ICANN81 | AGM – SSAC Monthly Meeting
Saturday, November 9, 2024 - 15:00 to 16:00 TRT

KATHY SCHNITT: Hello and welcome to the SSAC monthly meeting. My name is Kathy and I'm the participation manager for this session. Please note that this session is being recorded and is governed by the ICANN Expected Standards of Behavior and the ICANN Community Anti-Harassment Policy. And with that, I'm going to turn the call over to our chair, Ram Mohan.

RAM MOHAN: Kathy, thank you. Good afternoon, everyone who is here in Turkey and good day for the rest of you who are dialing in remotely. This is the SSAC monthly meeting. And we're doing this co-located here at the ICANN81 meeting. And the agenda is on the screen in front of you. So, before I get into the details, does anybody, and this is an open meeting, participation is restricted to the SSAC members, just to be clear on that. So, SSAC members, do you have any other items that you'd like to see added to the agenda? Barry?

BARRY LEIBA: Just very quickly, I don't want to leave it for any other business. We are in the presence of Steve Crocker, who has just been given the John B. Postel award for this year at the IETF meeting in Dublin this past week.

STEVE CROCKER: Thank you very much. There were actually two of us that were given the award. The other guy was smarter. He hasn't traveled.

RAM MOHAN: Okay, thank you. Yes, okay. Back to you, Steve. Yeah.

STEVE CROCKER: So, before we begin with the regular agenda, I want to take some time to introduce my colleague, Carlos Reyes. As you know that after 15 years working with the SSAC, I'll be leaving at the end of this month, so I'll miss you all. But my colleague, Carlos Reyes, will take as the overall lead to support the technical community, and he's here today. So, let me give the floor to Carlos.

CARLOS REYES: Thanks, Steve. Hi, everyone. Carlos Reyes. I've been working with ICANN since 2012, and I look forward to joining Kathy, John, and Danielle, and my colleague Dan will be joining the SSAC Support Team over the coming weeks and months. Earlier today, I met with the leadership team and got to learn more about your transformation and the goals that the leadership team has enacted. So, we're looking forward to working with you. Thank you very much. And if you see me in the hallways or in other session rooms, feel free to reach out. I'm always available online as well.

RAM MOHAN: Carlos, welcome aboard, and we look forward to indoctrinating you soon, how SSAC works. Okay, so first item on the agenda I had there was a readout from the SO/AC chairs meeting. I sent you via email the readout for the SSAC members. Are there any questions? Okay, no questions. Let's go to the next item, proposal for outward responsibilities. Jeff?

JEFFREY BEDSER: So, we'd started this conversation at the workshop in September, but continuing a bit further, this comes in the role of the Continuous Improvement Program across Community Working Group about what different organizations within the ICANN ecosystem are doing to continue to improve and engage with the rest of the community. So, what we are proposing is the obligations of the participation in SSAC to have some more formal roles and liaisons structured. We have currently quite a few formal liaisons. We've got the ICANN liaison to the ICANN Board currently held by Jim Galvin. There's the customer standing committee. I think that's currently held by Joe Albee.

The NomCom, which just closed, that was Robert Guerra. Continuous Improvement Program Committee, the RSAC, the RSERC, the RSS, GWG, and ALAC. These are all places where we have had a traditional role and liaison back and forth, but that leaves quite a few other parts of the community that are not liaised with or engaged with from an SSAC perspective, at least formally, not informally.

So, can you slide up a bit on that slide, please, Kathy? So, what we're looking to do is expand this and hopefully get up to two members to

volunteer to participate in public meetings for different SO and AC organizations. The ones that we're targeting for the first initiative are the ccNSO, the ASO, the GNSO, The Council, The Commercial Stakeholder Group, Registrar Stakeholder Group, And Registry Stakeholder Group, and The Government Advisory Committee, and The Public Safety Working Group. I think that's it. Kathy, scroll up.

So, basically the modeling on this is that the engagement would be members of SSAC who would volunteer to choose one of these communities for a one-year period and then look to see what public meetings they have, both virtual and in person, and would participate in those meetings, at least as an observer, and basically look for security and stability issues based on either the reports we've already written or topics that we should be looking at or addressing to better understand what's coming out of the community that should be part of our remit to be looking at.

