ICANN83 | PF – SSAC Work Session: FOSS & RIDE Work Parties
Wednesday, June 11, 2025 – 15:30 to 17:00 CEST

KATHY SCHNITT

Hello and welcome to the SSAC session for The Responsible Integration into the DNS Ecosystem Work Party. My name is Kathy and I'm the participation manager for the 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 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, I'm happy to hand the floor over to Rick Wilhelm.

RICK WILHELM

Very good. Thank you, I'm Rick Wilhelm. One of the things about doing these at an ICANN meeting is that I don't do get to do the introduction. Staff gets to do that. So what fun is that. Thank you everybody for coming. We've got some familiar faces here for the working party. And then we've got a bunch of other folks that are hanging out because it's in session. And this is the SSAC agenda that we follow. This is a work party meeting. And so there's

necessarily a little bit of sausage that will be made here today. So we apologize in advance to any vegetarians that are present.

The context here was established by the Lightning Talk that we just went through in advance where we're talking about that. And do I have sufficiently magical powers to be able to share? I will in just one second. And then the mayhem shall begin. So because I'm going to do is I'm going to share the deck. We're going to flip through it because and we got thumbs up.

Since this is a work party session, it doesn't have the polish of the Lightning Talk Session, because while Barry is here, he's not in charge. And so therefore you have to deal with a certain amount of anarchy. That's a compliment. That's very clearly a compliment. Yeah. And if you didn't take it as a compliment, go get another coffee outside. Okay. No, not with Warren for sure. Don't want to take it outside.

I can see hands, but it's easier for me if you're in the room and at the table to just wave at me. But then I can see hands in the in the Zoom queue too. So if you're if you're a working party member and you're remote and you want to chime in, please do that. So just to remind everybody where we last left our intrepid adventures, right?

We're going to be wanting to, we had this call with staff about the next round. And I'm flipping the slide flipping through the slides where the staff said that, hey, look, we're sticking to what is there, and ICP-3 and NCAP recommendations. And then the working party agreed that, hey, look, we got to be careful to make sure that

that there's potential for collision related to things that are existing in these alternate namespaces that could be coming in.

And so therefore, we want to address some of these issues via this separate initiative. And then lo and behold, the next round AGB has come out. And so we're going to think about a public comment. And then we have these goals for the work party. But most importantly, we want to put a document together, a public comment related to next round considerations. We want to get these next round considerations out of the way so that RIDE can get to its business with existing TLDs and their normal operations, to kind of separate the concerns between existing TLDs and emerging TLDs.

So we're going to deal with this stuff on the right, emerging TLDs, such that once we're done with that, we will focus on existing TLDs, which is going to be complicated enough, but it has to do with things like lifecycle management, resolution, security vulnerabilities, managing abuse, things like that. We've got to kind of get this stuff related to emerging TLDs out of the way. So that's the context.

We talk about a comment around the next round AGB. One of the things that we haven't done, but remains a, but is a bit of a to-do is we talked about this being a comment on the AGB. We've got to find the right section related to the AGB for this to be a comment about, which kind of seems self-evident, but it's important that if you're going to do a comment on the AGB, then you need to say

what you're going to comment on about the AGB. So we've got to kind of anchor this text. I haven't cracked open the AGB.

It's not a small document. Someone here is going to blurt out how many pages it has, probably within the next two minutes, but it's big. I think big is a good adjective, sizable, massive, huge, but it's not something I think you want to read on your phone, even though plenty of us have read very large novels on our phones in airports and things like that. So we've got to anchor this comment in the chat, and thank you, Michael, for throwing a link through the AGB. Someone's going to run WC on that thing after they download it, and then we'll all find out how big it is.

So we have a rough outline. We've got a goal of this document, alert ICANN and the broader community. There's a rough goal. And then we've got a rough outline here, and so what I'd like to pivot on and talk about in this session are thoughts related to the outline and how we can work on refining this outline and come up with things related to the scope. You can see at the bottom of this in the notes section of the slide, I was dutifully, diligently documenting Ram's comments during the last session, especially that he was coming, so I captured those things.

