ICANN82 | CF – Joint Session: ICANN Board and SSAC
Wednesday, March 12, 2025 – 09:00 to 10:00 PST

WENDY PROFIT: Hello and welcome to the joint session of the ICANN Board and the SSAC. 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. This is a meeting between the SSAC and the Board, so we won't be taking questions from the audience. Interpretation will include English, French and Spanish. Please state your name for the record, the language you'll be speaking if other than English, and speak at a reasonable pace for our interpreters. All are welcome to use the chat, but please note that the private chats are only possible among panelists in the Zoom webinar format. Any message sent by a panelist or a standard attendee to another standard attendee will also be seen by the session host, co-host and other panelists. Hand the floor over to our ICANN Board Chair, Tripti Sinha.

TRIPTI SINHA: Thank you, Wendy. Good morning, everyone. Welcome to the first joint meeting of the day. And this is of course with the SSAC and the Board. This session will be moderated by Jim Galvin, who is SSAC's liaison to the Board. So without any further delay, I'm going to turn it over to Jim. Jim, please.

JIM GALVIN

Thank you, Tripti, and welcome, everyone, and good morning. Just a reminder, there seems to be some confusion among some people. Any SSAC member or Board member here in the audience, please, whenever you want to speak and join us, just raise your hand. There is a roaming mic and it will be available when we need it for those who want to talk. SSAC is hoping for an engaging and vigorous discussion with the Board this morning. We've prepared actually a number of questions that we have for the Board. And I think with that we'll just jump right in here and I'll turn it over to Ram, the SSAC Chair.

RAM MOHAN

Thank you and good morning. Welcome to our friends here in the room, SSAC colleagues and all of you Board members. It's great that you are here for this first session in the morning. We had three topics that we wanted to bring up with you. You see them on the screen. For the first two topics, I'm hoping anyway that they are not going to take too much time. Let's just speak to the How We Meet discussion. There are two aspects to it, the way we look at it in the SSAC. The first is how we meet, as in how we, the ICANN community, meets, and what we're what we're doing in that area. We're very glad that there is a robust community discussion that is starting in this area on how we meet and, and that the Board and other parts of the community are coming together to look at better efficiency, better effectiveness, on how we meet. So we commend you for doing that. We're glad that that process is moving forward. And we think that while you keep costs in mind (this an essential thing), the higher-order priority should be effectiveness and

making sure that effectiveness of the meetings in the community is what you focus on. So that's on how we meet as a community. Let me turn my attention to how we meet as the SSAC and share with you some thoughts in that area. For the SSAC, our priority is, to make sure that our effectiveness as a committee and our effectiveness as a group of people, technical experts, who come together and who engage and provide reasoned advice (it may not be reasonable, but it'll certainly be reasoned advice) to you, that we can do that in a way that is high quality and in a way that is sustainable. The primary place where we find the effectiveness of that is in-person interactions. Various members of the SSAC meet together at these three ICANN meetings in-person. We're very grateful for that. But in these meetings that we come and meet at, a part of what we're doing is SSAC's own organizing work, SSAC's own work on its work parties, et cetera. A bigger part of the SSAC's attendance at the ICANN meetings is actually to go meet with the rest of the community, to engage with the rest of the community, engage with you, the Board, and both disseminate the information we have to share as well as learn from the needs that the community has. So it's terrific for cross-community work and for building and maintaining and enhancing relationships. However (and this may not be something that you, the Board, know about), the single most pivotal and indispensable meeting that the SSAC has is its annual workshop. That annual workshop is the one time where we bring all of the SSAC's members together. We've had them typically in either LA or in D.C. It just is convenient. It takes care of efficiencies from the ICANN staff and other perspectives.

But these meetings are fantastic in terms of strategic planning. But it's also almost, without any exception, the only time where our new people in the SSAC get to meet with the veterans of the SSAC. It's a time where we sit down and we say these six ideas are worth doing more with, and these three ideas we should put on the side. So that kind of planning, that kind of working, is really essential and vital to the SSAC's work and the way the SSAC comes together. So we bring this forward to you as a matter of education and also to lay the groundwork. And we had a very, very productive conversation with members of the ICANN Org's finance team earlier this week, and we had a similar message, which is that ICANN (you the Board and others in the community) is looking at efficiencies, you're looking at how to become better, how to be fiscally more responsible, et cetera. These are important and useful things. We commend you for it. But we want to make sure you understand that we're making the case here (and we will continue to make the case) that this workshop that we have, annual workshop that we have, is essential. And without it, the SSAC that you know and sometimes love will stop being the SSAC that you want. So I'll stop there with the comments and pass it on to any other SSAC members who'd like to say something. Barry?

