may need to be addressed to solve this problem. So it's kind of a hand-in-hand thing we need to be thinking about going forward.

I would also like to talk a little bit toward, looking forward, what DNSSEC may be part of and where it's being challenged right now as far as active standards.

And Barry, could you talk about it some of—

JIM GALVIN: [inaudible]

ROD RASMUSSEN: Oh, I'm sorry. Go ahead. Go ahead, Jim.

JIM GALVIN: Thank you, Rod. I just wanted to call out more generally, especially for Board members but for everyone who is listening, that Peter focused nicely on the technical side of this, and, as Rod said, there's some policy

implications. And I wanted to call that out and make that very apparent to folks. The issue here with DNSSEC is that there is a new player in the ecosystem who has an important role in the ability to role out and use DNSSEC. And that's DNS operators, authoritative service providers. That party didn't exist in the ecosystem when ICANN was first created and all of this first deployed and rolled out. And so it's useful to acknowledge their presence. So registrars certainly have the ability themselves to provide the automation and those kind of issues for registrants, but when you have a third party who is the service provider, that becomes an issue.

So I wanted to call that particular component of that out and ask, would anyone like to comment on that and add to that particular issue on this one side of this? Any comments or questions from anyone?

Or we'll just keep plowing here. So go ahead, Rod. Next.

ROD RASMUSSEN: Thank you. I'm going to hand it over to Barry to talk a little bit about some of the things currently going on with other protocols and things like that.

BARRY LEIBA: I wanted to point out that importance … DNSSEC clearly is important for protecting the integrity of name resolution queries, but DNS is being used for many other purposes in the Internet protocols other than just name resolution. We have protocols such as SPF, DKIM, DMARC, DANE, many others, and more coming all the time that use DNS to store and transmit protocol level information—things like encryption keys and

policy information and stuff like that that really need its integrity protected. If you visit a website that uses DANE to transmit its encryption keys and identification information, you need to be sure that you really are talking to whom you think you're talking. And DNSSEC is critical for that integrity protection.

ROD RASMUSSEN: Great. Thank you, Barry. So there's current work going on to enhance e-mail services and other things that are already identified. DNSSEC is a key component enabling [strata] technology for that and some challenges there that current work is going on here at IETF, etc..

But there are also some interesting future implications, and I wanted to hand it over to Jacques to just talk about some of the interesting things he's doing with CIRA and other folks are doing, where there's a real opportunity to create demand for DNSSEC-enabled technologies.

JACQUES LATOUR: Thank you. So I got an hour, right? So DNSSEC and digital trust is what CIRA is working on with the Canadian community. For over the last two years, in Canada there's been deployment of digital identify solutions across various provinces. Those are governmental initiatives. And most of this stuff is based on block-chain technology. There's no DNS. And there's no global interoperability.

And then, when we got involved to understand how a citizen in British Columbia could share information with a citizen or another entity in a different province, nobody thought about global interoperability at that level. And then I started to introduce the idea, the concept, of

DNSSEC, the DNS, unique identifiers, which is something they didn't really understand. All the ecosystem is walled-garden solutions, and they don't talk to each other. So the introduction of DNS with unique identifiers enables them to scale at a broader level in Canada and globally.

But the issue is that a lot of people think that the DNS in unsecure still. So CTOs, all the way down, think the DNS is not secure, it's not to be trusted, it can be spoofed—it can be all of these things. And if you check the stats in Canada, it's probably true because we're very low in the DNSSEC-validation level.

So it took a long time to educate people, all groups, to show that DNSSEC as a trust anchor can be trusted. It's a unique identifier. There's global scalability. It's a decently realized model. And after explaining all of this, the folks inside the digital identity ecosystem that are all focused on self-sovereign digital identity decentralization started to understand the value of the DNS, the unique identifiers, and now we're actually having a discussion, at least in Canada, and globally with the entities like Trust Over IP.

It took me a long time to explain all this stuff, and I shouldn't be doing that all the time with every new partner, so what we need from ICANN is  really good documentation to show that digital trust and DNSSEC work hand-in-hand. It's not centralization. It's a decentralized model. It can help support and grow the innovation around digital entity. And that's basically my ask here. I need help. I think it's a super great platform, but nobody knows about it yet, at least at that value where it can enhance the trust and the digital identity stuff.

Can I keep going?