So I want to throw it open, get us out of monologue mode into discussion mode, and get y'all's thoughts and about the outline of things we want to capture, key points we want to make, and things like that. So let's see what folks have to say and see if any of this

provokes any discussion. Let me stop there, see if we've got anybody that has anything to say.

WARREN KUMARI 395.

RICK WILHELM 395 pages. So we've got our first answer. Did not break the 400-page barrier, so the over-under at 400, the under pays, so check your betting apps. And John seems to be making a comment. Thank you, John.

JOHN LEVINE Yeah. I mean, my main concern here, which I think is shared by a lot of us, is somebody's going to show up with a blockchain full of names and say, we're just going to add these. And I want to make sure that this ICANN Ease covers that.

RICK WILHELM Sure. Okay, so thank you. And then let me flip over to Warren.

WARREN KUMARI Yeah. I mean, I think that the main thing that we want is for there to be clarity ahead of time. A lot of the drama in the last round was, the round was well underway when we ran into the HomeCorp mail stuff, and that threw a lot of wrenches into various sets of gears. Having clarity ahead of time of what will happen if somebody

comes along and says, I have a million names. I have a clear community of users. I should have this because I've got that. Like, not figuring that out on the fly either. You should get it because you have a community. That's not a community. You should not have sold these names. There are many different answers. But having transparency and clarity ahead of time is the important bit. Even if it's not actually published, as long as there is a plan on what to do.

RICK WILHELM

Very good. And bit not in the sort that can be flipped, but bit in the sort of bit of the piece. And I think that there also, I think that we within the RIDE team also need to make sure that we understand the community process, which is something I personally am not an expert in. There was a link floating about to it last time when we had the discussion with staff. But there is a community process. How does an applicant go? This is for community-based TLDs. And that link may show up in the chat. I believe that that link is publicly published. Blah, blah, blah. Community priority evaluation. Thank you. There's an acronym there. Thank you, Danielle. CPE is the term. And there's a document that's published. But I think that we also within the SSAC need to make sure that we're clear on how that process works.

I guess another question is like, what happens if people don't take that path? And we might be, and thank you, Marika. Is Marika in the back? I'm going to turn awkwardly around because I'm not very flexible. There she is. Of course, I turned over the wrong shoulder.

Do you want to come to the table, Marika? Not really. I don't want to come to the table. So, I got that one right. But Marika was-- and please, we might end up press-ganging Marika into commenting here. Because it occurs to me that as Michael has helpfully done some control F in search in that .8128 community priority evaluation might be a good spot for us to anchor our comment. Hypothetically, we can put that on our shortlist.

And then Marika is talking about the community priority evaluation process. And this is one of our topics that we talked about. Marika, do you want to talk a little bit about the situation that Warren explained and how the CPE might help address this concern?

MARIKA KONINGS

Yeah, thanks. Hi, everyone. This is Marika. So, I'm the lead for the new gTLD Program. I'm definitely not our SME on CPE, but I'm happy to give my best Jared imitation here. So, CPE is a mechanism within the program that's intended to resolve contention. So, this only comes into play if there is contention between strings. So, either that's direct contention, identical strings, or strings have been placed in a contention set for other reasons. If in that case, an application has identified themselves as a community application, they have the option to select CPE, which is community priority evaluation. Because the concept is if you are found to be a community, you will prevail in that contention set.

So, if an applicant selects that evaluation or that option to go to CPE, they will be evaluated by a third-party panel. And that panel

will determine whether the community-based application fulfills the CPE criteria and should receive a priority or not. Applicants designating their applications as community-based are required to respond to a set of questions in the application form so that they provide relevant information about their community. And that is used for them to be able to decide and will be evaluated as part of CPE. They're not required to, because again, there's a cost involved in this evaluation. But when they go to the evaluation, they're evaluated against four main criteria. So, one is community establishment. Second is nexus between proposed string and community. The third is registration policies. And then the fourth one is community endorsement.