BARRY LEIBA I wanted to highlight some of the things that Ram said. I'm going back to the meetings like this rather than the workshop, but clearly the workshop is critical to us. But Chris Disspain made a comment in Monday's How We Meet session, basically to the effect that we need to look at what we're accomplishing at these meetings and

what can be cut and what can't. And so I looked at what we, SSAC, are accomplishing at this meeting, and I got four points. One is that we've had work party meetings that engaged all of SSAC in things that normally only a subset are in. But probably more important, it also got the community in the room, and the community made comments. We've only had open meetings in SSAC for a few ICANN meetings, but we're already seeing benefits to our work from having the community in the room. And we don't get that on Zoom. We're having lightning talks (it's a highlight for me of the SSAC meetings) and the DNS Workshop where we're sharing technical information with the community. And the lightning talk sessions in particular have been very popular with the community. And we've gotten a lot of feedback from them on that. We're having joint meetings with the community groups like ALAC and GAC, and a lot of Q&A. And that's also been very useful to us and to the community. And finally, we're able to engage ICANN Org spontaneously. We pulled in ICANN Org people a couple of times this week at the last minute, and you can't get that done in Zoom. Most of this is possible with online meetings. It's just not as effective and it just doesn't work as well. And that falls into the SSAC Workshop; that we could have an online workshop [but] it would not be nearly as effective. We would not get nearly as much done. And I think in the long run, we would all lose. So thank you.

JEFF BEDSER Hi. I'm going to lean into a little bit of what Barry just expressed. Our recruitment to find people that understand this industry and understand the technology of this industry is only benefited by the

opportunities to engage with the broader community. We don't get that within our work parties in a meeting just within SSAC. And as Barry said, they're coming into our rooms. But also SSAC members are having conversations and talking, finding people who say, “Hey, I hear what you're doing. Now that you have an open program, I want to join, I want to contribute what I know.” And you know, we've recruited successfully from IETF for most of our existence, but we really haven't recruited successfully from the registries and the registrars and the content delivery networks, et cetera, until we started really engaging with the community. And that only happens when there's opportunities to engage as a community, not just engage as SSAC.

RAM MOHAN: Thank you. Kurtis?

KURTIS LINDQVIST: Thank you. The feedback on the value of the ICANN meetings and how that's engaged in the community is, of course, very useful. I just want to stress that the How To Meet is about the three ICANN meetings, not about workshops or anything else. That's a separate topic, a separate discussion, with the SO/ACs and whatever other needs there are, but that's not related to How To Meet discussions. Just keep those two separate because that's not what How To Meet discussion is about.

RAM MOHAN I agree. And I think I had said that, but I agree for the record. We have overloaded the term for our purposes for this conversation.

JIM GALVIN Okay. I think with that, unless there's any other comments or suggestions, why don't you move on to your next topic there and talk about the reviews. That's certainly a question the Board has a great deal of interest in.

RAM MOHAN Okay, great. Let's go to the next topic: reviews and bylaws amendments. So we've been involved, and we've been watching the … I don't have the polite word. So we've been watching the work that the Pilot Holistic Review Team has been doing, and we support the idea that that work should be paused until we actually come back and that team and the community comes back and looks at what are we actually trying to do. We don't think that that Pilot Holistic Review Team (really, the design team) should be sitting there talking about structural reform, structural reviews. It's the wrong fit, in our opinion. But at the same time, we note that you have a relentless calendar pressing on you by the bylaws. You have bylaws that tell you you must do reviews at a certain time, in a certain cadence. And we also note that ATRT3 recommendations are not all the way through, but ATRT4 is pressing on you. And there is this thought process that we got to get that going because the bylaws require it. And folks were engineers primarily. We're here to say, "Hey, these your rules aren't fitting. What is actually happening?" So watch what is happening, which is that you need

time. The community and ICANN Org needs time for the reviews to not only happen, but for the recommendations to be rolled through, implemented. The next review should happen when you have implemented the recommendations from the prior ones, and then you assess whether they are having the intended effect or not. But let's not just go forward rolling the next review and the next one just because the bylaws require it. So that's one thing we want to share with you. The second thing is, please be mindful that the bylaws are quite an important part of how trust is built. When you come to the community and you say, "Let's defer the bylaws," that starts to erode trust. So if the bylaws aren't fit for purpose, if there are pieces in it that are not fit for purpose, change the bylaws. Deal with the situation by changing the bylaws, not by circumventing them.

