SUZANNE WOOLF: The project started with a specific list of questions that the Board wanted us to answer, and there were a couple that it turned out weren't the interesting questions that we were able to say, “This is what we think about this,” about but also, “It's not that important for the following reasons.” So we got to sort of redirect some of the questions. And that was, I think, very helpful to the Board. And it's in the implementation stage now. There's a section on name collision in the latest applicant guidebook revision that's out for public comment. So if you're interested in what role the NCAP work is playing in the applicant guidebook for the next round, there's a draft out in the public comment archive. Take a look at that.

RAM MOHAN: Thank you, Suzanne. I invite everybody in the audience to come join us at the main table so you have access to microphones. Matt, I see you're on the line as well. Did you want to say anything in addition to what Suzanne and Rod said?

MATT THOMAS: Thanks, Ram. No, I think the two of them covered it pretty well. It was a pretty intense project, spanned a long period of time, was community involved with SSAC and ICANN Legal, and I think the work product stands for itself. So thanks.

RAM MOHAN Thank you, Maarten and/or Barry, did you want to speak for a moment about what you're doing?

MAARTEN AERTSEN Sure. So I got a question in the hallway about progress, so I'll be a little bit more detailed unless people stop me. So we're looking at open source software used in DNS and domain name registration infrastructure. The goal of the paper is to provide a publication out there that describes the landscape, because I think a lot of us practitioners know that open source software is used widely. But when I, in a personal capacity, was doing policy work in Europe, it was very hard to make that point stick. Like, you would have to explain over and over again that when you regulate software, you might want to consider the effects on open source because it's used in important places. And so I advocated starting a work party. And part of the publication's idea is to actually document what we as a community know based on data. And then the other part is trying to address some common assumptions that are made about open source and to inform those assumptions to maybe lead to different conclusions. Well, to get from the landscape to these misinformed assumptions, there is some bits that you need. You need to describe DNS, you need to describe the characteristics of open source software, and maybe talk about operational considerations. So that's the outline of the report. We did quite a few things already. So during February we had a survey out to the wider community to try and get their input on concerns they have, but also maybe specific operational practices. And we got a lot of responses. I think we didn't get to 100, but we did get to 98 or 97,

which exceeded our expectations. We're now in the process of analyzing these responses and seeing how we can integrate them in the various sections of the report. Our next work party meeting, which is sadly closed, will discuss what we will do, but when we publish, hopefully in the summer, you will be able to get the insights that the survey yielded and you may have perhaps contributed to. The other bit that we are working hard on is actual report content. And part of the relevant bit, maybe to this audience, is it has statistics on open source use among, for example, operators of authoritative DNS services. So on statistics that we found (and I don't know this by heart), basically, amongst the top 25 operators of TLDS, 22 or 23 are known to use open source software. So we're not naming individual entities, but if you look at this list, it's pretty clear that this is not a niche hobby or anything, like, operationally. And we tried to pull some of these statistics from other infrastructure components as well, some of which we are still working on. One of the areas we're still working on is data escrow, and we try to kind of map out what the open source uses in those areas. So I think that's basically where we are now. Challenges going forward is to make sure that what we write is actually consumable by policymakers. So we'll try and find ways to get people to actually review our text, maybe in parallel with asset consensus or … Well, I need to figure out how this works, but what I don't want is to publish a paper that might be appealing to a technical audience and is then not usable in an actual policy process. And other challenges are making sure we include all the components that we can. And in some cases (for example, the

registry space), this is not as easy. So what I would really like to do is maybe talk to GoDaddy, Tucows, and some of the bigger players and ask them some questions. So to the extent people here are able to provide introductions to me or Barry for this week, that would be awesome. I already received some offers. I think I'll hand it back to Ram because I can talk about this for ages, but I won't, not longer than I already have.

MAARTEN AERTSEN Thank you, Marteen. I appreciate that. Are there any members from the DNS Blocking Work Party who can provide just a quick update on where you are, what you're doing?

JOHN EMERY I guess I can take it, Ram.