We'd be looking for that to start in 2025, and honestly, if there's a chance we're doing this early in the week, if there's a particular group you're looking to, please let me know because I'm going to need to track who and where and what so we can have a, understand we don't have 15 people showing up, for example, at the ccNSO meetings, but at least track them, and then we could basically start this week with people could take a look at listening on public meetings for those groups and decide if that's the place they want to start so we can start really strong in 2025. I think that covers it, Ram. I'm happy to answer any questions about this. Maarten, I saw first.

MAARTEN AERTSEN: Thanks, Jeff. I was wondering, as part of this initiative, you have looked at the expected time commitment for this.

JEFFREY BEDSER: Yeah, that's a great question, Maarten. I think it's going to vary depending on the group and the frequency of their meetings, so it might be something to consider when you're looking to do one of these roles if that organization has a meter for their public meetings that matches your availability because I think every one of these organizations has different meter for how often they meet with public meetings and such.

MAARTEN AERTSEN: Sure, but you're proposing doing an activity, and I guess I'm asking what the cumulative load is that you're proposing.

JEFFREY BEDSER: Yeah, and I understand that, Maarten, and I don't need to obtuse. I don't know, and I'm not going to give you an answer I don't have, but I will say to you this is something that the whole community is being asked to do in this Continuous Improvement Program, so it's something we're going to be required to be doing in an engagement, so we just have to figure it out. That's all.

ROBERT GUERRA: Yeah, so I have a lot of different thoughts. I think it's, to your point in terms of the time commitment, trying to think of advice for us in terms of how to proceed. I think we should have a conversation with the ALAC

because the ALAC has appointed out a lot longer than we have, and there's a sense of commitment, time commitment, and stuff like that, and we can hear from people that have more recent experience with the ALAC.

I will say that's number one, so I think the second thing too is when the ALAC has appointed people to other parts of the system, then those outboard people have been granted certain kind of privileges, so it's not just like the SSAC is sending. We have a volunteer, so I think we need to then have a conversation with who we're appointing to in terms of the expectations, but also maybe the, for lack of a better term, kind of the privileges being granted to that person as well too, and we should use the models of other ACs as well, right?

So, I think ALAC and others have done that. I would say maybe the model is kind of like for the Board, so we appoint someone to the Board, they're granted full privileges and stuff like that. I'm thinking the GNSO, I think that you have listed there, is, do we get to vote? What are those privileges? So, I think those need to be in addition to first finding people and their time allotment and stuff like that, and the third thing I want to add too is I think the other thing too that maybe, Ram, you're, I forgot to put my hand up for your last discussion, is for some of the working group conversations that aren't these bodies, we may want to appoint people too as well.

So, there was like the finance given the budgetary stuff, I'm happy to volunteer for that or to others that want to do that, and so we may want to add a secondary list just to have a more consistent tracking instead

of just like volunteering every time as well, and then have that roster and have the reporting, and so I think it's a good idea. I think we just need the time, the expectations, but also the reciprocal privileges. Thank you.

JEFFREY BEDSER: The part of my answer first, Robert, is that this is not a call for more formal liaisons at this point. So, just to be very clear, that's why I divided.

ROBERT GUERRA: If we appoint someone, the expectation on the other side may be there.

JEFFREY BEDSER: Right, but we're not. That's the point here. I'm looking for volunteers to go to Public Meetings and listen in for security and stability issues. That's not a formal liaison. Now this may evolve to a formal liaison role, but that's not the expectation at the outset, just to be clear.

ROBERT GUERRA: So, just a quick follow-up, just to narrow the scope. So, am I hearing from you is, for the positions you listed above, is it to attend those meetings while at the ICANN meeting, or where are we listening? Because then for some of us, depending on how broad or narrow the scope is, then we may be interested in volunteering our time or not.

JEFFREY BEDSER: Understood, but I did state it clearly at the beginning. Public, virtual, and in-person meetings would be the expectation.

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: Okay, thank you. The mission is clear. I've been with ccNSO for six years and can volunteer definitely to grab and catch on security stability issues, both on virtual and open meetings, public meetings. I still have friends there and there are issues as well. I'm absolutely convinced, I mean, there are issues which might be interesting to bring, except that I should say that not at all the offline meetings I'll be able, will be available to do this, because, for example, in the US, it's physically not possible for me, but I'll try to help with this one. Okay, thank you.

