
ICANN82 | CF – SSAC Work Session
Sunday, March 09, 2025 – 15:00 to 16:00 PST

KATHY SCHNITT

Hello, and welcome to our SSAC 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. Please be aware that this session is specifically designed for the internal work of the SSAC, and it is not structured for active engagement. Therefore, we will not be taking comments or questions from the audience during this time. Similarly, comments or questions submitted via the chat function will not be read aloud. And with that, back over to SSAC chair, Ram Mohan.

RAM MOHAN

Thank you, Kathy. I appreciate it. We had scheduled this hour originally to do some planning for what we were gonna speak to the Board about. Then we've added a second topic to it which is the request for comment on accuracy. So those are the two agenda items for this this session.

Danielle, can you-- and yesterday, we met, a few of us anyway, the leadership team and there were others. Maarten was in the room, Suzanne, and others were in the room. We met and we spoke a little bit in preparation for this session on what topics to discuss with the Board should be. So Danielle, if you or Kathy, if you can

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

bring that document up, then we can walk through what we are thinking of speaking.

I think there's a link to this in the-- I don't remember if there's a link already in the message that Kathy sent this morning. Okay. So Danielle is sending it to the mailing list. Jim has shared this with the Board as a draft agenda that we want to talk about. So we thought we would speak about three things, two things, and time permitting, a third. Two things to the ICANN Board.

First is to provide them, it's called a briefing on the Keystone Topic Initiative, and we'll walk through the pieces of it in a moment. But we have some leading questions, some questions to ask of the ICANN Board, and the intent is to prompt a discussion with them. So those heads up on those questions have been shared with the Board already by Jim.

And our intent is perhaps we can make a brief statement on each of those five topics, and then ask the one or two questions of the Board members, then prompted a Q&A. The intent of those leading questions is to get the conversation flow started. The actual magic of the session will be for all of us SSAC members to all of us, at least some of us, SSAC members to engage and to respond and kind of start up a back and forth to the Board.

So the goal there is not to lecture the Board, not to give them a set of slides, they hear that all week long, but to start to get them to pay attention to the actual topics. The second part that we wanted to talk about was, and maybe very briefly, was the process that the

ICANN community and the ICANN Board has been engaged on with respect to reviews.

And a corollary to that is bylaws amendment. The short form of it for all of you here is that last year, ICANN came and said, we want to start a group called a Pilot Holistic Review Group. And that Pilot Holistic Review Group, it was a misnamed. The intent was to form a group that would be a design team that would provide the design for how to do holistic reviews.

That team has deadlocked, the Pilot Holistic Review Team has deadlocked. There's been some folks in there who've thought they would do the original charter, the original job of designing how holistic review should be done. Others who started to think perhaps that is a group that should undertake structural review of ICANN, look at all the structures and provide recommendations on whether the GNSO is in the right form or other SO/ACs are in the right form.

And so the last week, the chairs of the Pilot Holistic Review Team came to the SO/AC chairs, I was there in that meeting, and they recommended that that holistic review be paused. And we've had discussions earlier in the week this week with the ICANN Staff, the ICANN Board Chair, and we're of the opinion, yes, it should be paused at least because it's just not gonna work the way it is structured.

The parallel piece to it is that under the bylaws, ATRT4 is supposed to commence, that is a requirement. Now, the conundrum is that the recommendations from ATRT3 have not been implemented.

And so if you were to commence ATRT4, a new accountability review process, you're gonna be reviewing something that is either work in progress or has actually not progressed much at all.

And you may recall, but last year we had said to ICANN Board, when they came to us and asked us for permission to defer the bylaw requirement to start a review, they had said, we want to defer it. We wrote back to them and said, bad idea, bylaws mean something. If the bylaws are wrong, correct the bylaws. Change them to reflect what reality is actually, rather than just deferring it. So that's kind of the idea that we wanna talk about. Russ.

RUSS HOUSLEY

So you may recall all this started because they paused SSR2. Because Steve paused SSR2. But it's been a domino since that act, because now all the review teams are not happening in the cycle mandated by the bylaws, and they either fix the bylaws or follow them, or somebody's gonna get in serious trouble when they choose to go to court about it.