RAM MOHAN Sure. Please.

JOHN EMERY I'm John Emery. I'm staff supporting the DNS Blocking Work Party. So we're about to the final stages of this work party. It's a really fascinating update from two previous papers that SSAC published back in 2012 about the status of DNS blocking and content blocking kind of globally. The world has moved on since 2012. A lot of things have happened and a lot of new technologies have more proliferated for end users to kind of get around blocking. So this is a really interesting paper that doesn't make recommendations, per se, but is really geared toward policymakers and not making necessarily value judgments about why blocking occurs, but more about that we recognize that blocking exists, lots of policymakers

use blocking, and here's some possible kind of collateral damage that can occur if you block in the wrong way. So it's very much a recognition of the state of play in the world, kind of jurisdictional issues, how these come about. And we're in the very, very final stages, looking to send it out for full SSAC review in the next couple of weeks. We've gotten some early great preliminary feedback from some SSAC members. So it will be published in the next month or two, ideally, and there will be some presentations on it at the next ICANN meeting. So those of you interested in that, be sure to check that out at ICANN 83. Ram, back to you.

RAM MOHAN Thank you. And I don't think we have anybody from the …

ERIC ZIEGAST I have a question.

RAM MOHAN Yes, please.

ERIC ZIEGAST Question. Eric Ziegast, DomainTools. Are the review of documents limited to SSAC members, or do you take input from other people in the community for domain blocking coming up.

RAM MOHAN So the general way we work is if there are invited experts from the community in the work party, then their comments make it into the work party. Otherwise, all of the discussions happen just within the work party and the members of the work party and eventually the members of the sac.

ERIC ZIEGAST Thank you.

TARA WHALEN I can also add that at meetings such as this one, our work parties have been giving updates about some of the work they've been doing, and we have been having comments and additions from people who have been coming to those. Now, how these are incorporated into the documents is up to the work party itself, but I will note there are opportunities to at least speak with members of the work party if you want to highlight something, bring something to their attention, and they can bring that back to the work party and feed that to the document. So thank you.

RAM MOHAN And in fact that work party met in public at this meeting, so there was an opportunity to at least listen to what was going on and then reach out to the chairs and other members in the work party. And almost as if he had heard it, the one of the co-chairs of the Responsible Integration to the DNS Ecosystem has materialized in the room. So let me point to you, Rick, and ask if … We're just having, on each of these pieces of work, just a brief explanation of what it is, what we're trying to do and provide some sense of timing and expected audience and output and things like that.

RICK WILHELM Sure. Sorry I'm late. I was not legally detained, nor was I illegally detained, but I was detained. So the Responsible Integration Ecosystem blah blah, blah. We're going to be working on blockchain stuff. You probably already covered that, I assume, a little bit. Right? Didn't cover anything. Okay. The general gist of it

	is that there's various technologies, probably most importantly, most notably, blockchain, that are looking to integrate into the DNS ecosystem in one manner, shape or another. And this work party is looking to provide a document for the ICANN Board about ways in which we can provide guidance to the Board about how that should be done in a way that doesn't negatively impact the stability of the global DNS and also allows for smooth and relatively seamless integration for those applications, most importantly, taking into account respect for the domain name life cycle for various events like registration, renewal, transfer, inter-registrar transfer and things like that [inaudible] various events. We're getting the work party going here in the near term, so SSAC members are kind of in process of signing up. We haven't established a timeline yet for when we're planning on delivering something, so I won't speculate on that. Eh, that's probably about enough. I'll take questions.
TARA WHALEN	It's possible some of that was muted. I was getting a message that you were speaking, but it might not have been coming up. Hopefully not the entire thing.
RAM MOHAN	Everyone is muted, from what we're hearing.
RICK WILHELM	You can only be so lucky as to have me muted.
TARA WHALEN	Everyone is muted.

RAM MOHAN Looks like you may have to repeat yourself as soon as the muting problem changes and you become immutable. It's fixed, Rick. Could you summarize what you just summarized?