So, if an applicant comes out successful in this evaluation, there's a scoring associated with each of these criteria. Community has spent quite some time working on those and defining the criteria and what those consist of. That's currently also part of the applicant guidebook and out for public comment. But if the CPE applicant receives a passing score, so they will get a priority in the contention set and come out as the prevailing applicant.

Having said that, if there are multiple community applicants for the same string, and they would all be determined as passing this evaluation, they would still go to an ICANN auction. That's the mechanism we have to resolve a contention. So, either you prevail in CPE, or if you don't prevail, then you will still have the opportunity to participate in that auction.

So, I think that's in a nutshell. I think as we shared on the call we had as well, this evaluation doesn't give specific consideration to whether someone is an alternate namespace. But it will, for example, look at how many members do you have. And again, that could either be in an alternate namespace, or that can be on your mailing list, or whoever visits your meetings or conferences. So, there are several ways in which applicants are able to demonstrate against how they meet the different criteria. But it's a third-party panel that will do their evaluation.

And there are also opportunities to, of course, object. So, if a community, someone claims to represent a community, but members of that community are not in line with that, or believe that they're not being represented there, they have an opportunity as well to provide that input. Similar, if there's support and the community indicates, yes, this is what we see as representing our community, they're able to do that as well. And that's also input that goes to the evaluator. So, I think that's a bit in a nutshell what CPE is all about.

RICK WILHELM

Super helpful. Not sure how you remember all that. But you've obviously been living it for the past 10 months. I think that in listening to that and trying to parse it in real time, and trying to match it up with a fair bit of what I've been hearing over the weeks, not been months, but the weeks from days from Warren, and I don't

want to like solely put it on Warren, but I want to give it, I said it in giving him credit.

What the third-party panel that's doing the evaluation for the community, the scoring process that they are using, I'm wondering if some of the concerns that we're talking about here in and around RIDE are, if the place where we should be commenting about the considerations related to name collisions, if we should be highlighting those concerns in the context of the scoring in the community criteria.

Because as, as Warren was saying, if someone is applying for a particular label, and they've sold and are operating in an alternate namespace, a whole bunch of these labels, and then they want to get a TLD string, and then have labels in the ICP-3 DNS, and integrate those labels automagically into the ICP-3 DNS, the labels that they've already sold in their alternate, in their other naming system, that represents a certain community of a certain size. If someone else has a community of a certain size, and they, let's say they have a similar label, but they haven't done anything infrastructure-related, I think what Warren's getting at is that they would potentially cause a different kind of, that could cause different havoc in the infrastructure.

And I wonder if the area where the SSAC should make its comment is related to the scoring and the criteria there to make sure that that gets the right emphasis. Am I picking up that correctly? Because we would need to anchor our comments somewhere. We just can't

say, we need to think about this. We need to think about it in a certain spot. Let me stop.

WARREN KUMARI

I think there's a couple of different ways that this could go well or badly, right? It could be, for example, I decide that I like hats. And so I'm going to launch a new web three domain name thing, give people their names for a penny, and then say, look, clearly I have a community of people who care about hats. If two people apply for .hats, I should win it because I have this community. Like, is that a valid community type thing?

Another concern is if somebody has been selling off the names for .hat and they've got a couple of million users, for example. Even if there isn't a contention, if somebody else applies for .hats, the use of that TLD in the real ICANN world, that TLD is not going to work as well because people are already using the name in a different namespace. The applicant in the ICANN DNS world is going to have a less valuable and less useful name. Their registrants are going to be harmed. And the people in the other namespace are potentially going to be harmed as well.

So it's not just the collision between multiple people applying for the name, which is where we end up in like the CPE, the collision part, or sorry, the contention set. But also if somebody applies for a name which is already in wide use in another namespace, potentially the TLD doesn't work as well. So some of it is community evaluation and contention set. Some of it is also just

warning this good you're buying might already be polluted or tainted.

RICK WILHELM

Yeah, so it's two parts to that. Yeah, thank you. Thank you, Warren. Please.