MATTHIAS HUDOBNIK: No, I just wanted to respond to Maarten's questions maybe. So, I think now it's also more-clear to me if you really appoint a liaison, I think, first of all, it's good if this person knows the community already, and the people there, and then it also depends on the community. Let's say, for example, you could check the working parties, how many they have, and then if you would have a formal liaison, then you would know how much work it would be.

You would say, okay, I have, whatever, three calls a week, and then maybe at the beginning you need to attend every call, then maybe it's enough if you attend every second, whatever, you get a feeling for it, and then this is kind of, I think, the way how you could do it. But if you just need to attend, or if you just should attend a public meeting, I think

it's even less work, because you would just go there, listen into it, and then say, okay, here is something interesting, or there, and then you would say, okay, let's discuss it here in a monthly meeting, and that's it.

JEFFREY BEDSER: Thank you.

MERIKE KAEO: Yeah, this is Merike. I'm wondering which constituents or areas here in SSAC do we not yet have covered with SSAC members?

JEFFREY BEDSER: Kathy, could you scroll back up?

MERIKE KAEO: Oh.

JEFFREY BEDSER: Right there. These are the places we don't have formal liaisons and don't have people reporting in on, so these are the areas where we may have people who participate there, but we're not getting anything back about security and stability issues from those communities.

MAARTEN AERTSEN: Now, I'm a bit confused, because you answered to Rob that you're not looking for more formal liaisons, and now you're saying that these are the constituencies that we don't have formal liaisons?

JEFFREY BEDSER: Right, because we do have formal liaisons, if you scroll back up.

MAARTEN AERTSEN: Yeah, sure, I read that.

JEFFREY BEDSER: So, we don't need to have people from SSAC participating in these other groups, because we have a formal liaison there. This is the part that doesn't have formal liaisons, we're looking to get better information out of for engagement.

MAARTEN AERTSEN: Right, and then Merike is asking, out of the current SSAC constituency, don't we have people that are from those constituencies already, right? That's what you're asking.

MERIKE KAEO: Yes, because when I look at the Public Safety Group, I mean we've got, Gabe, and are there others. So, is the issue more that we have people that participate, but they're not giving information back the way we'd

like it, or are these new places where we need to make sure that SSAC members participate?

JEFFREY BEDSER: I'll give you a simple answer, yes. It's not binary, the answer to both those questions is yes. There're places where we're participating, we're not getting information formally, and there's places we're not getting any information. So, I think it's about improving engagement, it's not about saying SSAC's doing something wrong, or we need to do something better, it's about we need to have better engagement. This is one of the ways we're suggesting to have better engagement.

ROBERT GUERRA: Just a quick follow-up for me, so as of this meeting, someone else is taking over being the person on the NomCom. So, my appointment to the NomCom finishes at the end of this meeting, so that'll flip.

JAAP AKKERHUIS: Well, I'm a bit confused, and most of the time I am, but for me personally, I've been involved in a lot of ccNSO work during the years, and especially not being liaison, because the basic rule in SSAC is that you cannot represent SSAC on any of these things. So, I made sure that, now suddenly we seem to be asking for liaisons, and this is kind of contradictory to what we've done over the years.

JEFFREY BEDSER: Yeah, I don't know how to respond to that, but I think I've said it clearly four times now. I'm not looking for further liaisons, I'm looking for further engagement to groups that don't have liaisons.

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: Just a short notice, there is a ccNSO DNS abuse standing committee right now. It's open public, and they discuss security and stability issues in terms of DNS abuse. It's right now going on there, so it might be useful at least to use a chat GPT or whatever to grab the valuable data from the transcript. I mean, it will take just five minutes, but it will be interesting for all of us to see what's going on. Thank you.

RAM MOHAN: I think further conversation on this topic should move to the list. We've Jeff has got the topic introduced, and you know, let's take it forward. Good feedback. Next on the monthly meeting agenda is a quick discussion about the ICANN Strategic Plan. You'll note we did not, as SSAC, we did not provide kind of formal input to ICANN on that. However, we have a session with the ICANN Board later this week, and I just wanted to bring in front of all of you just what is in the Strategic Plan, and Kathy, before that, if you could go just to the 2030 vision that ICANN has put together further up. Yeah, if you look at that, I think there's really nothing to dispute, nothing really for us to comment on.

This is what the ICANN Board has said. They want us a Strategic Vision. It makes sense, but inside of that, so there are four components to the Strategic Plan, four main topics in the Strategic Plan, and so let's just go

through those. We don't have enough time to have a full-scale discussion. We can have that on the list, but I want to make sure you folks see what is there.