RICK WILHELM There was a comment to the right of me that is maybe the funniest thing I've heard all week. "If I was also idempotent as well as immutable, then I would be super powerful. Give me a huge enough pointer and I will control the world." That has been said. I did not originate that quote, but someone here will remember who did. Okay, so no one on the remote heard a bloody thing? Oh boy.

RAM MOHAN Well, they were hearing other things, but not you.

RICK WILHELM If you're hearing voices instead of hearing me, that might be an upgrade.

TARA WHALEN I was told it was cut off about halfway, if that helps.

RICK WILHELM About halfway. Okay. So then we got through an overview of what we were doing, probably. Maybe we didn't hear about picking up the bit about the domain name life cycle. We want those applications that are going to integrate to respect the domain name lifecycle, so things like renewals, deletes, inter-registrar transfers, nameserver updates and whatnot are properly accounted for and respected by those various applications. That's probably the centerpiece. We will take other issues as they come and are raised by the various members of the work party or by

those who raise questions for us as a group. Timeline hasn't been established, but we'll be getting started in the wake/aftermath of ICANN82 and we're all looking forward to it. We're also going to be tracking some work that's going on in the IETF related to responsible integration and we're going to do our best not to be in conflict with that. I would say that's a fair bit. That's probably enough. Again, thank you.

RAM MOHAN Thank you. So that gives you a general sense of what we're doing. Tara, can I turn to you for a moment to explain how people get into the SSAC?

TARA WHALEN You can. I already had someone ask me about this already. I like seeing all the enthusiasm before I even put out the call. So people get involved. I mean, hopefully people will come from the very, very beginning to a meeting such as this one, one of our other open meetings, getting an idea of the sort of work we do. Also it would be useful to have a look at some of the reports. Maybe they have used it in their own work and they say, "This is the sort of thing that I would like to contribute to. I have some skills." We do have a baseline of technical expertise that can be in a lot of different areas within the DNS and naming systems. And we have people who are sort of regular computer science folks, people with networking expertise or protocol experience or operational experience, or they may have done lot of work with a registry or a registrar, DNS abuse—any number of these, like research backgrounds. We have quite a lot of different skill sets that then come to be used in one of

these reports. So if you look at one of these and say, “You know, this is the kind of thing that I think I could contribute to. I have something that I could have contributed to this report. There's something missing. I think I could make one of the future reports better,” then you are in a good position to put yourself forward for the SSAC. The material about how to get involved is on our part of the main ICANN website. So there's an SSAC component. There's a How to Get Involved place there, which will tell you what you need to do to be involved. So there's an application process. Our application window is open. We would like you to get your materials in by the 30th of June, so we have time to go through them for the remainder of the year. I'll talk a little bit about process, so I won't get ahead of myself. But you'll give us information about your CV that we understand more about your skills and experience. Supplement that with a statement around interest, why you want to join, any disclosures of interest around the area you may represent, your employer, for example, and their interest within ICANN's interest—conflict of interest, that would be. As well, we have a survey that we've just changed from one survey format to another, really to highlight things like what kind of things have you written, what kinds of skills you want to highlight. And then we'll use all this material. We'll come to a committee. So we have a committee of five people plus myself. All of those materials come in and we sit down and we have a look, get an idea of who you are and what you might bring. Then there's an interview process. People are selected to come forward, to interview, to talk to us again. We'll get more idea of who you are, what you want to

contribute. And then if we then think this person is great to join, then our recommendations are brought to SSAC, who then have to approve somebody joining. And then that also goes to the Board. So there are quite a number of points throughout the system. So it goes from you're having this kernel of interest in our work all the way to a formal approval process. And then that's for a three-year term. Did I miss anything that people on the committee want to say? And also people are free of course to talk to us as well. It doesn't have to be quite so arm's length. So we're, we are here during these meetings. We are available throughout. People can send questions. Our support staff, particularly Kathy, will often deal with questions that we get from people and forward things to us. So we are always interested to talk to people who are interested to talk to us. So don't be shy about asking us questions.