JIM GALVIN Okay, thank you. I think I'll look to Tripti. Want to speak first?

TRIPTI SINHA Thank you, Ram. As you might be aware, we've been having this discussion with all the different constituencies, and in general, people are coalescing around more or less what you summarized, which is that these reviews were intended to keep us honest, to ensure that we are held accountable and are transparent. And because (excuse me, I'm losing my voice) of the outcomes of ATRT3, where there was some ambiguity as to what the outcomes meant, which is not a good place to be or how any review should conclude, that led to the holistic review, the pilot holistic review,

and the CIPs and so forth, and it's in a state of being stuck. That's not good. So we're not really doing justice to the obligations for the bylaws. So we shouldn't be afraid to look at the state of reviews and modify the bylaws and achieve what we want to achieve, which is keeping us honest to all our obligations. So, indeed, that's where we're headed. There are some communities, sections of the community, that would rather we use the ATRT4 modality to achieve exactly that. But that was the intent of ATRT3, and it didn't achieve what we wanted to achieve. So we take a step back and see how we can get our arms around this problem and solve it. So I think we are more or less in agreement, and we don't really see too many outliers in the community as well. And I'm an optimist and I believe we'll get to the right place. Thank you.

RAM MOHAN That's great. Thank you for that.

JIM GALVIN And I'm looking around. I'm not seeing any other hands or comments. So I think we're all in agreement here on that topic. Obviously, very important. So let's move on to getting into the real discussion that we wanted to have here. SSAC has prepared a number of topics, and we have some questions to bring to the Board, and we're looking for some interaction. So back to you, Ram.

RAM MOHAN

Thank you, Jim. So the SSAC Keystone Topics Initiative, if you will, is really a strategic effort on our part to enhance our role as a leading resource in our community on critical security, stability and resiliency issues. And we're appropriate to the broader Internet community as well. And that initiative, the Keystone Topics Initiative, focuses on two parallel tracks. One is on curation and communication, which is focused on taking the existing SSAC advice more accessible, more digestible. So that is one part of it, and the other part is actionable recommendations—develop concrete steps that the SSAC can advocate for within its remit. So those are the two kind of core pieces of it. There are five aspects that we look at in terms of keystone topics: the security, stability and resiliency aspects of Internet governance, alternative namespaces, DNS abuse, new gTLDs and DNSSEC. So what we want to do in the rest of our time together is to initiate a dialogue with you and really invite you to collaborate with us in thinking through what we can do to enhance your mission and our charter, to combine them, to really amplify and to improve what we're doing together. So in order, if you look at the SSR aspects of Internet governance, we currently have two work parties that are doing work that is related to Internet governance areas. Should we go to the next slide, Jim? There you go. Thank you. So we have two pieces of work that is underway. The first is work that we're doing on free and open source software. What we're doing is to describe the extent of free and open source software's used in the DNS and domain name registration infrastructure. We're trying to identify unique characteristics of free and open source development and

particularly point out how that impacts the evaluation and selection of DNS software. And our aim with this work is to raise awareness amongst policymakers about the critical role of free and open source software and Internet infrastructure. You know, we've had conversations where we've heard from regulators talking about supply chain and supply chain vulnerabilities inside of this area. And we are recognizing this is critical infrastructure and it is in some jurisdictions regulated or on its way to being regulated or at least being threatened to be regulated, some somewhere on that spectrum. So we're focused on, on that area, free and open source software. And one of the chairs of that work party is here in attendance to share a little bit about what they're doing. That is one thing. The other work party that we are spending time and effort on is on DNS blocking. Now, several years ago, the SSAC provided a report on DNS blocking, and we said several things, but as time has passed, we have recognized that DNS blocking itself, with the way it is being deployed, as a weapon, as a tool, as it's evolving, there are several jurisdictions that do it as a matter of course. So we're analyzing the technical effectiveness of government-mandated DNS blocking and we're also trying to make clear the consequences of that on the operation of the DNS and the potential effects, upstream/downstream effects, of blocking at the DNS level and the impact on security and stability of the DNS. We're also reviewing and updating our prior guidance. We have two documents that we had published earlier, SAC050 and SAC056. But this one will reflect evolution of the DNS ecosystem. So that gives you kind of the background of what we're doing. But

the discussion we want to have with you are the general questions that you see on the screen. In the past, the way the SSAC worked was we would publish reports and then we would start to think about how are we going to communicate this, who are we going to reach, and then start working with you. We're changing that model. These are works in progress. Both of these are reports that are on a track to come to fruition later this year. But we want to start the planning process with you, start engaging with you, and we want to ask you, how do we engage? Where are the areas where you would like to get our knowledge, our expertise, to be brought to bear? Are there conversations you want us to be a part of that we're not aware of? Are there rooms that you would like to have us be in where we can say things that perhaps you may be more constrained to say? So that's the beginning of a conversation. Before I get to the questions, let me just ask the chairs of both of these working groups if they have any comments that they would like to add. Maarten and Barry say yes. They don't have anything. Greg says he doesn't have anything either.