MARIKA KONINGS

Yeah, thanks. And yeah, I think Warren makes very, very good points, or at least on what is currently in place, maybe just to mention as well on the hats example. You really need to demonstrate that you're representing the hats community, which is probably not a very easy thing. You have to demonstrate, are you the organizing body for the community? So are you the organizing body for the community of hats? Are you able to demonstrate that you have active engagement with community members?

So again, hats is a very broadly defined term. So if you look at the criteria, they're very specific about what needs to be demonstrated to really make sure that you're indeed representing that community and are able to show as well the nexus between as well the string and the community.

So again, maybe it's, if you're dealing with people that wear black hats, your nexus would be the black hat wearers. And there you may be able to demonstrate if you can show that you're really only representing that community that that nexus exists. But hats is a

very general term where I think many could say, well, you don't represent me, I wear white hats.

So, yeah, but it may be worth looking at that. But it says it's very specifically focused on resolving contention. This doesn't deal with the situation if someone claims to be a community. And indeed, there may be an alternate namespace with the same name that wouldn't get caught in something like this, if they're the single applicant for that in the new gTLD program.

RICK WILHELM I'm going to go to Russ first, who has him in the room now, come to you Maarten. Russ, please go ahead. You're muted Russ.

RUSS MUNDY Oh, ah, got the Zoom mute, but not the other mute. Sorry about that. Well, I wanted to ask if the work party felt that it was necessary or appropriate to make some clarifying statements about the role of the TRT for name collisions outside of the ICT3 DNS. Because my recollection from earlier discussions is that the NCAP report inferred that it, well, said it was only dealing with DNS collisions and not collisions outside or named systems outside of the DNS. And I think that's also a concern that was discussed here. So, do we need to say something for clarification purposes about TRT and NCAP guidance?

RICK WILHELM

Thank you, Russ, very much for the question. Warren's eyes lit up when you asked the question. And so, since he moved first, I'll go to Warren. Warren, please go ahead.

WARREN KUMARI

Thank you. So, yeah, there was a bunch of discussion in NCAP about whether or not alternate name resolution things should be in scope or not. And I believe that we explicitly decided that they're not. But there is mention that the TRT should have wide latitude and should be able to consider other things as well. And there's, I think, a single sentence that mentions potentially including other name resolution systems or something.

When we were having this discussion in the RIDE work party and in SSAC, it took us a fair amount of time to try and find that specific bit of advice mentioning potentially other things, too. I think it might even just be a footnote. And so, potentially, we could point a big, like, hey, there's an arrow here. Like, we mentioned that you should pay attention to this. So, maybe just drawing more attention to that. But yeah, the NCAP group explicitly said we're not going to discuss this, I think, because we realized at the time it was hard and we needed to get done at some point.

RICK WILHELM

Thank you, Warren. That's consistent with my recollection. I'm looking at Suzanne, the NCAP chair, to see if she wants to come off

mute at all. Sure. We'll drag Suzanne to the mic. It seems to be our habit today.

SUZANNE WOOLF

Something like that. So, yeah, I'm thinking that we do probably need to at least clarify what the NCAP work did say that's applicable to non-DNS naming systems and linkage between DNS and non-DNS naming systems. Part of the background to keep in mind that I think also needs to be amplified a little bit is just that one of the key findings of the NCAP research work was that because of the way the DNS has evolved technically and economically, it's a great deal more difficult than it was 15 years ago to find reliable, public, comprehensive data about all of the things you would want to know about DNS and how leaks or name collisions are happening.

So there's a general directive we ended up giving to the review teams that we expect would be doing some of this evaluation of name collisions that we're going to have to make sure these are very knowledgeable people and that they are willing to and able to be a little bit creative how they find out what name collisions exist, how widespread they are, what their characteristics are, just because the information we based the older generation of evaluations on is not as easily available, is not as reliable. And I think that applies equally or more so to potential collisions between DNS names and non-DNS names.

And again, part of what we have to emphasize in any timely way such that it goes into the AGB review and revisions is just that that

applies equally. You know, that advice that you got to be, you got to dig into things and you have to be both knowledgeable and a little bit creative about how to study these potential challenges.

RICK WILHELM: Very good. Thank you. Warren has two fingers.