RAM MOHAN And with that, let's go to the next slide, which is: ask us questions. And please, everybody in the audience, come sit at the main tables and come join us and ask us what you feel like asking.

MICHAEL PALAGE Thank you. Michael Palage. Some of the work that SSAC has done has been cited in regard to incident reporting in both the dot-com contract as well as the proposed new baseline registry agreement. Both of those have cited the SSAC's work. I guess my question is: that was, I think back, in 2017 (it was several years ago), and I was wondering has ICANN Org engaged SSAC in any issues regarding cyber incident reporting since the publication of that initial report? And if so, what can you share?

RAM MOHAN Rod?

ROD RASMUSSEN So when you say cyber incident reporting, we're not talking about DNS abuse? We're talking about incidents that might involve ICANN Org or registries and registrars?

MICHAEL PALAGE So what I could do is if allow me to go get this specific reference, I could pull it up.

ROD RASMUSSEN I just want to know what topic area you're asking about.

MICHAEL PALAGE So again, if you read the public comment that ICANN put out in connection with dot-com, they specifically cited the one SSAC report. In the baseline registry agreement there, it was the ICANN Board, and when it said what was the basis for this change, they said the community and then they cited SSAC. So I guess my question is it seems like ICANN is specifically referencing incorporating the work. And I was wondering, is there an ongoing dialogue or is it just that historic reference point?

ROD RASMUSSEN That's a historic reference point. There hasn't been any engagement subsequently. I know Jim's not here. He might know if the Board had any thoughts on that. But there was at least not while I was chair. We didn't have a dialogue on how they had referenced prior recommendations, which I believe was from way, well—

MICHAEL PALAGE I think it was 2017, ’18.

ROD RASMUSSEN Yeah, I believe this was before I was chair, even. So it'd be under Patrik. But I know that we did make reference to that. I think that even came up internally as a question somewhat recently as to where that work had gone. But I may be confusing that with something else. But no, there's been typically … Though, to be fair, unless there's some sort of implementation thing, the ICANN Board will take on our advice, approve it or not, take it on, and then assign that out to somebody to incorporate. And sounds like in this case they had to refer that over to ICANN Org to include in some other updated contracts, but at that point we wouldn't necessarily be involved.

MICHAEL PALAGE Yeah, that specific SSAC report actually had six recommendations, but it appears that they only took one out of the six. So one of the questions I'm going to be asking the ICANN Board is, why one? Why not the other five?

ROD RASMUSSEN Be careful when you ask that question, because the Board may have referred it on to Org to implement and then, [for] the question, they'll just refer you to the Org potentially.

MICHAEL PALAGE You know me, I'm [reluctant]. I'll follow the bouncing ball wherever it goes. Thank you.

RAM MOHAN Please.

JOHN EMERY All right, next in the queue we have Janos. If you can unmute and ask your question, please.

JANOS DRIENYOVSZKI Hi, thank you. I'm right here. This is Janos Drienyovszki, European Commission, and also Co-Chair of the GAC's Public Safety Working Group. And the mandate of the PSWG is quite closely linked to that of the SSAC in terms of that we are also working on making the DNS safe. So my question is on blockchain domains. And I'm glad to hear that the SSAC is working on the responsible integration of it. And I'm also aware that OCTO released two documents on the sort of the technical description, OCTO 39 and 40, which did not take a position on whether it's positive or negative. But I understand that the SSAC report goes a bit further than that in the sense that in a potential integration it will address the risks, maybe. I guess my question is aimed at whether that report will assess that, because I'm also wondering because the blockchain domains of course function in a very different way and they're not part of the ecosystem that falls into ICANN's remit. So I'm wondering if that report will address risks, potential risks, of duplicative domains, and how will we address the DNS abuse of these duplicative domains. So yeah, I hope it was clear. If not, I can clarify. Thank you.

RAM MOHAN Rick?