ROD RASMUSSEN: I'm sure you could. Thanks, Jacques. So I think that's just one good example of an enabling aspect of DNSSEC that those who are trying to deploy the next generation of things on the Internet are hardly even aware of. And that seems to me like a big opportunity for ICANN to take advantage of.

I would point out that yesterday we had lots of really good sessions of the DNSSEC Workshop—again, another thing SSAC has been doing for many years and our commitment towards evangelizing and helping this technology grow. So we've had a lot of effort over time. In that presentation, Wes Hardaker, who's on the Board [inaudible] over here, is part of a group that is doing a rather amazing job of measuring deployments of DNSSEC, etc. And I know ICANN has been supportive in those kinds of efforts to gather statistics, understand what's happening.

So to wrap this all back together, there's a lot that we've been spending time, money, and energy on. It's clearly a core part of ICANN's current mission. And as many people say, budget equals priorities. And there's definitely plenty of budget being spent on this. As we look towards that strategic plan, how can we help enhance the visibility of this effort, codify that, make this more transparent to the community, and think about how we want to promote this going forward? Do we want to do something along the lines of what has been done with universal acceptance, with a lot more evangelizing and things like that, and

thinking about talking to people who aren't in there room at ICANN typically—application providers and things like that?

So I'd like to throw that over for some comments back from the Board and continue the conversation.

JIM GALVIN: Okay, thank you. I already have Wes in the queue. Let me just ask if anybody else wants to raise their hand. I'll take them down. Let me take a moment to play back a little bit what I heard from you just to frame this.

In general, SSAC is looking towards being engaged in strategic priorities on the side. And you picked on in particular, which is DNSSEC and a need, really, for At-Large, from a security and stability point of view, to raise its profile, to raise for greater opportunity for more things to happen. You walked through the fact that there are configuration issues. There's an ability to manage DNSSEC. So DS Automation is the work party that we have. You noted that it's a building block for many things.

Barry mentioned to us about other standards that depend on the presence of DNSSEC, which are gated in some sense by the fact that there is not broad deployment of DNSSEC.

Then Jacques told us about a very particular application that is getting broad deployment, broad engagement, and broad usage in Canada, and that's digital identities and building off of DNSSEC and using that. And I think digital identities is a broader topic in general in our global Internet. So there's a real opportunity there for something significant

happening. And of course, even in ICANN, there have been many discussions about identities, digital identities, and how to manage them in our registration system. So that was a particularly good reason for highlighting that project.

And with that, we're looking for engagement. Any SSAC member, any Board members, please, I'm going to run a queue here. And anyone can add to it.

So, Wes, you're up first.

WES HARDAKER: Thanks very much. I really want to commend SSAC. I think, within the ICANN framework, you guys have done a crazy amount of work to promote and evangelize DNSSEC as a security solution for the DNS ecosystem as a whole. So very well done on that.

On the presentation yesterday that I gave that you alluded to, I'll note that Viktor Dukhovni and I have been working on for years now … There's now 21 signed registered domains at the registration points, which is a fantastic point. When we started measuring, we were about ten million, and that was three or four years ago. So in the increase in DNSSEC deployment is definitely going up and up and up.

On the "What can we do in the future?" side of things, Jacques work on identity management is fantastic.

In the IETF, we have the DANCE Working Group, which is working on client-side authentication. I'm the Chair of that group. We just passed an RFC that produces better error messages for DNS, and I'm going to

come back to that in a minute. That's physically targeting DNSSEC on how hard it is to figure out what went wrong when DNSSEC possibly goes wrong. So debugging is still an issue.

I think ICANN's expertise and of course strength really amount to that education and outreach, right? I think that's where ICANN really, really has the ability, both through SSAC and through other mechanisms. And the DNSSEC and Security Workshop that you mentioned and alluded to already is a perfect example of that.

I'll note that, since the pandemic, we've stopped holding the DNSSEC For Everybody presentation, of which I've had three conversations this week from people saying, "Where did it go? I want to see the skit again. It was funny." I would argue that the people that have seen this skit and been to them in the past were not the target audience. We were always trying to do education and outreach. And I took that over from Dan York a while ago. So I'm staring at Kathy now because she's the one that will have to lead and organize and pull out the T-shirts from wherever they are. But it would be good to start doing that.

I do think that we may we need a shift in the type of education we're doing. Almost all of the TLDs are now signed. There's a huge amount of signed domains. I think what is really missing concentration-wise for education and outreach would be on the validation side. Even that's happening a lot. Google and Cloudflare, for example, validate by default, and they're very common top-level-wide resolvers. But we should really encourage validation to be increasing. Last I heard, it was still only that 25% of the world gets validated DNSSEC.