WARREN KUMARI: Yeah, there's a Hitchhiker's Guide quote, time is an illusion, lunchtime doubly so. And I think sort of it applies to this as well. When we were doing a bunch of the NCAP work, we discovered it's really hard to find collisions in the DNS, right? They could be happening in private companies, they could be happening and being hidden by a bunch of rules and recursive resolvers and authoritative resolvers. You don't have good visibility. That's hard. Finding collisions between the DNS and other name systems is orders of magnitude harder because these queries don't show up where you would expect them to.

So I have a lot of sympathy for whoever ends up being in the TRT. We've given them a very hard job to try to figure out. The easy answer is, well, if they're not showing up in the DNS and we can't see them, it doesn't matter. Unfortunately, that doesn't really work because you don't know who won't be able to resolve the name and have it go somewhere and not hit the DNS. I worded that poorly.

RICK WILHELM

No, but there's an old cartoon in the New Yorker about the guy that's looking for his keys. And he's looking for him under the light. It's a cartoon or a joke, depending on how old you are. And it's looking for him under the light. And some guy says, where'd you lose him? I lost him over there. Why are you looking here? The light is better here. And it's a little bit of that. Suzanne also has two fingers.

SUZANNE WOOLF

Yeah, actually, Warren's invocation of time as a factor actually reminds me of another thing, which is just that I think it's good to have. We're trying to set up a comment for the new guidebook that imposes a deadline on us, which I think creates some positive, as in good pressure, on us to decide what we want to say about this. Because I think it's a good idea to say something. And what we're hearing is that it's going to be a little bit of work to settle on exactly what needs to be said. But I think having that deadline is healthy.

RICK WILHELM

Thank you, Suzanne. Appreciate that. Thank you, Russ, for that very good and thought-provoking question. Maarten, please go ahead.

MAARTEN AERTSEN

This is Maarten, for the record. I had a clarifying question for Marika. You mentioned the need to demonstrate a relationship and engagement with members. I was just wondering, could it be that that's inherent in running an alternate namespace, that you meet those criteria by the sole fact that you are coordinating a namespace?

MARIKA KONINGS

That's probably a determination for the panel to make. We're not doing the evaluation, so we're setting out the criteria. I think with the IRT, we discussed quite a few examples. So those may be helpful to review if you really want to dig into what is the intent behind it. But as I said, it's a third party that will be doing, at the end of the day, the evaluation. So they will look at all factors. And again, they're scoring for the different elements or different criteria.

So it is possible that someone may pass one criteria, but not pass another one. But at the end of the day, the overall score, they need to have a passing score for all those. No, I think it's a total score. And then I would need to double check. But I think there's a total score that they need to pass. But I think there are certain criteria that if they don't pass that one, it's not possible to actually meet the overall score, because I think they're deemed more important. I think I did see Anne in the room. I think she was on the top of her head. So what are the criteria that have to be passed?

ANNE AIKMAN-SCALESE Well, there are four categories of criteria, and you have to get a total of 12 out of 16 points. And so we've run some hypotheticals. And it's really not all that easy to pass.

MARIKA KONINGS So Anne is a member of the IRT, because obviously staff has worked on this very closely with the IRT to come to agreement on what it needs to look like, and indeed what are the important elements of it.

MAARTEN AERTSEN Thank you for the clarification.

RICK WILHELM The community evaluation panel is different than the technical review team, just so also everybody knows. We've got two different groups. Everybody should know that, because there's different skills, different things like that. And so those are different processes. Warren has his hand up. Warren, please go ahead.

WARREN KUMARI Thank you. Somewhat related to that, I'm concerned that we might only be focusing on what happens if there is a collision between two people applying, or if one of them is claiming to be a community, or they're both claiming to be a community. You could

quite easily also have something where there is a string that's being widely used in an alternative name resolution system.

Like an example, this would be like .wallet or .crypto. If they don't apply for the string, the people operating those, but somebody else does, it's not a collision. There's no contention here. It's just a standard name collision type problem. And so if the people currently running .crypto in the Web3 world don't apply, but I as a normal DNS user does, the TLD that I end up winning, or whatever the correct term is, isn't actually going to work the way I expect it will. There'll be some set of users currently using the space who will be affected. Some of my users will be affected. That's not a contention or a community thing. It's just a, wow, this ended badly, collision.