JIM GALVIN

Okay, thank you. Let me apologize to online participants. I don't know if there's anyone who's just online, and I ask for the table please to keep an eye out. My Internet connection seems to not let me stay in the Zoom room so I can't see hands. But let me first look around the room. And please, anyone in the room, you can raise your hand if you want to speak. Over to Kurtis.

KURTIS LINDQVIST

Thank you. I actually had a question which [inaudible]. So on the first topic, DNS blocking, what type of recommendations would you see making? I mean, it's also because DNS blocking can be both affecting security and stability and not … Right. So there is not DNS. DNS blocking can mean a lot of things. So there has to be some scoping around DNS blocking for it to be … Hence the question is what would recommendations be? Because DNS blocking can have no effect on secure instability, and it can have grave effect on secure disability.

RAM MOHAN

Greg is one of the work party chairs.

GREG AARON

Hi, this is Greg Aaron. I'm the Co-Chair of the party. Kurtis, we're not going to make any recommendations in this paper to the ICANN Board. Instead we're going to lay out when DNS blocking is done and for what motivations. There's actually a wide variety of circumstances that you can have. We will make some recommendations in general to anybody who is either thinking about doing blocking or wants to understand how it works. You're going to talk about, for instance, don't affect people who are outside of your realm of control. You know, for example, if you're blocking at your ISP, make sure you're not blocking and having it leaking into other customers or people who are not your customers.

RAM MOHAN Okay. CB?

GREG AARON Does that make sense?

KURTIS LINDQVIST Yeah.

CHRIS BUCKRIDGE Thanks. So, I'm going to speak a little broadly here. Certainly, I really welcome that this aspect of Internet governance is now part of the key topics that SSAC is identifying. It's obviously a very important period for Internet governance issues, and so having that activity is really critical, I think. I also appreciate the way you describe it. I think this is not something where we want to put the cart before the horse. We shouldn't have Internet governance discussions driving sort of the work or the priorities of SSAC. But I do think there is an opportunity there to make sure that there is ongoing communication and we can identify where work that's coming out of SSAC can be put to good use in Internet governance discussions. I think in relation to the DNS blocking work, that ties in quite naturally to concerns about Internet fragmentation, and that's really been picked up as quite a rhetorical device in a lot of Internet governance discussions. Even if we look to the global Digital Compact that was agreed last year, Internet fragmentation is referenced as something to be avoided. And I think the work that SSAC is doing can very usefully inform that understanding of what Internet fragmentation actually is. I think that's also something

that took place in the Internet Governance Forum, where there was a group on Internet fragmentation which essentially came to the conclusion. I don't know if it has actually concluded yet, but that Internet fragmentation means a number of different things. But one of those things that it means which ties in very precisely to what ICANN does, is a global, interoperable, unfragmented Internet at a technical level. And ICANN's role in those discussions, its role in ongoing discussions, is to bring technical perspective, to bring technical understanding. So to have that informed by the experts in the ICANN community is really important, I think. It boosts and reinforces ICANN's authority to speak to this and hopefully then produces better outcomes in those Internet governance discussions. So I very much appreciate this and look forward to opportunities to coordinate more on how those outcomes develop.

JIM GALVIN Thanks, Chris. So I have Wes in the queue over here and then Tripti.

WES HARDAKER Thanks. Wes Hardaker, RSSAC Liaison to the ICANN Board. Thank you. I always love the SSAC sessions. They get down into the technical weeds like I like to be in. With respect to the first question, I think that there's a number of elements to consider. One, it's a wide problem. I think you know that already if you consider it only with respect to the DNS. The aspect of running a root server for the DNS, for example, involves us considering many elements of software that are not just DNS-based. What routing software do we use? What operating systems do we use? And that dives deep. The

one thing that I would like to pass on from the perspective of RSSAC and the root server operators that have been working for a long time to make sure that the root is stable through diversity of software so that no one vulnerability could take out the system because we don't all run the same thing … And we have worked extensively lately. We're working on producing a document that shows our diversity level, how many different pieces of software are we using. So it's not just whether or not you're using free and open source software and how secure it is and what their bug-tracking system is like and what their response level is like. It's also the diversity to make sure that no one system is vulnerable to any particular thing. And we've worked very hard on the root server side of the world to make sure that the case. So it's just something to consider. I don't know how deep you want to go. One interesting thing that you could take on would be trying to get that bigger perspective. What are all the pieces in resolvers in authoritative sources that need to be considered beyond just the DNS software? What's the entire landscape? Obviously you can't catalog it all, but even the big picture so that people can talk about it better would be a good useful thing to go forward.