So maybe there's things we can do there, and part of that is debugging how do you notice when things are going wrong in validation and how do you recover from that? And I think that's an area where SSAC or the ICANN community at large could really roll out a fantastic education and outreach type of program.

And then finally, I think the other thing that you guys haven't mentioned yet which is already underway is time to do another root KSK roll. That's been known. The pandemic pushed that back a little bit in terms of timeline. We were supposed to do that by now but we haven't.

And following that, we need to also probably change the algorithm. I think there's a lot of people that would like to see the root moved to ECDSA elliptic-curve-based algorithms.

But I think everything is on track, but I think we should refocus. What are the next step in education and outreach? I think we should shift away from what we have been doing exclusively to, what are the next steps that people are battling? Thank you.

JIM GALVIN: Thank you, Wes. That was quit of tactical objectives to add to our overall security strategic objective. And very much I appreciate that.

Let me go down. I have Edmon, Matthew, and Harald. And a reminder to anyone sitting in the chairs out there. SSAC members and Board members, if you'd like to speak, please just let us know. Edmon?

EDMON CHUNG: I think the question asked and some of the items that were highlighted, building on what was saying, it seems to be calling for ICANN to lean in more in its strategic direction to have DNSSEC promote some of the issues, like automation of the DS records, like the digital identity items. ICANN should be more front and center. Is that what I'm hearing?

And on that, I guess Rod related to the UASG as well and how ICANN really tried to lean in on the universal acceptance issue. Is that the thing you're looking for the Board to do into the future? Because of the things is that, of course, both universal acceptance and DNSSEC are actually in the current strategic plan of ICANN. Maybe some feedback on how we are actually doing, especially on DNSSEC—maybe we're doing poorly … Obviously, there are more things to do, but the world has moved on a little bit as well. That's what I'm hearing. And the strategic direction needs to be adjusted or amplified. So that's what I'm hearing.

So I'd love to hear from SSAC on what we should do and how we did. I think at least the team created the KINDNS package, which encapsulates also DNSSEC. Is that the right direction? Is that the vehicle for us to push forward further on? So I'd like to hear from the SSAC on that as well.

ROD RASMUSSEN: Great. Thanks, Edmon. Yeah, that's akin to what we're talking about, and looking at this to have that conversation about, looking forward into the next strategic plan, how we emphasize this and maybe adjust course. And that could be doing a retrospective as to, where are we, how do we get there, what are the remaining gaps and challenges, etc.? And then how has the industry evolved? What are the things we're

seeing in the future which we didn't see five years ago or ten years ago? And can we reach out and enhance those future directions or help seed the ground for people to do those things? That's what we're talking about. But this is an open conversation about how to do that, and we're willing to dig in and help with that planning as we move forward.

I think Jacques wants to weigh in a little bit too.

JACQUES LATOUR: Yeah. So I think what I'd like to see is a digital trust package of some sort to explain how digital trust is achieved using DNSSEC. That would go a long way in explaining the value of DNSSEC to the developers and the community.

JIM GALVIN: Thank you, Emon, Rod, and Jacques. I like the digital trust suggestion as a larger initiative to think about.

With that, just a reminder: if anyone wants to speak.

And otherwise, Matthew, please?

MATTHEW SHEARS: Thanks, Jim. Rod and SSAC, thank you very much for this question because it's particularly timely. So what I'd like to do is just very briefly tell you where we are in terms of the strategic planning process so that then you get a sense of when would be the best time to come in.

But I just wanted to say the retrospective and then the forward-looking analysis that you were just talking about would be incredibly helpful in that process.

So the fiscal year '26-'30 plan. We're just about to get a timeline for that plan from Org. So once we have that timeline, it goes to the Strategic Planning Committee, and we'll start to look at, what are the components in that strategic plan? And what's the timeline? The last plan took 18 months. We're hoping we can shorten this to twelve because we feel we have a very robust plan at the moment that we're going to build on. We'll question it and we'll build on it. We've got a series of inputs that come in on a regular basis on the trends work that the community goes through on an annual basis and from some mid-cycle reviews that we do of the priorities of the strategic plan. So those all feed in. But the one thing we're going to do this time around is ensure that we have more opportunity for community input. So this is where this question is particularly timely.