On number one, just a little up, Kathy, you'll see what the objective number one is, evolve and promote ICANN's multi-stakeholder model to sustain its inclusive Internet Governance Model, and if you scroll down, they have three sub-points to that, 1.1, 2, and 3, and really, the one thought that has, this morning when we were meeting in the leadership team, the one thought that arose was on 1.3, the thing to say to the Board is the ICANN multi-stakeholder model of governance, we don't have a dispute that it remains the right model for delivering ICANN's mission, but we want to caution ICANN that they don't fall into the trap that sometimes has happened in the past, where you get an advocacy that says, the Multi-Stakeholder Model Of Governance is the ICANN Model Of Governance, because there are other Multi-Stakeholder Models of Governance that are also in effect in other places, and so, that's the only kind of highlight on that one, okay.

On number two, so that's enhanced organizational excellence. We certainly agree on that, and we've already had some discussion on list about this as part of comments on priorities for the ICANN CEO, so we don't need to go any deeper than that, but we've got some discussion already on the list, and we can derive from that.

Objective number three is, collaborate with relevant stakeholders to evolve the internet's unique identifier systems, and in there, there are three goals that they listed. One thought that arose from this morning's

meeting was on 3. 1, facilitate digital inclusion, it has 3.1.1 and 1.2 that are focused primarily on Universal Acceptance, Internationalized Domain Names, and the observation is that those tend to be fairly technical in nature and focused on script-oriented responses, but if you look at ICANN and look at ICANN's Strategic Objective and Digital Inclusion, at the higher order, language is a key component for digital inclusion, and certainly we're not disagreeing that universal acceptance IDNs have to be executed, but the real question is, say in four years' time, ICANN checks off 3.1.1 and 3.1.2, there will still be digital inclusion issues, and the driver for that is language, and language can be a unifier, it can be a divider.

So, the feedback to ICANN would be consider the impact of language, not only scripts and not only the technical issues such as Universal Acceptance and Internationalized Domain Names. Number four is Strengthen the Security of The Internet's Unique Identifier Systems, and in our discussion earlier this morning, we didn't think we had something extra to add on what's already here, so that's what we're thinking. This is to share kind of the evolving thoughts on this. I would suggest further commentary on this to be done on the list. Okay? Robert?

ROBERT GUERRA: I don't want to comment now. I would be happy, in addition to Jeff's and my volunteering, I would be happy to contribute my time to help you and others working on this issue as well, too. I do have some

concerns, particularly around point number one, but have a conversation afterwards.

RAM MOHAN: Great. Okay. That covers that topic. Let's go back to the agenda, and we're in your hands, Samaneh.

SAMANEH TAJALIZADEHKHOOB: Hi, everybody. This is Samaneh. I'm giving an OCTO update today to the SSAC Team. Happy to be here. So, I thought we start from here because maybe some of the new members do not know the structure. This is how the IROS team is now. It consists of OCTO, the office of CTO, which is led by John, and the IANA functions, which is led by Kim. So, this group is called IROS, Identifier Research Operations and Security. And there is OCTO, which is led by John Craine, and it consists of four Smaller Sub-Teams.

IROS Operations and Admin, which is led by Steve Conte, the research team led by Matt Larson, the technical engagement team led by Adiel Akplogan, and The Security, Stability, And Resiliency Research Team, which is led by me. So, today's presentation will mostly be updates on what each team has been doing, and also the ongoing activities, and also, at the end, I will give the floor to you guys to see what you guys how you would like to be engaged with OCTO in the future.

So, our ongoing engagement activities are now technical engagement with DNS operators. The TE Team is holding webinars on technical topics related to the internet technologies, and they also do capacity

building with ccTLDs and DNS resolvers to basically implement best practices like DNSSEC or have sessions to do it all together and test it. As you all know, the TE Team launched the KINDNS project, I think two years ago it was, and now it's been ongoing improvements. The KINDNS is basically a Holistic Framework to promote best practices for secure DNS operations, and the TE Team is holding DNS attempts at NOCs, hands-on sessions to basically implement some of these best practices.

The TE Team and some other operators come on Board, and they basically comment on each other's work and help each other to make it better and improve. We also contribute to technical assessment of policies, regional and local regulations, and also the technology trends. The TE Team also helps bridging the regional communities in each region and the type of research that OCTO does. So basically, from these technical hands-on sessions or the engagements with any kinds of regional communities, some of it becomes research, or we help the researchers, or it becomes a further collaboration.