RAM MOHAN Maarten, did you want to respond to that?

MAARTEN AERTSEN Sure. So this is Maarten Aertsen. I'm the Co-Chair of the work party. Thank you for your comment. Wes, I think you just mentioned a number of ingredients that went into our scoping discussion. So we

do know this is like a large elephant, and we have chosen to bite a little chunk of it. And the scope that we have chosen is to look at just DNS. So routing was something that was discussed and parked. So if you look at DNS, we've also chosen to scope this only at the like top-level application layer. So we are very much aware about the operating systems, the libraries, etc., etc. But we've also had the commitment to deliver a work product within a reasonable timescale. Sowe made some choices, and I guess if this work proves to be useful to the target audience, which is predominantly policymakers, then we will maybe come back and do another one. But as to your point of diversity, I think … And you also mentioned the keyword "landscape." I think these are two keywords that will appear in the final product. We do try to sketch a lay of the land with respect to the use of open source software at this top application level. And already I think we've been collecting some statistics that we've not seen published before which hopefully would inform future policy discussions when different software are considered to be regulated to inform them that if you regulate this space, don't forget about this particular niche that may look small to you from a certain perspective, but it's definitely not small if you look at Internet infrastructure.

WES HARDAKER Yeah, thank you. I will just end by saying I know that my colleagues in SSAC looked at the entire problem space. I had no doubt about that. The diversity element is certainly one I would love to see passed on to policymakers because anytime we get into that there is a single code point that is in the middle of an important stream,

whether it's HTTP or DNS or anything else, it always turns out badly. So thank you.

JIM GALVIN Thank you, Wes. I have Tripti, Ram, and then Robert.

TRIPTI SINHA I was going to comment on the first question as well, and much of what I was going to say has been said: you said what do we think about free and open source software? I speak more from my professional background as a technologist. I think, for free and open source, the whole environment is a cradle of innovation where it's going to bring minds who can continue to evolve, whatever that problem space is, whatever is being developed. And when you look at the landscape of all the different kinds of software that runs the Internet, we're not just focused on DNS, but routing and switching and all of that. I think doing an inventory would be great. And being unfettered by proprietary needs, driven by the commercial sector is a good thing. So in that regard, open source and free is very good. However, oftentimes what we do is we start to customize the software for our own environments and then that individual moves on. And now you're stuck with a piece of software that's unsupported. So it's a delicate balance. And I know I've been in that situation many, many times where we're very excited about this new open source software that's meeting a particular need, and we have our engineers modify it to suit our particular customer needs, and you get into a problem later on. But when it comes to running critical infrastructure for the global Internet, we should

ensure that we don't get ourselves into that spot. But just an opinion for me.

JIM GALVIN Any additional comment, Maarten?

MAARTEN AERTSEN I recognize this concern, and I think, for our paper, one of the challenges is to disentangle where these concerns relate to the specific license, like whether it's free and open source software or proprietary, and where it relates to your governance, your operational practices, etc. And I think, at least from my personal experience watching some of the European policy debate around software, this is a very hard space to discuss. And I hope we can provide some data from our technical perspective to make those conversations easier in the future.

JIM GALVIN Thank you, Maarten. I'm going to go to Robert next, please.

ROBERT GUERRA Sure. It's Robert Guerra from the SSAC. I just wanted to echo something that Ram mentioned earlier. In an ever complex environment of Internet governance where there are a lot of challenges in the world today, having private spaces to discuss some of the challenges and potential recommendations, I think, going forward would be particularly helpful going forward. We had some lightning talks, and some of those things were addressed. I'll

just mention that one kind of recommendation in regard to some of the challenges is that, for a lot of decisions, a lot of assumptions, in terms of the state of Internet governance, a lot of education has been lost, and I think a lot of educating in terms of the importance that ICANN and many others did many years ago would be very helpful to do again because I think that institutional knowledge may have been lost. Thank you.