And so, once we have that timeline, and once the Strategic Planning Committee has sat down and figured out how we're going to plot this out and provide for the opportunity, then we can come back to you and say, "This is where we anticipate this will be happening." That probably won't be until the next calendar year by the time we've sorted out the timeline and plan and put all the component parts together. But we're going to be making sure it's significantly interactive.

So I just wanted to give you that sense and the sense of the opportunity going forward. Thanks.

ROD RASMUSSEN: Thank you for that. And I think that the timing is, from our perspective, is good because we need to plan ahead for if we're going to be having a work party or what-have-you formed to help support some role that like. Say we wanted to look at that maybe in conjunction or OCTO or something like that, if we were to a retrospective or a look-forward. Anything like that. We can start hedging for that now.

Also, I want to put a shout-out. That would tie in with what we talked about in KL as well when we were talking about, again, the strategic plan around DNS abuse and how we might be help shape that.

So this is the right time to be talking about, getting prepped for that, so that we can hit the ground running in 2024. Thanks.

JIM GALVIN: Yeah. Thanks, Rod. And thank you, Matthew, for that comment. I think the important thing for SSAC is can, but we prefer not to. work [to] deadlines, per se. But this process will have a deadline at some point, and if we want to maximize our opportunity to input to this, we probably should start now thinking about what we want to contribute so that we're ready when the timeline is announced and we know what our schedule really is.

You're looking like you want to speak. Yes? Over to Maarten.

MAARTEN BOTTERMAN: Yes. Thank you. The DNSSEC strategic plan. Yes, I see a fit because DNSSEC isn't ready yet. Let's be clear. And the more we can lower the thresholds for implementation, the better, of course.

What I would like in this context to also ask you in SSAC to think about—maybe a bit blue sky—is what threats and opportunities of upcoming technologies at a general level there are because, if you only look at what we do today, we'll miss out on some things for the future.

So it's a wide ask. I don't expect a perfect answer because there won't be one, but if you guys, from your perspective, can come with something there as input, that'd be greatly appreciated.

JIM GALVIN: Okay. And with that, the last person I have in the queue is Harald.

HARALD ALVESTRAND: Thank you. When I listened to the presentation on what DNSSEC is, I'm thinking that you divide in in three almost orthogonal axes. And it's very different to what ICANN can do in those axes. Like, there's one axis that is deploying DNSSEC in the infrastructure, making sure that you can actually get DNSSEC records. That's something that ICANN should actually be able to help with using our relationships with registries and registrars, including Contractual Compliance, where we can get that.

Another one is sheer evangelism, convincing users that, when you have done your homework and enable DNSSEC on your domain, your name lookups are in fact secure. That is the thing that is most closely resembling the universal acceptance effort. It's user outreach. ALAC might be vital for getting the right people in the right places in front of the right mics to perform that.

But then there is a third axis, which is new things, new functionalities, that build on DNSSEC because, when you can assume that the lookup is secure, it simplifies the design of any system you build on top of it. And that is perhaps the one area where ICANN is not in a position to help because this needs to be worked out. Solutions need to be worked out in the IETF in industry fora and the open source world and deployment before we have something that can be evangelized, institutionalized, and put into contracts.

So I'm very happy to see that SSAC is really working in all three dimensions, but it might be good thing, when we think about how we incorporate this into strategic direction, that we keep these things a little bit separate so that we can say, "This part is compliance. This part is evangelism. This part is research," to put some labels on the three axes I was hearing in your presentation.

JIM GALVIN: Thank you, Harald. I appreciate the sage advice and that distinction in those areas. And we should certainly focus our attention in that way. I like that breakdown in all of that.

We do have an SSAC member who's remote who put their hand up and would like to speak. Can we please let Russ Mundy speak?

RUSS MUNDY: Hello. Well, one thing that I'd like to contribute to this discussion is that, many years ago, there was what I would describe as an overall plan for the development and deployment of all aspects of DNSSEC, and it was

referred to the DNSSEC roadmap. And myself and Steve Crocker and a team of folks were involved in putting that together.

And many, many things have changed since it was assembled, but to the best of my knowledge, there has never been an effort by another activity to assemble what could be described as an overall look or an overall analysis of both the gaps and the requirements that are needed to be closed to accomplish widespread use of DNSSEC. And this is something that I think might well be looked at as somewhat analogous to the universal acceptance activities. And I can say, from the past history, it is a big job. And it's a hard job. But I think it is a job that the ICANN staff would be clearly able to put together in a form that would let the community—not just ICANN, not just SSAC, but the community—be able to see what is needed for the broader, more widespread use of DNSSEC. Thank you.