RAM MOHAN

Yeah. So the thinking Russ is to really, maybe not advice, but to say to ICANN, the reality is not matching what your bylaws mandate, so don't ignore the bylaws, change them. So that's a short form of it. Okay, let's scroll down to the key- I'm sorry. Oh, Laurin, please.

LAURIN WEISSINGER BENEDIKT Hello, everyone. Sorry for not being there in person. This is Laurn speaking. So I just wanted to add to this, like being part of this review, and I'm now seeing Steve present in the room, who's also privy to these conversations. It has been quite a few sessions already where we there is like a lot of back and forth on like, kind of like, what does this review even mean? And like, what should be included in the scope and so on and so on.

So, I think in addition to kind of the concerns about kind of bylaws, there's also kind of a concern I'm seeing about, okay, how are these things framed and how are we defining what these reviews should do. And they're clearly different interpretations, and it has taken a lot of back and forth so far without a proper kind of full solution on like what it is that the review is actually supposed to do. I'm seeing Havier here as well, so all the free people who are on this review are actually present in some way, shape, or form. I just wanted to add that as an additional concern.

RAM MOHAN Thanks, Laurin. Hadia.

HADIA ELMINIAMI Thank you. Okay, so I was wondering, so the organization reviews are actually evolving into the continuous improvement program along with the holistic review. And since the pilot holistic review is going to pause, that means that we won't have any holistic reviews. And the CIP, I guess all structures are now working on their continuous improvement program. They should have already

developed this improvement program, but then what after that, what comes after that?

RAM MOHAN

Thanks, Hadia. So the proposal is to let the CIP, the Continuous Improvement Programs get to where they get to their conclusion. But what we're asking, it's a dialogue that has begun in terms of what to do next. We think that there ought to be some clear questions created in terms of designing the holistic review. I think this pilot holistic review team ought to be reconstituted to be called a design team for holistic reviews, number one.

Number two, if ATRT4 should get started, I mean, personally, I think that it's gonna dumb to kick off another review when the prior review hasn't gone forward. So the short answer is it's actually quite muddled and there is not a clear path forward. And in the meanwhile, there are clear accountability requirements that the entire organization is gonna get in trouble with. So no real clarity yet.

RICK WILHELM

Rick Wilhelm. One of the things that I would offer on the IANA function review team at present from the GNSO side or from the registries, and the report is about to go to public comment. So there's a finding in there about the frequency of reviews, and it's there we talk about-- there's a recommendation in there that the IFR, that the team is recommending bylaws amendment to change the tempo of the IFRT, the IANA function review bylaws.

It's not only talking about when it's still about in years, but also about when the team submits its final report so that these things, the recommendations have a chance to go into effect and be measurable. So like you had pointed out that it's important to not just stomp on the say when the recommendations haven't even had a chance to be implemented, but then they also have a chance to take some sort of measurable effect.

So yes, and to your comment. And then the other thing is, so that's one point of the comment, but then the second one, which I'm sort of want to make sure that we sort of register, is that this is about other reviews, so amplifying the point that Russ was making about the ripple effect and things like that. So this is about the broader process.

Now, the IANA function review is able to kind of get around this and things like that because it was delayed a little bit in getting started, but the report that's about to go out for public comment is gonna have a bylaws change recommended. Thank you.

RAM MOHAN

Great. Thank you. Just a very quick aside, Rick, the SO/AC chair discussion, we heard from both the chair of the GNSO and the ccNSO that they had been asking ICANN for a bylaws amendment for, I don't remember if it's a few months or a few years, it's kind of all the same, and nothing had happened.

And then in the session with ICANN executives and the Board chair, that question was raised, and for the first time, I heard ICANN

general counsel say, we can help facilitate a bylaws amendment without a lot of work, which was quite a change from what had been said prior. Okay.

I always underestimate how these policy things along these things will take. Let's go to the earlier part, which in my mind is a very important part of the discussion that we wanted to have with the Board.