JIM GALVIN Thank you, Robert. Any comment or response from anyone. I might look to CB. No? Okay, thank you. I think, with that, we're going to draw a line onto this conversation. We'll let Ram get the last word here and move on to some other topics.

RAM MOHAN Thank you. So on this topic, the homework is really for you, the Board. What we want to ask you is how do you want to effectively utilize forthcoming work from the SSAC? We don't want to just write a report and publish it, send you a set of recommendations, and you review it, and then you send us a letter back that says, “Thank you. We've, we've accepted your recommendations,” or,” We've done” whatever. So we want to foster collaboration. We want to maximize the impact. So what we want to hear from you is how do you want us to be present? Where do you want us to be present? How do you want to leverage the work that is coming out? And so we commend those to your attention. But we will leave this

with you because we don't know where these things will resonate and where they won't resonate. You do, so help us help you.

JIM GALVIN CK, please.

CHRISTIAN KAUFMANN Well, the short answer would be I don't know yet. So I'm chairing the BTC right now, and especially it relates to alternative namespace. It's one of our pet projects and our hobbies. So it's something we follow quite closely and have an eye on what it means for us as ICANN but specifically what it means for the technology; how can they work together? Or not. So far we relied on OCTO for this kind of information. One example is that OCTO produced this OCTO 34 document just recently which talks a little bit about blockchain, DNS and this kind of stuff. And to be honest, that was, so far, our main input vector to form opinions about it. Funnily and probably not completely unrelated, Jim contacted me a couple of days ago and talked about the keystones and, I guess, your offer. So my intention is at the next BTC meeting to bring your offer and see what we can do in that regard and how collaboration could look like. I think right now we don't have any particular questions or ideas. And as much as we like documents, I think we probably would look for something more specific where we have a set of questions and, if I may use the word "outsourcing," outsource and rely on your expertise in that field. But we also got to see that it kind of fits to the things we look at in general and probably is either complementary with OCTO or goes in the same

direction so that we get a more comprehensive idea about it. But we certainly will come back to that—hence my "not yet" comment. Thanks.

RAM MOHAN

Thanks, CK. And in this area, for the integration of alternative namespaces, we're starting up a work party also just to focus on it. We have a charter that has just been built, CK. So if you have questions, if you have areas that you think are relevant for us to look at, it's a great moment to bring those in. One of the work party chairs is here: Rick. Did you want to speak just briefly to where the charter is so far and kind of where we're going, Rick?

CHRISTIAN KAUFMANN

As he's looking for the microphone, that actually could be another idea, that instead of we brainstorming what is the missing puzzle piece in our knowledge and understanding that, we actually turn it around a little bit and say, "Now, as you have a charter, do you want to come a couple of minutes (15, 20) and actually present on it?" And then we see how these things could fit together. It might be an easier approach instead of you waiting for us to come up with something. But, please.

RICK WILHELM

I'm Rick Wilhelm. I'm Co-Chair of the work party that we're forming in the SSAC to discuss this topic—Co-Chair with Matt Thomas. We're jointly taking this on, and there's some other group that's sort of forming around it. The big thing that we're working on is

focusing right now on the charter out. The draft charter, I assume, will get over to the Board so you can take a look at it, offer some input, ask some questions, that sort of thing. Main thing we're focusing right now is areas related to the life cycle of the domain because the life cycle of the domain as it goes through the registration process, the aging process, other events in its life cycle related to renewals, domain renewals, transfers, things like that, such that if anyone wants to integrate with the DNS with their alternative namespaces and things like that, such that they properly understand and relate to the changes in the domain state and changes that they might need to be aware of that happen from outside of their system, changes that happen in the DNS ecosystem and then also if they want to integrate with and help to cause changes to that state so those systems can interoperate properly such that they don't negatively impact the integrity of DNS and unified root … Not quite standing on one foot, but hopefully that's a good enough summary.

CHRISTIAN KAUFMANN Thank you. Do you have a fancy name already for your subgroup?

RICK WILHELM It wouldn't be a subgroup if we didn't have a fancy name. I was not responsible for the backronym as it's known. It's called RIDE, Responsible Integration to the DNS Ecosystem.

CHRISTIAN KAUFMANN Thank you.

RICK WILHELM It's not only a backronym, but it's a compound backronym, so that gives us extra points.

CHRISTIAN KAUFMANN Certainly.

RICK WILHELM Thank you.

JIM GALVIN Okay, thank you. Tripti, please.