JIM GALVIN: Thank you, Russ. I appreciate that.

And I think, with that, we'll wrap up this topic.

And Rod, do you have something to move into? Then we'll move on to the next topic.

ROD RASMUSSEN: Thank you very much. So we were going to shift our attention to the question the Board posed to the SSAC. I'll just read the bottom bit there so the room can hear it. "The Board would like to hear from SSAC and explore together suggestions for how SSAC's advice and

recommendations might be communicated to the ICANN community and addressed more efficiently within the multistakeholder model."

Thank you for the question, first off. I think it's a very pertinent question, especially with the conversations that have been going on throughout the ICANN community, particularly amongst the leaders of the SO/ACs, and how interact with each other, coordinate, etc.

So we took a look at this question and divided it into two buckets, and I'm going to talk about that a little bit at a high level, then I want to make sure, if there's other further into this question before we dive further in, that we get that.

But we looked to this in two buckets, and the first bucket would be largely tactical in that there's a set of processes that exist that we've been using and evolving over 20 years of SSAC's existence. When the SSAC provides a document that has formal advice for the Board, it's considered and either acted upon or sent back or turned away with a reasoning for why. So there's a process for that. And over time, we've come to add things like the ARR to track what's going on where things and advice exist in the system. So that's where we stand today. So there is a process. We're tracking things along, etc.

There are certainly areas where we can improve the communications. When I say "communications," they're more around understanding. And when you get to the question of efficiency, there are ways we may be able to better engage upfront whether that's having a get-together session of Board members and of folks in the SSAC who worked on a recommendation or with part of the organization—usually OCTO—that would have to do some implementation, etc. There's opportunities for

us to get better at that, and those are things I think we should always be looking for, from a tactical perspective, for how we can improve our internal processes and understandings because, when you have the back-and-forth via a formal tracking process, that can get very dry and still lead to having to back and forth more times than you should rather than just having a conversation. So I think there's things we can do there.

There are also areas where we provide advice where the Board itself or the Org aren't able to necessarily towards that advice but other parts of the community are—or the broader ecosystem of the Internet or even more broadly on that, depending on what we say and like.

So on that, there's a couple of different things. When it's in the community—I'm going to put a check mark on that one—that's where we have the second big bucket …When there's advice we have that would be something to be disseminated to a wide audience—say it's the user community or something like that—there are ways that we may be able to work with ICANN's communications team or other ALAC or other folks who have reach to be able to get messages out. We've had several publications recently that were more broadly advisories and didn't have recommendations. We did a paper on routing security. We did a paper on the Internet of Things and some others. Those are broadly educational, trying to promote better understandings of challenges, opportunities, etc. And we've had some discussions on that in the past, but that's something we can definitely look towards. So that's one bucket.

So that's one bucket. The other bucket, getting back to that, is the intercommunity—inter-SO/AC, if you will; the broader community—working with each other. And when our advice, which crosses lots of different policy aspects potentially because we're looking at security, stability, and resiliency issues … Those could affect all kinds of different policy, whether it's something that is put into practice, like IDNs and the ccTLDs. And ccNSO may have a lot that we work with there. Or it's something like access to registration data. The entire community has looked at that. How can we better interact with each other, especially given all the differences between the different community groups that are present and how they're governed, how they form consensus, and how they bring things to the table? And I know this is something we're all talking about and working with, so that's why it's a good topic to be talking about.

But how do we make sure that, when we're working—what I mean by "us" is SO/ACs and people in the ICANN community—on things and providing inputs and feedback and advice and policy, we're listening to each other and are taking into account what other folks are saying?

Greg Aaron, I'm going to just call on you because you really distilled this really nicely in the conversation we had yesterday in discussion on this question.

GREG AARON: Thank you, Rod. We want you to know that SSAC, when it formulates its advice, works very hard on it. And work on some principles, which are we want our advice to be practical, we want it to be implementable. Sometimes there are things we want to ask for, and we scale it back

because we know we have to be realistic. And we also try to present it based on the merits. We work very hard on our research and to make our work professional. And then we put it out there to the community, to the Board, and it will hopefully stand on its own, and people will then decide on what to do with it. And they'll either adopt it or not. And that's the way it works. We're an advisory committee, after all.