So if you scroll up on the five keystone topics, and for those of you who were at the ALAC meeting, you'd heard me say we're shifting from calling them steady state topics to keystone topics because someone pointed out to me that steady state topics doesn't necessarily abbreviate very well.

So on the keystone topics, if you look at DNS abuse, what we intend to say is that empirical data shows that access to RDRS data is crucial for mitigating abuse. And really, to say that you look at what we have there under leading questions, the SSAC has consistently advised the timely access to registration data is essential.

We observe an ongoing shift in minimizing data collected by registries, and we note that the development of RDRS RDDS is limited in how it can be a viable mechanism for providing access to law enforcement and security researchers.

So those are just factual statements, and what we would thinking of doing is, if you scroll up a little bit, two questions, or scroll down. Sorry, a little bit. Two questions. Question one: How does a board

envision addressing the challenge of ensuring timely access to registration data?

So, want to clarify, this is about access to data rather than data elements themselves. So it's not the privacy part, but it's the ensuring that timely access to registration data can actually exist. So that's the first. And the second is to ask, how the SSAC can constructively contribute and support the Board on this topic. I'll come to you in just a moment, Rick. Jeff, did you want to elaborate briefly on that, on the distinction between data access versus data element access?

JEFFERY BEDSER

Thanks, Ram. So at the basis of it the registrars are the main point of mitigation for most abusive domains, we can all agree, and without a validated method of the RDAP functioning. Sorry about that. With a non-functional query, you can't figure who the registrar is, thus you can't get the report in the hands of who needs to get it. So I've heard reports of volume based issues, blacklisting on IPs, et cetera, that blocks someone's ability to make the query.

And without the query, you can't figure out the registrars, thus you can't mitigate the abuse. So I think that is one type of access to the RDAP system that is very clearly separated. The access to information about the registrant themselves, I think is a different issue to be handled separately. One is about technical access to determine, and one is about access to information needed for other purposes. So that's the bifurcation I was talking about.

RAM MOHAN

Rick.

RICK WILHELM

Thanks. Oh, whoa, sorry about that. We got a different problem there. So I think the, the questions are good. Could you scroll up just a little bit to the preamble? So I don't understand the need for the second bullet under leading questions because to my mind, that's irrelevant to the discussion below.

And I think that that is miss, well, if we're gonna just drop it, then I don't need to lean on the reasons why. I think it's an issue and because I think that this it's a misleading thing. Now, actually, I don't know that I share everyone's position around the need to access registration data about fighting abuse, because at PIR, we don't use registration data to do stuff about abuse.

I understand that there are different ways of tackling DNS abuse and different reasons for different things that different folks do regarding the first bullet. And so I may be in the minority around the first one, but certainly around the second bullet that I don't think that that's a needed point. Thank you.

RAM MOHAN

Thanks, Rick. So queue is Crocker first, then Maarten, Matthias, and Hadia. Crocker.

STEVE CROCKER

Thank you. Steve Crocker. That small point about whether or not the registries are or not in the process of minimizing the data they collect leads to one of several different dichotomies that interfere or confuse us at different times.

If the data's collected and there's a need to get at it, then the question of whether or not it's only at the registry or only at the registrar or both or whatever is subsidiary to that, but not everybody comes to the discussion with that same view. And so some parties will say, well, we don't have the data, so it's not a problem from our point of view.

I don't want to and I don't think we should say, which is correct. I think it's much more important to identify that these different points of view exist and not let them slide by and cause confusion, which they do repeatedly over and over again.

The second one, which Rick just pointed to, is whether or not access to registration data is or is not required for combating abuse or more generally. One can ask the same question whether it is or isn't required for some other purposes, and that causes some amount of confusion.

And just for those who haven't had the pleasure of hearing it, one of the more delightful areas where this confusion exists is to hear a registrar or registry say to law enforcement, well, you asked us about this domain, so we took it down, to which law enforcement says that's not what we needed you to do. We're in the middle of investigation, we need the stuff.

And meanwhile, the registrar presumably is saying, oh, well that's what we could do safely, so that's what we did. And so it just becomes people talking past each other and not getting whatever the job is that needed to be done.