RICK WILELM

Thank you for the question. I'll attempt to answer that. The paper obviously hasn't been written, nor has the work party been formed. So I'll try to answer within the remit of what the charter says. And I appreciate your perspective on the questions. I think it's a fair assessment that the members of the SSAC are familiar with the OCTO document. The goal of the working party is to talk about (it's sort of captured in its title) the responsible integration of those two. And I think that within the SSAC, there's broad consensus that a blockchain name is not a domain name. And I think that one of the things that is of broad consensus in the SSAC is that helping to de-confuse people and maintain clarity around what is a DNS (a domain name; an actual capital D, capital N domain name) and what is a name inside of other naming systems that may or may not have a scheme that involves dot-separated labels is an important thing. And there have been one could offer that, for purposes of maintaining that clarity, there have been some unfortunate design choices made by various naming systems that cause that kind of intellectual confusion and other situations where naming systems have been designed that don't cause that kind of intellectual confusion. And we don't need to bring up examples in this meeting. But the purpose of the work party is going to be talking about how naming systems, whatever their syntactic label construction mechanism may be, if they desire to integrate into the capital D, capital N capital S system that we know, love and protect around the unified root as manifested at IANA, can do so responsibly without causing mayhem in their own system, because one of the things that can happen is, if they integrate improperly, they can be

caught on the back foot about changes in the global DNS in the global route that aren't properly reflected in their systems. And so failing to capture those would be a lack of responsible integration. And this work party is designed to capture ways in which those applications who seek to integrate into the global DNS can do so responsibly so as to avoid confusion and delay, as Thomas the Tank Engine famously taught so many young people. And mayhem perhaps. But Thomas the Tank Engine I don't think ever used the word "mayhem" in any of those books. So hopefully that's a reasonable summary. I appreciate the input and the thought and look forward to collaboration as necessary. Thank you.

JOHN EMERY Next in the queue, we have Maarten.

MAARTEN AERTSEN So I'm not sure if this fits in the open mic format, but I just heard Janos speak and your employer. And one of our work parties that I co-chair is working on a paper that hopes to reach policymakers. One of our challenges is to make sure we don't write text that is too technical. So would you be willing to do a bit of a review, near publication, to see if things we write would be consumable for your colleagues. And "no" is a perfectly fine answer because I'm just doing this out of the blue.

JANOS DRIENYOVSZKI Just to clarify, my colleagues as in the PSWG or the commission?

MAARTEN AERTSEN Your colleagues or the people you would advise as policymakers worldwide. So I'm not asking for a review in your official capacity

	or anything; just someone who is closer to policymakers than maybe some of us are.
JANOS DRIENYOVSZKI	I'm reluctant to make a commitment, but let's touch base after the meeting. I'm happy to, to discuss.
MAARTEN AERTSEN	The best I was hoping for.
UNIDENTIFIED MALE	I mean, that does generally bring up the puzzle that we have every time we write a document. What's the target audience? And is the language in the document appropriate for that target audience? It's a balance that we always have. And more and more recently we've been doing more advisory documents, informational documents, that we want to be consumable by a broader audience. So on the one hand, we don't want to eliminate all the technical details, but on the other hand, we don't want to glaze people over who are not technical experts. And it's a challenge.
JOHN EMERY	Currently there's no one left in the queue. Yes, please come up to the mic.
RAM MOHAN	And again, I invite everybody in the audience to come sit at the table, if you'd prefer.
JAMES KUNLE OLORUNDARE	All right, thank you very much. My name is James Kunle Olorundare. I'm not yet a member, but an aspiring member. Let me put it that way. So I have a couple of questions that I really want to

find answers for. I wouldn't know if that has been addressed before I came in because I was a little bit late. So my apologies for that. So the first question has to do with … I can see that SSAC is doing a lot of amazing work, and it's something that I really, really appreciate. And I was thinking maybe if there is any way, even before one becomes a member of SSAC, if one can contribute to some of the research, the papers, that have been done here. I would like to know if it is possible. All right, so that's on one hand. And the other question is from what Barry said just before I picked up the microphone. And that has to do with the output document because I am aware and I know that most of the work being done here is technical, so to say, but for the fact that we need to collaborate and work with other communities, other groups who are not really, really technical, maybe there is a need to balance up the output document in a way. So I'm just wondering if maybe there can be something like, "Okay, this is the technical paper," and probably maybe an interpretation of the technical paper for the community so that the other community members will be able to use the document. Thank you very much.