Finally, the TE Team helps to support the ICANN constituencies in just broadening the reach all over the ICANN community, with the TE Team relying on the resources we have in different regions. These are some of the ongoing activities that the OCTO team has. We try to basically have all of it in this presentation. So, we from the SSR research, from the Engagement Team, and from the Research Team, try to have ongoing participation in IETF.

At the moment, there is active work on the DELEG, the root server priming, and the trust anchor discussions. Also in the RIPE community, actually. We coordinate the ICANN DNS symposium, last year, it was in Colombia, and we also now have a closer partnership with the L-root operations team for research and the architecture of the root operator.

We do the dataset management. We help with that. The L-root traffic, the zone file archive, the core, and with the longitudinal TLD Apex parameter measurements. We took this over recently. And finally, the name collision analysis project, the NCAP, which is completed, and we contributed project management and lessons. Some of the other ongoing activities are our collaborations with the academic community, with the RIR community, and recently with MAG, and some more, actually, that I forgot to list, but they are there.

We sit on program committees from the SSR team. Some of us sit on program committees of a couple of security conferences, like USENIX, IMC, PAM, and ECrime this year. And I am a MAG member for the IGF from the technical community, to which I mostly contributed for discussions about the content of the IGF this year, and also the WSIS plus discussion Boards.

Our ongoing research. We recently published, and it is actually ongoing, two new documents, two new OCTO docs, one related to the blockchain name system technologies and one related to blockchain technologies. Interesting documents in case you haven't read. We are working on public reservoir usage. This is a follow-up of the OCTO-032, but then with a focus on North and South America. And I think the research team

is also working on classifying resolver behavior at the root. This is also a new branch of work that the research team is doing.

From SSR research, well, this ICANN meeting is an important one for us because we are launching the ICANN Domain Metrica Project. There is a session on Wednesday at 1:15 which we will talk about the project and its details and the future plans. And also, the study that we funded, we commissioned called Infermal. I'm sorry, The Infermal Study is going to be talked upon about in the same session as Metrica. The researcher who conducted the study will be there, Maciek, and will give more details on it. We are the coordinators from the ICANN side, SSR team.

More on the research, so our vision for Metrica is that it will be the home to a lot of the research we are doing. Our research will become, basically we develop a prototype and the prototype will become a part of Metrica, a module in Metrica in the future. So, the research topics that you see here, most of them are in our future plan to be implemented as in inside Metrica. We did work on being able to classify unsolicited emails. I think we presented this to SSAC some time ago. That is going to be helping us in distinguishing spam from general spam, from spam as a delivery mechanism for other threats.

We developed a method for distinguishing park domains from other types of domains, which is also going to be part of Metrica in the future. At the moment, we hired a new machine learning engineer to work on DNS abuse prediction models and do research in that aspect. We are actively still working on developing a better method than existing one for estimating time to mitigate. It already exists, but we are working on

improving that method and also for distinguishing between maliciously registered and compromised domains. That was it from the work we do inside OCTO. Now, we would like to hear if there are other areas that OCTO and SSAC would want to work with in terms of measurements, research, and also engagement.

RAM MOHAN: Thanks.

MAARTEN AERTSEN: Can you close the mic on what you're on? Yes. So, thanks for the presentation and I would like to respond to your final question. Maybe you've seen that we're starting an open- source software working party. There's a meeting on Tuesday starting at 10:30. I'm actually interested to hear from your side, from your perspective, if there is something you can contribute to the goals we're trying to reach in network party. We're basically trying to document a lay of the land or a snapshot of the role that open-source software plays in realizing DNS infrastructure and registration infrastructure for the purposes of making this dependency visible to policy makers. So, there's two steps.

The first step is data collection and making this world map, more or less, and then writing a very high-level paper based on that data to document what I feel like many in the industry know but seems not to be written down in this type of form, in an accessible form for Policy discussions. So, I would be really interested to hear if you from the SSR

team or your colleagues have something to contribute because that would be super valuable.

SAMANEH TAJALIZADEHKHOOB: Thank you, Maarten. First of all, very interesting topic to work on. Do you mean from pointers perspective, to give pointers on where to look, the literature or the existing work?