So sorry to take so long at this, but separating out these pieces of where people are coming from or what they're saying as opposed to trying to evaluate which is right and which is wrong, is a precursor in my mind to getting this right.

RAM MOHAN

Thanks, Steve. So you would advocate to not delete the line that we have deleted?

STEVE CROCKER

It's complicated because observing that leaves different people saying, so what does that mean? It's really a thread that when you pull on it becomes a whole thing in itself.

RAM MOHAN

Yeah, that's why I'm inclined to move forward this conversation with the Board, I'm inclined to delete it.

STEVE CROCKER

That's fine.

RAM MOHAN

Because that's a separate conversation to be had.

STEVE CROCKER And then bookmarking that.

RAM MOHAN Correct.

STEVE CROCKER There needs to actually be sort of what are the elements of the conversation. Thank you.

RAM MOHAN Hadia.

HADIA ELMINIAWI Okay, thank you. So I'm also with deleting that phrase, but I would like to note that which data is collected is, it has been already determined by the EPDP Phase 1, which actually identifies the data that the registrars need to collect. So I don't know, even if this like shift in to minimize data collected, it's possible because contracted parties are required according to policy to collect a set of data. If they don't, then they're violating a policy that exists. I think EPDP Phase 1 is still under implementation.

RAM MOHAN Thanks, Hadia. So in the queue next is-- oh, you have a two finger.

STEVE CROCKER

So thank you very much. I'll just flag that enlisting carefully to what you said, you're talking about what the EPDP says and what the registrars are required to collect and what the registrars are required to collect by the various policies is very important and worth a lot of discussion and is separate from whether or not the registries then get that data. So that's just another element of where there is all sorts of things, and data minimization, which is a nice word going around is part of both conversations.

RAM MOHAN

Thanks, Steve. Maarten, Matthias, Greg. And I just want to share with you that time seems to have been passing, and so we may end up short-changing our discussion on accuracy and we may end up trying to find another venue or another way to have that conversation because the Board discussion is upon us soon. Maarten.

MAARTEN AERTSEN

This is a perfect bridge to my comment because I was wondering, we have now this list of one to five corresponding to the slide that has one to five, but I wonder, considering that the Board meeting will also have some kind of time pressure where people fill the space, if we should maybe prioritize whatever we feel is most important and maybe put on the bottom the things that are not, and I observed that the two work parties that are ongoing and the one that's being started are currently towards the bottom, whereas

the thing where we maybe don't have so much to say right at present, DNSSEC is in the middle and quite lengthy.

So I guess my proposal would be to at least bump that one to the bottom and maybe ask the group whether there's other, like, things we want to reorder here.

RAM MOHAN

Great idea, thanks. Matthias.

MATTHIAS HUDOBNIK

Matthias speaking. Just very quickly, do we have an idea what we understand under timely access? Because it would depend, for example, if, I don't know, you have a threat to life, it would be a different timely access than just whatever, getting some data for other purposes.

So just when the Board would ask, okay, what is the understanding of SSAC for timely access? Are we referring them to our publication where we also made a differentiation? I think it was, I don't know which SSAC126 or 125. So this is just that it's aligned with the advice and also that we have an idea of that what we are understanding under timely access.

RAM MOHAN

I don't have an answer at the top of my head. Anyone else here does?

MATTHIAS HUDOBNIK

Because I think like in the SSAC advice, I think we said for threat to life 24 hours if I recall it correctly, but I'm not 100% sure, but I think we should just keep it in mind that we are consistent.

RAM MOHAN

Thanks, Matthias. Greg.

GREG AARON

Thank you. I think we could keep that second bullet in. We don't have to spend any time on it, but it's probably worth mentioning. There was a time when the community passed a consensus policy that said transferring the data to the registries is actually important for a variety of reasons. And those reasons haven't changed, what changed was some of the transfer arrangements under GDPR became unclear. And that's kind of getting cleared up now, especially now that NIS2 is coming.

The really important reason that a registry have some contact data is that that helps them deal with abuse. And there are times when a registry is really in a good position to deal with abuse with malicious registrations. So it's something I think to say, and then we can move on, but keep it on the agenda maybe.