BARRY LEIBA So I'll take your first question and maybe a little bit of the second. For the first question, as we give summaries of the work parties that we are operating and spinning up, like the RIDE one, which is just starting, you're hearing from the chairs of these work parties. And what I suggest to anybody who's interested in contributing to that topic but isn't joining SSAC yet, or isn't ready to join SSAC, or maybe even will never join SSAC, is to approach the chairs of the work

parties and talk about the topic. They're passionate about the topic, so they're interested in talking about it. If you have particular skills that you think could help the work party write a better document, discuss that with them, and they may choose to invite you to be a guest of the work party. And I think that's the approach for that. For the second one, we are trying to do short summaries of some of the key documents that we've put out in recent years and sort of have a digestible "If you don't want to read the whole document, here's a quick summary of what we said about this topic." So we hope that as we develop those, we'll have the community, we'll have some resource where they can sort of dip in and say, "Do I want to read more about this topic? What is the summary of what SSAC said about it?"

MOHAMMAD ATIF ALEEM Hello, everyone. My name is Mohammad Atif, for the record, and I'm an ICANN Fellow. I'm new to this ecosystem of SSAC as well. So while I was going through the presentation, I also saw that there was mention of OWASP, which is a separate body. And it publishes separate cyber security reports on application web testing and things related to that. So how is SSAC collaborating with that body? And they published some security measures, and I saw that SSAC also takes that into consideration in some of the working groups. So I would like to ask, are there any formal collaborations of SSAC with such bodies? And how do you take that into account in your working groups? Thank you.

RICK WILHELM I think you said OWASP?

MOHAMMAD ATIF ALEEM Yeah. Open Web Application Security Project.

RICK WILHELM Yes, I think they operate at a different level than we do, a different level in the stack.

TARA WHALEN Now, there are sometimes collaborations, or we have people who, for example, sit in some different bodies already. We have individual members in an individual capacity, of course, who are in related security groups. And so sometimes work is just coordinated from that perspective. Or there are some overlaps of some of the larger bodies. So there's some, for example, coordination with the IETF in particular ways. And so there's a little bit of coordination in those larger systems. The smaller ones or more targeted ones will tend to be, I would say, one-on-one, because there's an overlap in our communities. People are naturally involved that way. And we know about the work of each other. So when someone provides a report, we may use that as a reference in one of ours, and they may use one of ours in one of theirs. But that's quite different from having a very formalized relationship. So a lot of this work is just we're all working on similar things, and in the places where they overlap, we have some alignment because of the nature of the work that we do.

BARRY LEIBA I'll also say that while we do security, stability, and resiliency of the Internet, our focus is really on security stability, resiliency of the domain name system and that sort of thing. So we sometimes go

broader. We did an advisory on routing security, but it was partly focused on how that affects the DNS. We did a nice one on Internet of Things, and that ventured out a little further than the usual DNS focus. But it also looked at how billions of IoT devices will affect the DNS. So it always comes back to that. So we have a core focus.

ROD RASMUSSEN: Just to add something as well, yeah, lots of us are in various different organizations, and there is some kind of lightweight collaboration that happens informally sometimes. As SSAC Chair, you will sometimes receive a formal letter from some organization. We typically will kindly acknowledge the letter, but because we report to the ICANN Board, there's no formal process for us to liaison, or whatever you want to call it, with another group that's outside of the ICANN sphere.

RAM MOHAN: Other questions? Anything else that SSAC members want to add into the open mic? Anything online, John? Okay, last call. Michael?

MICHAEL PALAGE: Thank you for opening up most of your meetings. It's greatly appreciated. Thank you.

BARRY LEIBA: And I'll say we like it, too, so it's a good choice for everybody.

RAM MOHAN: All right, that wraps the session up. And that returns half an hour back to your lives.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]