TRIPTI SINHA Ram, as we discussed yesterday, as your work matures on RIDE, at some point in the future, you could use this forum to do a presentation and tell us where you stand and also how it would impact our space—things that the Board should be aware of and so forth. So that would be good. Do a deeper dive. I think that would be time well spent like you did on name collision some meetings ago.

RAM MOHAN Right. I like that idea. Tripti. And we'll discuss it inside the SSAC. Perhaps we work alongside OCTO and others in the community. Maybe it's a part of Tech Day or something like that where it begins

with a 101 but it actually then gets into what are the challenges and what are the risks. Okay, I love the idea, but I'll see if the rest of my committee members also love it and then we'll come back to you.

JIM GALVIN Thank you. We have Maarten.

MAARTEN BOTTERMAN Hello. Thank you for this. Excellent. Always a very good discussion. And the focus on things is very, very good. I do believe, with Christian: don't wait for us until you come up with what to do next. And if we have ideas, we'll come to it. But I'd also like to ask again on your attention to the strategic plan that we are about to adopt. I think it's vitally well received, but we are now to make it happen. And specific strategic objective has been dedicated to strengthening the stability and security of the Internet unique identifier system. Help us make that more practical over the years to come; not everything at the same time, but we count on your input there too.

RAM MOHAN Maarten, thank you. That's really great. I had intended to speak to it. I simply missed speaking to it. We recognize that the strategic plan has it. It's an essential component. And that actually is what informs the second question there, which is on safeguarding user trust and confidence in the DNS. That is informed by what you have

in the strategic plan. You can count on us to engage and to work together.

JIM GALVIN Okay. I'm not seeing any other hands, nothing in the Zoom room, which I'm unfortunately not a part of. Okay, let's move on to the next topic.

RAM MOHAN This is our last topic to discuss with you. And inside of DNS abuse and improving the integrity of the DNS (that's a core focus), I want to spend just a moment speaking about RDDS and RDRS, those systems. And really what I want to bring in front of the Board is not a discussion about access to the data elements. There is a lot of debate, there's a lot of discussion, on access to the data elements, privacy versus security, etc. And there is a good and long discussion that is worth having, but not worth having in this conversation. What we want to bring to your attention is that the SSAC has consistently advised that timely access to registration data is essential for effectively addressing DNS abuse. And we know that the ongoing development of RDRS and RDDS is limited in actually how it can be a viable mechanism for providing the necessary access for law enforcement and security researchers. Anecdotally I have heard, for instance, that to some of the providers who have the information, if you hit more than 10 queries in a given amount of time, you're locked out and you have to wait for some amount of time, which could be quite a bit of time before you can get access to those systems again. Now, that really impedes security

investigations. That impedes what law enforcement needs to do. So I want to focus the conversation and make sure that the Board, the community, understands that timely access to registration data is an essential thing. I don't want to sit here and debate, when you have access, what is it you're accessing? Is it thin, is it thick? All of those. There are important discussions to be had there. But in the time we have here, I want to make sure that we bring some spotlight and recognition that I would go so far as to say that that is broken in many ways, and it's an impediment for law enforcement. It's an impediment for security researchers. Jeff?

JEFF BEDSER

Thank you. I'm going to take it a step further, Ram, but your point is to emphasize that it's not just security researchers and law enforcement. This is about mitigation within our industry. You can't determine the registrar without access to this data. The registrar cannot be informed that there's abuse without this mechanism. All the mitigations we're trying to deal with to take the harms down that are part of the obligations are all rely on this system functioning flawlessly for access to it. So it's the simplest point of, "is a domain registered? Which registrar is it? That data is not available. We have a stopping block."

JIM GALVIN

So let me just use moderator's prerogative for a moment, then I'm going to look to Becky to respond. I want to make sure to clarify one particular point, especially that which Jeff was making. It is true that the IANA ID and the registrar information is available, and it is

public information. We do all understand that. The issue is, when one wants to get that data, there are sometimes infrastructure restrictions. So registries and registrars may provide, for various reasons, limits on how often you can get that data and ask for it. And that's not a part of this conversation in timely access. So that's the key thing from an infrastructure point of view that needs to be brought to bear on this topic. And let me turn first then to Becky to respond.