RICK WILHELM

Okay. Just bluntly, no, because here's why. Depends what we're here to do. So I think that the reason that this point is on here, because we want to talk about timely access. If SSAC wants to talk about timely access and that's what you're here to talk about to the

Board, then I would not co-mingle the discussion about registries switching to the minimum data set because as Hadia said, that was brought up in the EPDP, and that is done and that's policy.

And so I would not recommend as a member of SSAC to the leadership team and to the other members of it that you attempt to re-litigate policy, and quite frankly, tilt windmills with the Board. If the SSAC chooses to do that, have at it, I think there's a much more fertile ground to be plowing if you want to look at urgent requests. But I would not muddle those two in the Board's mind because the Board are fantastic people, but this is a lot for them to distill. Thank you.

RAM MOHAN

So in the queue, Hadia, Greg, Matthias, then I'm gonna draw a line under this. Hadia.

HADIA ELMINIAWI

Oh, thank you. So more or less, I was going to say this is policy. So if the registries are now getting less data from the registrars, or less or more, we can't really do anything about it because it has been already established by a policy. If we want to actually set a minimum set of data that the registries need to get from the registrars, we need a policy for that. So that's a different topic that we could actually discuss, but it's a standalone topic, I think.

RAM MOHAN

Thanks, Hadia. Greg.

GREG AARON So to Rick's point, this is not about re-litigating policy, it's about understanding what the effects of the policy have been. Now what I see on the point is we're not talking about urgent-- this doesn't say anything about urgent access, this says dealing with DNS abuse. So which topic are we talking about? Urgent request or DNS abuse in general?

RAM MOHAN Well, look at the question, we're talking about timely access to registration data, that's what we're talking about.

GREG AARON Yeah, but timely is different than like the emergency request. It's dealing with abuse, right?

RAM MOHAN Yeah, I think Jeff explained what that distinction was earlier. Matthias.

MATTHIAS HUDOBNIK Yeah, I fully agree with Rick. So I think we should delete the sentences, and also, I mean, how much data is collected or not collected by registry or registrar also depends very much on the applicable law and also on the policy. And so I think it makes not a lot of sense. Firstly, it's very complicated, and secondly yeah, it will like draw the attention away from the timely access.

RAM MOHAN

Thanks. Let's do this. Let's go through the other four topics, share what those questions are, and then we'll come back to what Maarten suggested, which is what do we want to prioritize in our discussion today, and then with the Board when we meet with them? Let's go to the next one. New gTLDs. We actually had a nice conclusion yesterday.

We had come in and you'd seen the mail that Jim had shared, but some potential concerns about what staff was doing. We managed to get Francisco to come in and clarify, turned out to just be something that had been missed in the specs that they had put out. So that's being clarified. So we don't really have a whole lot to say on New gTLDs other than what you see on the screen there. Maarten.

MAARTEN AERTSEN

But I think the conclusion was also that we might want to publicly comment.

RAM MOHAN

That's correct.

MAARTEN AERTSEN

Which is separate from the board conversation, just flagging that.

RAM MOHAN

That's correct. You see the third bullet there that says what we intend to do, it says what we intend to do, but no trouble Maarten, but we're not gonna say a whole lot to the Board on that.

Third topic, DNSSEC, and really here, because we began the chartering work for a DNSSEC evaluation work party, but we haven't progressed it much further, we don't have too much to say about that work party and its charter, but we thought we would simply pose some softball layups to the Board and ask, Hey, what do you guys need from us as you are progressing on this topic on DNSSEC, and specifically, are there any questions that you would like the SSAC to consider in what's most likely to be in a potential work party on DNSSEC?

Now, I'm told that the Board Technical Committee is thinking about that already, but we don't have anything so far. So this is kind of a soft thing not anything specific to bring up to the Board. Next one is on alternative namespace, and keep scrolling down. And yeah, you can see what we have on the leading questions. And again, perhaps have a quick shout out to the fact that we're starting up a responsible integration work party.