MAARTEN AERTSEN: So, I think your question is super well-timed because I think on Tuesday we'll move from the charter, which is now finished, to actually doing things. And I think for some of the topics, some of us might know pointers. And for some topics, there might actually not be as much data collection or data collected. And then I guess we're getting into the engagement territory.

So, I heard you mention that that's something you're involved in as well. And it would be really great if you have time to participate on Tuesday and then tell me after if this is something you feel you or colleagues are willing to contribute to. So, I guess I don't have the answer right now in long form.

RAM MOHAN: Thanks, Maarten. Other questions for Samaneh? Steve?

STEVE CROCKER: Thank you. Can you roll back to slide five, maybe? Thank you. So, the first bullet there, oops. First bullet there, IETF participation in DELEG root server priming and trust anchor. Focus on DELEG for just a minute. DELEG is, as I understand it, a kind of strategic evolution of the DNS provisioning process to make it easier and coordinate various kinds of things. Meanwhile, a bunch of us have been working on multi-signer protocol and automation of DS updates both in conjunction with multi-signer and separately.

The thing that emerges in any of these discussions is that there's several steps to go from concept to definition to demonstration and documentation to formal acceptance in the IETF to then deployment and so forth. So, we're talking about timeframes that turn out to be measured in fractions of a lifetime 10, 15, 20 years sometimes to go from conceptually simple things. Within OCTO, is there a recognition and a sort of planning process or a setting of expectations about when these things are going to mature and how they're going to come into existence?

SAMANEH TAJALIZADEHKHOOB: Thank you for the question, Steve. Actually, I don't have enough. I cannot comment on that because this is a work that is led by Matt's team and Roy Arons from that team leads this work. So, if such discussion happened, it would be at the level of their team. So, I can actually get back to you on that question.

STEVE CROCKER: Thank you.

TARA WHELAN: Yeah, I'll just mention that, I mean, the IETF just concluded yesterday and the DELEG was a buff, a bird of a feather. So, I believe it's not even clear that it's going to become a working group. The hope, I think, from some people is that it would. So hopefully we can get some added information, though, from the OCTO perspective.

BARRY LEIBA: I think it's pretty clear DELEG is going to get chartered. That one will become a working group, probably before Bangkok, I'm guessing.

RAM MOHAN: Other comments, questions for Samaneh? Please.

CHAO LU: Hi, Samaneh, Chao Lu from Tsinghua University. I noticed in your presentation there is an ongoing project about open resolver usage. I wonder if that is led by you or other team members. If it's by you, then I would like to ask something. Because I know that at APNIC, they have similar measurements on open resolver usage. They publish a web page and, in each country, they measure via their advertisement network that how much percent of users are using Google Cloudflare or their local resolvers, respectively.

So, my first question is, is OCTO doing something similar or different? And if it's doing something similar, then, are there differences in the methodology or other perspectives? Thank you.

SAMANEH TAJALIZADEHKHOOB: Thank you for the question. Yeah, this is a work that the research team is doing. They are collaborating with people from APNIC and I think their plan is to build up on what is already existing. Build up on the explanatory measurements. Did that answer your question? Thank you.

MERIKE KAEO: Merike Kaeo, SSAC. That's a really good point to bring up. I just have a comment that in DNS ORC, which was three weeks ago, there were a lot of talks about open resolvers and DDoS attacks and amplification attacks in particular. And the SSAC back in 2008, I know because I'm the co-chair of that work, we have SAC065. And that is one where at that time there was a big issue with amplification attacks in the deal with the DNS. And I remember we made a big distinction about managed versus unmanaged open resolvers.

So, I would be interested in knowing how many unmanaged open resolvers there still exist so that somehow, we can help folks understand that that's probably not a good idea. Unless you're really managing them.

RAM MOHAN: Any other comments? Thank you so much for bringing the work and sharing that with us. And we'll make sure that the presentation is available as part of the meeting minutes that we get sent out. Okay? Thank you so much. All right. Now comes the next part, which is readouts from the two work parties. So, Maarten, let's go to you or Barry. Who do we go to? Maarten. Okay.

MAARTEN AERTSEN: So, yeah, we have chartered. Thank you to everyone who put in comments, regardless of whether they joined the work party or not. That was useful. So, on Tuesday, we will start the work by dividing up in more specific milestones with respect to data collection. And I hope to see many of you there. It will be a little bit of a non-traditional session for the ICANN meetings, at least to the extent that I have witnessed them in the past year, because I think we will be using some collaboration tools to do collective brainstorming, including with remote participants.