But we do have an aspirational thought that we were discussing the other day, kind of like how the community interacts. And we would like to see two things. First, we want to know if people have read our advice and have considered it carefully. And second, we want to then hear, if they don't accept our advice or don't take it, why that was. Tell us the counterarguments or the reasons why. We want that feedback.

And these things are important. And we get those things, by the way, from the Board usually. We have our advice tracker. And when the Board looks at our advice, it will provide rationale. But we think these things are important for three reasons. The first reason is that we're volunteers. And all volunteers all across the community want to know that their work is having some sort of an impact, or at least they're being heard. And we all know that volunteer burnout is a real problem in the community. And we want to avoid that.

Second, we know that it's been very difficult to get policies through the ICANN process, especially in the GNSO. The community has not had an enviable record over the years recently. And in some cases, we've had to say, with things like the SSAD and the disclosure system, we don't think it's going to meet the goals that the community has set out. We don't think it's going to be fit for purpose.

Third, it's just good transparency. We should be able to talk to each other, exchange our ideas, and tell each other why we think things are working or why one idea is better than another.

So some of these discussions get to the conflicts or the difficulties in the multistakeholder model. If there's an idea out there, does the best idea win? Or on what basis are we making decisions? And we want to hear and have honest conversations about that because we work hard. We're putting people on various cross-community working groups and at the GNSO. We're trying very hard. And while we know that our advice will oftentimes not be accepted, we want the feedback and we want to be able to talk to our friends in the community about how things are working. And maybe we can reach better agreements that way. Thank you.

ROD RASMUSSEN: Thanks, Greg. And this is a two-way street from our perspective as well, or a multi-way street with all kinds of different directions because we have all these different SO/ACs, and we do talk about this in the meetings amongst leadership. But how can we take this up and encapsulate the spirit of this Board question and continue to evolve that?

So that was our initial take on the question. I wanted to make sure that we got that. And if there was anything further the Board wanted to add to the flavor of the question and then engage on the feedback we had. So please.

JIM GALVINL: Okay, thank you. I know that Sally would like to speak to this question.

SALLY COSTERTON: Thank you. Thank you, Jim. I just wanted to ask you as a group—you, Rod, but you as a group … I'm conscious and incredibly grateful to you for the amount of effort that you're putting as a group—and you're not a big group—to stretch yourself across all these policy issues that you have to put input into in order for the process to work. And you're already doing that. And now we'd be about to get into a very intense period when the whole community groups are going to have to rally around to get through to the next stage of the subsequent procedures. We talked about this separately in our meeting.

And I just wanted to ask you, is there anything more that we can do collectively to help you—I don't know—with more participation? I really am just very conscious that this elastic band is tight. And the whole community is going to have this issue, which is why I've been very transparent in all my private meetings and open meetings this week that the organization is ready to stand by you to provide you with more resources to help you to meet more. But I also know that, in this particular group, it's not like there's 10,000 people out there to bring together around the problem. I just wanted to put that on the table while we're together.

And if there is anything that is on your … "Yes. Okay, Sally, if you could do this or this or give us some of that. We have these other volunteers that might be able to be more involved, but we need this and this and this." This is the kind of thing I mean. And you may not answer that now, but I just wanted to put that on the table because I absolutely get that

we're at capacity and then somehow we have to have to find some more.

JIM GALVIN: Thank you, Sally. And I do want to go back to say thank you to Greg and to Rod. In a larger principle, I think that at least one of the things that Greg was focused on was the whole feedback loop analysis. And it's more than feedback just between the Board and the SSAC because there is at least a system in place, as you spoke to. We should look at better ways of doing that. but Greg was calling out the need for greater feedback loop with the community in how SSAC advice is dealt with and certainly looking for other comments and contributions to that.

Just a reminder. Please, if anyone who's sitting out here—SSAC members and Board members—want to add, but I do have Maarten and Edmon, and then Barry and Matthew. Maarten, please?

MAARTEN BOTTERMAN: Thanks, Greg. Rest assured, if there's any advice, we read it and it's discussed in the technical committee. But I hear you, and this is something we hear from … ICANN is based on volunteer work, whether it's professional volunteers that get paid by the job or whether it's volunteer-volunteers that just come because they're interested. And we are aware that, to value that, you need to show you do something with it. And we think we take it to heart and we discussed that we maybe should be more explicit about it. What David has been working hard on is to get an advice register so you can at least keep track of what happens with it.