BECKY BURR

Thanks. And thank you for clarifying that because I was freaking out because I was pretty sure I could find out who the registrar was. First of all, let me say I think that the Board is of a united mind, that access to registrant data is important, that there are legitimate uses for it and that timely access is critical. We have been working on this RDRS experiment. That experiment first of all will never solve the security research aspect of this because as I understand it, if you are doing not just a single investigation of security research, what you need is data that can be searched and organized and looked at for patterns and that kind of stuff. So I want to make sure we're talking carefully about sort of distinguishing the "I'm a security researcher. I need bulk data from the IM law enforcement, and I need to find out who's behind this bad behavior." Now speaking in my personal capacity, I've wondered why it wasn't possible to have a conversation that gives you access to data that has direct identifiers removed in a way so that if you identify a pattern, you can then get access to the data. And I don't know where the conversations have gone on that. That

that is just not part of the RRDRs thing. With RDRS, the Board has concluded that we've learned what we're going to learn from the pilot, and we need to move forward with making a sufficiently robust system that addresses that. We want to keep RDRs up and running until a fully robust system is built. And that is going to require sort of mapping some of the SSAD policy requirements onto RDRS. We think it requires the participation of all registrars. We think it requires that privacy and proxy data be accessed through that system. And we also think that there's a big issue with APIs—APIs for users and APIs for registrars. As we just saw with the Tucows withdrawal from the system, there are significant inefficiencies in the way the current system is operating. The problem is that is not going to solve the, "are you guaranteed to get timely information?" So I just want to put this on the table right now. We live in a world where the data controller, which is not ICANN at this moment, although some of us would have esoteric arguments about those kinds of things … ICANN doesn't have the data at this moment. And so in the end, the decision about whether to release data is going to be made by an individual registrar. And we have not figured out a way to get past that. That does appear to be what the law requires. And Steve and I have had many conversations about why you would ever write a law compliance with which cannot be automated. But that's what we have here. So I feel like I'm not solving your problem here. I do think that there are productive conversations that could be had with respect to security research. One of the problems with the security research is we don't know how to identify who is actually a security researcher

and who is not. That's a big problem. We have had a problem with law enforcement in the sense that it's very difficult to confirm that somebody asking for data is in fact law enforcement unless you know them. We've had very productive conversations with the Public Safety Working Group, and they are now working on a system that will provide authentication, and that should help a lot. Now, it is not going to ensure that every time law enforcement asks for data, they're going to get it, because there are a lot of folks in the world who will give data to some law enforcement agencies and not to others. And again, they are deciding what they're allowed to do under applicable law, and it's hard for us to change that. So we would very much like to make the world a better place and have a simple, direct, clean way to seek the data, to get it based on the legitimate interest in applicable law. If you're asking if there's a way that ICANN can guarantee that data be released, the answer is we haven't identified that yet.

RAM MOHAN Yeah, I think really the question is about finding ways to ensure, as Jeff said so clearly, that when we want to mitigate DNS abuse problems, access does not get cut off in an opaque manner. We don't understand why access is suddenly cut off. We just know that it does get cut off. And we also know that that impedes mitigation. It impedes law enforcement. So, that's really the ask

BECKY BURR Yeah, that's an interesting conversation because the same rate-limiting systems that registrars use to prevent people scraping the

data for phishing and spam kinds of things I think get in the way of a significant …. And again, a solution to that turns on being able to identify who's a security researcher and distinguishing those from likely spammers. So, just as a practical matter, is there a way to do something like what the PSWG is for authenticating law enforcement, for authenticating security researchers? That would be to my mind a significant step forward. But every time I've asked about it, I've been told the answer is, "No. They're not all universe associated with universities, are not all associated with corporations that we know." But if you guys have a way of thinking about that, that, I think, could move the ball forward.

RAM MOHAN

Thanks Becky. That's very useful. I recognize that we are one minute left, so I think we will have to take the rest of the conversation on this offline. I do want to go just briefly to the next slide, and I wanted to say something really good that has happened. On new gTLDs, the SSAC had provided recommendations on NCAP. The Board had accepted those, and ICANN Org is working on those things. At this meeting we had a really positive and effective interaction with ICANN Org. And Kurtis, you have an excellent team there. And we were discussing it. We asked if folks from that responsible group could come in real time. They dropped other things, they came into the room, they sat down with us, and it turned out that what we had pointed out or what we had thought was a problem was merely a mistake in what was being written in the applicant guidebook, and what could have become some kind of an escalation got solved very quickly. So it's

kind of a great example of collaboration, working together to get good things going. So we don't want to be a group that just comes and says things aren't working. These things are working. We really enjoy those collaborations with your team and with OCTO and other technical parts of the organization. So commend that to you. And we will submit a response to the public comment proceeding that points out that inconsistency that will get fixed.

JIM GALVIN And with that, we are actually over time. I apologize to those who didn't get a chance to speak, but we are adjourned.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]