But you see what we are asking the Board, how can they leverage our expertise on DNS security to inform their engagement with stakeholders and their proposed technologies? The explication of that is the following. We've heard, I've heard, we've heard that proponents of blockchain technologies or have already provided proposals, ideas into ICANN that have to do with integration linking

in some way or the other of what they're calling Web2 and Web3 identifiers.

So that's really asking the board, we are starting a work party, but other than that, is there anything else? Are there questions you want to direct to the work party? Are there specific things you would like for us to look at? So that's kind of an open invitation on that one. The last piece is on the SSR aspects of internet governance.

We have the two pieces there, one on DNS blocking the other on the free and open-source software. And if you scroll down, do we have leading questions on that? Yeah, there you go. So those are two questions. I think Maarten, you were the one who wrote those yesterday. Do you want to speak to those?

MAARTEN AERTSEN

Well, I suggested we use the leading question format to give a bit of spotlight on what we're doing. I think Danielle actually wrote the questions, so if you want to give compliments, it's not to me, but maybe, yeah.

RAM MOHAN

So those are the five topics and the plan to ask these leading questions to the Board to begin an engagement with them. I've heard Maarten suggest that we put number five as the first topic or among the first topics to discuss when we talk to them tomorrow. But are there other suggestions in terms of these five topics? Do you have suggestions on order or priority? It actually matters less,

which is first, which is second. What matters more is which goes to the appendix and kind of doesn't really have to be discussed so that we devote most of our attention to the meaningful ones. Maarten.

MAARTEN AERTSEN

So my concrete proposal would be to keep too brief because we don't ask a question, so I'm assuming we have some control over how long we spend on the topic. If we do that, then it doesn't really matter where it is in the whole space of things. And then I would prioritize five and four over three.

And amongst five and four, I would say five over four, because five has actually work parties and four is just starting. I don't have an opinion about where number one is, but it seems that considering the amount of discussion, it's somewhere high up. Does that make sense?

RAM MOHAN

Your proposal is five, four, with a brief touch on two, and unknown on one.

MAARTEN AERTSEN

Yeah. So where one is like suppose up to the group.

RAM MOHAN

Understood. So at least up here is a proposal that five and four, there should be priority on five and four. Any dissent on that?

None. Okay, sorry. Yeah, concur. Okay. What about one, folks? Third?

JEFFREY BEDSER

I think it's got the opportunity to suck a lot of the air out of the room, so let's put it later. So if we get up to the deadline, we run out, everything else is discussed before we really hit that hard. It's important.

RAM MOHAN

Okay. So 5, 4, 1, 2, 3. Okay, good. It's 5, 4, 1, 2, 3. Okay. I don't think we'll have time when we meet with the Board, but the third thing, just to brief you on the third thing that is there as a time permitting element was how we meet, right, Danielle? That was Greg. Oh, I'm sorry. I missed it. Back to you.

GREG AARON

Oh, just briefly on number four. So if we tell the Board we're coming up with a working party on this topic, one of the questions that may be prompted in their mind is, oh, is SSAC gonna make any recommendations? And of course, we don't know yet. But it's kind of late for that in the new TLD stream of things. So I don't know, if they ask about that I don't know what to say, but I would anticipate somebody will ask.

RAM MOHAN

Fair enough. Barry. Thanks Barry.

BARRY LEIBA

Yeah, the goal of that budding work with the right working group is not to have a connection with GTLD round in particular, but just to, it's sort of following up on the what we did with DOH and DOT and then with the evolution of the resolution. Those were both informational, and so this is looking at whether we have anything that we could recommend now that we're seeing more proposals involving blockchain and things like that, but it's not intended to be related to the gTLD round.

RAM MOHAN

Yeah, I think it's a good admonition from Greg though that because many of those parties have publicly said they're gonna be participating in the new gTLD round and they're likely to take those technological innovations that they're coming up with and integrated, so whether we like it or not, there's probably some overlap that's gonna happen, Barry.

BARRY LEIBA

Right. I mean, I guess what I mean is the recommendations may involve caution, that kind of thing with operational caution or that kind of thing, rather than something that would actually affect the round itself. That's what I'm trying to say.