But I hear your call and I sympathize. Thinking of myself, sometimes you come with reports, and then you think it's very good, and then what's happening with it? Sometimes a lot. Sometimes maybe less. But rest assured that we do appreciate it and drink in the advice that comes. Our job is to become more explicit about it, I think. Thank you very much.

JIM GALVIN: Thank you, Maarten.

Greg, if you want to [inaudible] at all at any time, just let me know as we're going through this.

Edmon, over to you.

EDMON CHUNG: So I guess, adding on what Maarten said, on the GNSO policy development side, actually the SSAC advice is often used. And the policy staff do a very good job at the beginning of PDPs to ensure that we identify the right SSAC advices that pertain to a particular issue. I especially have been obviously working on IDN-related ones. They are especially listed. And I think that is a feedback loop that is useful as well because, when policy development process goes on, we would be looking at the advice and saying, "What does that really mean?" and therefore actually responding to it.

So I guess I would encourage also the SSAC to look into that particular part because I think, right now, all the PDPs do have an early input process, so if SSAC sees a particular PDP and thinks one or two or more of the advices may be pertinent to that topic, then that could be a good

feedback process as well. So that's beyond just the Board accepting or implementing certain advice.

I wanted to also build on what Greg said—I think it's really interesting—about feedback and perhaps what the community doesn't agree with—certain items. That's actually quite interesting. I never thought about that. I thought it was said and done. So that actually opens up a good dialogue, I think. And perhaps maybe we need to think a little bit about what the mechanisms of this feedback might be and how SSAC would incorporate it or even revise potentially certain advices. So I think that is a really interesting direction that we all should think through about.

JIM GALVIN: Okay, thank you, Edmon.

Just want to do at quick time check for everyone. We have four minutes left in this session. I have Matthew and Barry. Matthew, go ahead.

MATTHEW SHEARS: Thanks. Just listening to the discussion, it occurs to me that one way of possibly bringing more attention to the vision and the outline that you presented at the beginning of this session, Rod, would be to have an interactive session with the community on, what are the security opportunities and threats in the next three to five years? I mean, I think that would be a wonderful way also of communicating about your advice and bringing the community into a more interactive type of environment, which this isn't so much. It doesn't provide that opportunity. So I think that might be something that would help in

terms of socializing the perspectives SSAC has on these issues in the future. Thank you.

BARRY LEIBA: I was just going to highlight that has already been said. Let's just save time and skip it.

ROD RASMUSSEN: Great. Thanks.

And Edmon, I really want to key in or what you were talking about there. We're also looking at the system. It's just our issue is—it's kind of all the SO/AC's issue … And the incorporation … You brought up the GNSO policymaking thing, which is great. And we know that happens, but it's a little bit of a black box because we don't really have a formal or even an informal mechanism for that, other than, if there's something that's really big coming out of one of our reports directly, that we'll hear from whoever is going to do that and say, "Hey, can you talk to us about this?"

But this is something they might be able to think about: how can the Board and Org facilitate each of the SO/ACs as they're coming out with things and are about to consider work, saying, "Hey, there's a cross-pollination here. You're starting policy work in this area, and by the way, ALAC has said this. SSAC said this. How do we bring those in?" We're trying all kinds of things. We're trying small teams. We're doing all kinds of different interesting innovative stuff to encourage that. But I think if we can do some more to help—and that's where I think ICANN Org can help the most—in identifying those areas, those topics, where there are

these cross-community interests that aren't just the big ones but the little bits, maybe we can look towards helping improve that process and getting that feedback to each other, setting up more bilateral sessions or multilateral sessions to talk about as specific topic. When we present things in our public meeting, well, everybody else has got meetings too, right? So how can we do a better job of concentrating on those issues when they come out? So let's continue that discussion.

JIM GALVIN: Okay. Thank you to all. At this point, we'll move towards closing.

Rod, any closing comment?

ROD RASMUSSEN: No. Just thank you all. I think there was some good questions that were asked by both sides here. It's very topical. And I think it applies not just to the work we do but the work that we're all doing. So thank you again for this session. I really enjoyed it and look forward to doing it again.

JIM GALVIN: Thank you, Rod. And thank you to the Board, all the SSAC members, and everyone who came here to listen to us have this discussion. I too agree. I thought we had a very good interaction this time and look forward to doing it again. We are adjourned.

**[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]**