So, I hope you bring some energy and bear with my lack of experience with the particular tool and we'll make the best of it. We have actually 90 minutes. So, I hope to chart the path and then maybe I can ask Samaneh after if it was clear enough to actually state a meaningful question afterwards about Octo participation. So, that's it for the open-source software. Maybe one detail. We now have regular meetings on Fridays. I think it's 4:00 in the afternoon CET. Well, there's an invitation if you're interested. So, we are meeting regularly and I hope to make

good progress over the coming months. So, that's it from Barry and my side. Thanks.

RAM MOHAN: Questions for Maarten? I had one question for you. You're targeting to have a report deliverable in how many months? When do you think you're going to get there?

MAARTEN AERTSEN: The charter lists a deliverable for the summer of 2025. So, for the ICANN meeting held, if I'm not mistaken, in Prague. And yeah, that's stated in the charter.

RAM MOHAN: Yeah, got it. Thank you. All right. DNS filtering, Greg.

GREG AARON: Hi. This paper is an update and extension of two earlier papers that SSAC wrote on this topic. But that was almost 10 years ago when we decided we should revisit it and update it. We may actually change that. We have to arrive at a title amongst other things. The filtering and DNS blocking are technically little different things. But the idea is the use of DNS blocking, the blocking of domain names. We're approaching this as a discussion about technology and tools. Technology and tools can be, of course, used for different purposes.

We mentioned some of the purposes, but our intent is not to take positions on those things. The purpose of this paper is to describe how the technology works, its limitations, and some of the things people have done with it. So, of course, some of this is interesting to people like governments because there may be laws about what content should or should not be accessible to the people within a jurisdiction, for example.

So, one of the things we're going to be doing this week in our working group meeting is we're going to be talking with one of the ICANN staff who liaises with the GAC and governments. We want to hear kind of what's on their mind and make sure that our paper talks about some of those questions. We are probably two weeks behind where we want to be. It's turned out that so many of our members have been at conferences over the last two months. This will be my third one recently. But what we want to do is we've, at this point, cleaned up our document. We've answered a lot of the back and forth and questions and comments in the document.

We need to do another round to do a little reorganization and transitions. And our goal is we want to have a first look version out to the SSAC members, hopefully within a couple of weeks. The purpose of that first look is to let people read it if they're interested. We do like to solicit early feedback. So, if there's like a big question or a big disagreement or something that we haven't made clear as we should have, people can tell us then, and then the working group can work on it, and then we can move towards a more final version and get it out.

We've got a little bit of outstanding content. I don't know if we're going to publish it in December. I kind of doubt it at this point, just to be honest, because we're all going to lose some time during the holidays. So, early next year, that will still be one of the quicker turnarounds we've probably ever had on a report. So, going okay. We've added a lot of new content. Part of the new content is about new developments in technology. We've also pulled in some material from the NCAP project and so forth. So, it should be strong material. Any questions?

RAM MOHAN: Go ahead, Maarten.

MAARTEN AERTSEN: I was just curious if you expect to have recommendations as part of the word product. I noticed when I was studying your charter for the purposes of writing a good one myself, that there was some space left over that there might be recommendations for the general community. So, I was wondering if the work is--

GREG AARON: It probably won't have recommendations like the ones we write in some other papers, where we give a recommendation to the Board and say, we recommend maybe the community should do this or that. It may turn out to be like a recommendation that, as we had in the previous papers, where we said, if you are considering doing blocking, here are the things you should consider, like the potential for collateral damage,

or having results that leak out of your jurisdiction because of the way the internet works.

So, there'll be some maxims, which we'll probably repeat from the last paper, and we'll see if we come up with any more. But there won't be recommendations to ICANN, probably.

RAM MOHAN: Any other questions for Greg? Greg, one thing in our conversation with the GAC later this week. One of the things that we're sharing with them is, we are now getting to a position where, as policymakers start to engage on topics that are important for them, the SSAC is open and available to engage with those policymakers to help guide them, provide technical clue as they're doing it. So, I suspect that this topic, when we do put out a report, is going to be something that generates enthusiasm from them.

GREG AARON: Yeah, this might be the kind of thing where we present at a future ICANN meeting, yeah.