RAM MOHAN

Fair. Rick says he agrees with Barry. Okay. Sorry, go ahead. Alright, so the last part on how we meet is-- you can read what's on the

screen, but let me just share a little bit of again what-- I did send notes from the SO/AC chairs meeting, I sent a readout to the SSAC. But for those of you who found that too long, here is the short version of it.

A year ago, ICANN came to us and said, Hey, we want to review how we meet. 2014 was the last time we had a review of how we meet, can we work with you to do that? We said, yeah, good idea. It's been 10 years, time to go do the review. The next iteration of the interaction came back to here's how we think we can reduce 2 or \$3 million from our meeting budget, right?

And we said, whoa, whoa, that's a different conversation to have and we're not the right people to have the conversation with. That has to go through its own process and its own methodology on what has to be done there, so let's not confuse the two things. So we had kind of pretty candid discussions with ICANN this time.

And on Monday, there's gonna be a session that ICANN staff are gonna be putting forward. I would commend this session to your attention to actually be present to this session and to engage in that because they have apparently come up with a list of various suggestions, innovations, changes on how we meet, what we do and how we meet that. What I've heard, for instance is cut the Thursday off some of the meetings or maybe reduce the scope of Thursday, so it reduces costs.

I've heard add a day ahead of day zero so that you don't have to have a separate regional meeting or something like that. I've heard add a fourth meeting that is solely virtual. I've heard take the

second meeting and make that fully virtual, things like that. What we've said is if you want to take that second meeting and make it fully virtual, that then collides with the recommendations, the community wide consultation that happened in 2014 that said what we want to do with the meeting.

So we've said that's kind of the, not a red line, but caution if you want-- it's one thing to tweak what we are doing already and make that better, it's another thing to, to say we want a wholesale change what we're doing already, right?

So go to the Monday session, listen in, provide commentary. And for those of you who are in the Lightning Talk session this morning, you saw what we're trying to do, which is to lay the groundwork for a red line on cutting our workshop and trying to convert our workshop to be an all-virtual event.

So we're trying to build enough momentum and provide enough data points that in-person workshop is indispensable to the way the SSAC works and to a proper functioning of the SSAC. So we're trying to make sure that we preserve the budgeting for that in-person workshop. So that's the low lights of that discussion. Comments? Nabil.

NABIL BENAMAR

Yeah, I have just one question about this. The maintaining the workshop, the SSAC workshop, did we get any feedback from ICANN about this, or we are still debating whether we will keep it or not?

RAM MOHAN

We haven't gotten any feedback as of yet. This is a preemptive measure, and they have said they're listening. They have said they're listening. It's a preemptive measure because last year, Nabil, I heard informally, I heard somebody say, oh, everything is on the table, everything is being considered to be looked at. And to me that was a red flag of whoa, if everything's gonna be considered, then we have to make sure what should be taken out of that anything can be cut criteria, and that's why we're saying preserve that SSAC workshop.

Last year was the first year where the admin committee usually used to meet in December to do planning, and last year that got cut, we funded it ourselves and we met anyway. But now this year, what ICANN is suggesting is that maybe the committee comes a day or two before the AGM and it's kind of clubbed together in some way like that so that the function is still done, but it doesn't have an extra cost associated with it. Peter.

PETER THOMASSEN

So earlier, we reprioritize what the other five topics were, and there were some which are just information like the gTLD thing, we'll submit a comment and the DNSSEC kind of work party outlook. If we think this year is really important, which it seems like, it's under AOB, so I was wondering if it should be, and whether we should maybe do these informational other topics under time permitting.

RAM MOHAN

Yeah, I see a couple of thumbs up. And Matthias. Danielle, first.

DANIELLE RUTHERFORD

I just want to say, I think we need to check with Jim before we make any final decisions on that just because we've submitted the keystone topics to the board to say, this is the one thing we want to talk about, and this is just an add-on. So I think formal procedure wise, we need to confer with him before we commit to doing that is my recommendation.

RAM MOHAN

Okay, got it. I don't think that's gonna be a problem though, Danielle. I can help smooth that through, so not an issue. Matthias.

MATTHIAS HUDOBNIK

Yeah, actually want to support what Peter said. So I think it's very smart to do this at the beginning already, that we say we have these concerns and that's very important for us, this workshop, and we just want to highlight this once more how important it is, and that we start in the discussion with this thing could be a good strategic thing.

RAM MOHAN

Good advice. We'll do that. And we'll work the administrative pieces with the ICANN Board Ops.

RAM MOHAN

Okay. The accuracy piece, there's a discussion that's already happening on the list, and Jothan has been pretty clear that we're quite late in that process. And you guys should know that we're late because of me. There was an email that was sent only to me, and it wasn't sent to our normal, the whole admin committee, and I went on holiday, I didn't catch up with that email, and here we are. So blame me for it, but we're gonna try and see what we can do to recover from that. Steve.

STEVE CROCKER

It's gracious of you to take the blame, and a narrow reading of the process, I think that that's probably accurate that we're late in responding to the secrets of things. However, my sense of things, and I don't have a hundred percent perfect understanding, but my sense of things is that from the GAC's point of view this is an open question that remains highly unresolved, and the process of asking ICANN Org and the GNSO and having the GNSO ask SSAC and others is a subordinate process that had its own timeline.

But at the end of the day, what's going to come back from that in my judgment, isn't going to result in anything that can be considered final or done because the issues are quite open. So whether or not the subsequent conversations take place within the prescribed process here, or it takes place outside and then comes back around to be raised more formally at another time, is a whole different discussion.

RAM MOHAN

I share that completely, that same view, Steve. This is ICANN and there are specific deadlines we should try as much as we can to conform to those deadlines, but when we don't conform to those deadlines, I look at it and say, if our council or our comments are still valid, I hope that folks take that seriously and take it based on the validity of the content rather than the timeliness of that content.

The one case where I know that that did not work was root scaling many years ago where we provided some advice, it was valid, but we came late and it didn't really get integrated, but that was 15 years ago.

STEVE CROCKER

I'll bite my tongue and not say anything about the root scaling.

GREG AARON

It's Greg. So the, the GNSO hasn't started work on this. It seems like they want to know what everybody thinks are the big questions that need to be discussed. Then if they decide to go ahead, they'll do a charter and figure out what they want to talk about. So I think maybe the worst that could happen is if we're late or don't get a comment in, there's gonna be plenty of time to do commentary later. I think the worst thing could happen is maybe something important doesn't get into their charter. We kind of have to do this soon though, right?

RAM MOHAN

Yes, we do.

GREG AARON

Sounds like we might come up with something which is very, very short, which is just to say the following topics are important and just leave it at that. is that an approach?

RAM MOHAN

I think that would be an approach, Greg. What I would really like is if a subset of the folks from our committee can actually raise their hands, volunteer to help put something together, because I don't have enough bandwidth to corral, collect, and convert that into something actionable. So it'd be great if there's a subset of you who can say, we'll take it, we'll craft something and then I can send it onwards.

HADIA ELMINIAWI

I'm just agreeing.

RAM MOHAN

Oh, you agreeing? I thought you were volunteering. You're also volunteering.

GREG AARON

I volunteer, Steve, volunteers.

RAM MOHAN	Greg volunteers, Steve volunteers.
RICK WILHELM	I'll volunteer anyway.
RAM MOHAN	Okay. Rick volunteers.
RICK WILHELM	I'm more interested in what we submit rather than in drafting something. I'm probably more interested as a reviewer rather than a contributor.
RAM MOHAN	Okay, correct. So small team, Hadia, Greg, Steve, to help with the drafting, Rick to help with the review, and do this sooner than later because we are--
STEVE CROCKER	And for the record, I think I already submitted my views on accuracy to get things started.
RAM MOHAN	Fair, thanks. Rick.

RICK WILHELM

Jothan will probably want to review also, I want that since he's wearing a registrar hat.

RAM MOHAN

Okay. So Danielle, you have the team. Thank you. We are at time. Next session is with the GAC, next door. Thanks, folks.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]