RAM MOHAN: Okay, thanks for that. On number eight, there are a few reports that have gone out to the list, in terms of what's been going on. What questions do you have for the folks who've put reports out?

MAARTEN AERTSEN: And I think we should add to the list the CSC with Joe behind it.

RAM MOHAN: Got it. Kathy, if you could please make a note for that. Hadia?

HADIA ELMINIAWI: So, it's not really a question, but I've been going to the WSIS+20 meetings, as well as the Pilot Holistic Review. And if we have time, I would send a report, but there nothing much has been done so far. But I could give a brief now, if like just, yeah, one or two minutes. So, first with the WSIS+20, and so background what this is about. So, the commission on science and technology for development is conducting currently a 20-year review of the WSIS summit in 2003 and 2005.

So, the review focuses on evaluating the implementation of WSIS outcomes. The WSIS outcomes aimed at leveraging information and communication technologies for development and bridging the digital divide. And the key areas of focus include assessing advancement in ICT infrastructure, e-governance and digital inclusion. Challenges, which are persistent issues such as digital divide between developed and developing countries, and unequal access to technology.

Future directions, recommended strategies to address emerging technological trends, and ensure ICT contribution to the sustainable development goals. So, this group is basically a discussion group, and there are some timelines related to the group that I could be sharing later, along with the report. And then, if I give also a quick brief about the Pilot Holistic Review.

So, again, some background information. So, the ATRT3 recommended that organization reviews evolve into a Continuous Improvement Program, and currently a community coordination group is developing the ACIP pilot framework, under which each group would model its Continuous Improvement Efforts. ATRT3 also recommended the creation of a Holistic Review with four objectives. Review Continuous Improvement Efforts of SOs and ACs, and NomCom review the effectiveness of various advisory committees and supporting organizations, and review the accountability and review as a whole if those structures continue to have a purpose.

So, the purpose of the Pilot Holistic Review is to define the relationship between future Holistic Reviews, Organization Reviews, and Continuous Improvement Programs, and define the roles of the community structures, consider what bylaws amendments are required. So, the Pilot Holistic Review will not make recommendations with respect to the purpose or structure of the ICANN, SOs, ACs, and NomCom, but it will provide guidelines.

And, of course, bylaws amendments will need to happen after the Pilot Holistic Review finishes. So, far, we've been discussing the terms of reference and the relationship between the Holistic Review, the CIP, the Organizational Review. So, the CIP and the Holistic Review together would replace the organizational reviews. I will be sending reports.

RAM MOHAN: Questions for Hadia? Okay. Any other questions for the liaison reports? All right. On the any other business part, there's been a good discussion

on our list about travel funding and guidelines, methods how to do this. And, I've asked if Barry could help chaperone that because there's this continuing discussion on that, and we'd like to take that to a good conclusion. So, Barry, could you take it up?

BARRY LEIBA: Yes, I don't think we'll want to discuss it here. We'll take it back to the list. But the short thing is that what Greg and Maarten have said makes a lot of sense. So, we'll be expanding on that angle.

RAM MOHAN: And, we're going to have a quick worked example coming right up because for ICANN82, the demand exceeds supply by two. So, there's got to be some work to be done in that area. So, that'll directly go to Barry to help resolve. Thanks.

MERIKE KAEO: Benedict, did you have a word?

BENEDICT ADDIS: Hi, all. We are having a special meeting. I don't know if it's appeared on the agenda yet. It has. Gosh, well, that's an incredible efficiency. To brief SSAC members and a few invited guests on Operation Endgame, which was a very interesting and technologically and legally quite challenging case against these loaders, these malware loaders. Law enforcements are going to give a presentation at 3pm, is it? Monday

afternoon? And, you're all very welcome. And, there's going to be a few invited guests there as well. Sorry, SSAC members are welcome.

RAM MOHAN: The room has more than SSAC members here.

BENEDICT ADDIS: But, if anybody who is in the room and is not an SSAC member would be interested in attending, please come and see me and we can see what we can arrange.

RAM MOHAN: Thanks, Benedict.

BENEDICT ADDIS: I'll send it. Monday, 3pm local. That's what UTC is that, 12?

KATHY SCHNITT: I will put it on the SVAC calendar and give you an invite. It's on our daily email at the moment. So, I'll do that after this meeting.

BENEDICT ADDIS: Thanks, Kathy.

RAM MOHAN: All right. With that, we conclude this month's meeting. Thank you.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]