RICK WILHELM Yeah, but we'll go to John. John, please go ahead.

JOHN LEVINE I agree with everything that Warren says, but I would point out that the people with blockchains full of names have things that look like DNS records, but aren't DNS records. All the ones I've seen, I would say, even if they wanted to have some way to say, oh, we're just going to fix the contentions by preemptively registering all the names we already have. It doesn't work because the semantics of the DNS and the semantics of their blockchain thing are different and the meanings of the registrations are different.

Personally, I think we're likely to find that it's an insoluble mess and we should be prepared for an outcome that says, if there's a significant blockchain of these names, we shouldn't delegate it at all because it can't work. I'm not saying that is necessarily the answer, but I think that is an entirely plausible outcome.

WARREN KUMARI

I started jumping in to be like, no, you're wrong. Somehow these will collide. And then you said, yeah, that's going to end up a mess and they might cause issue. And I was just like, I remove my stinky eye.

RICK WILHELM

So, are you saying, hypothetically, if someone, they're operating a blockchain and they're using a label and they also happen to be operating in blockchain with a naming system where they're purposefully imitating the dot separated convention of the ICP-3 route, I'm choosing these words ever so precisely. And so they're choosing to do that. And then ICANN opens up the next round and then they purposefully choose not to apply for said label and they just say, meh. And then someone else, John Levine goes and ratchets down his application fee and just no one else applies for it and John gets it. I'm just picking on you because you happen to be smiling.

JOHN LEVINE I'm perfectly happy to have you chuck these softballs at me. Yeah, no, I'm saying that it is entirely possible that this group could decide that, well, there's enough of these things that look similar enough. Or imagine I decided to register dot onion, like, the number of dot onion names in the DNS is zero. The number of dot onion names in spaces that smell like the DNS is pretty high. I don't think there's any way you could make that work.

RICK WILHELM Well, I mean, dot onion, as we all know, is a special, special case.

JOHN LEVINE Yeah, but, I mean, the ITF diked that one out and the ITF has had arguments about diking the blockchain ones out, which I don't think are going to go anywhere. But whole point is there's an existing set of names that look a lot like DNS names, but aren't. And I think that's likely to end up being very confusing.

WARREN KUMARI I mean, I possibly have a different example. The Brave browser supports .wallet or the wallet system. They end things in something, something, something, .wallet. That is not an ICANN TLD, but it seems like a valuable name that somebody might apply for. If there are a bunch of people using these .wallet names, and I'll point out it's incredibly difficult to measure the usage of this thing by design, but if somebody were to apply for the .wallet TLD,

and it wasn't Brave slash the people already using that string, bad things might happen. Yep, if they run unopposed.

In the same way that we discovered that if somebody had applied for .corp or .home or .mail, even if they weren't the people using that, it potentially ends badly. I think it's a similar the fact it's being used in an alternate name resolution system or not, if there are people using it, people are using it, and you need to take that into account, either positively or negatively. And the answer would be, you probably shouldn't have been selling these names that look like DNS names, because they might end up DNS names, or turns out you've been using it, maybe we should recognize it. That's not our decision, just recognition that there are other people using it.

RICK WILHELM: Very good. Russ has his hand up. Russ, please go ahead.

RUSS MUNDY: Yeah, thanks, Rick. It seems to me that these questions that we've currently been talking about, where there's a space, especially a space that looks like DNS, but it's not DNS, it exists, it seems that that is something that would be appropriate for the TRT to consider in their review of applications, and the consideration might end up being, oh golly, this should not be part of the ICP-3 route. Could be something else, but that could be one decision that was made, and whether or not we want to say that directly, it may be, we might

have to say something as an example to point out why that would be an appropriate outcome to an applicant. Thanks.

RICK WILHELM: Very good. Thank you, Russ. I'm going to withhold comment on this, because I think it's enormously subtle, as I think those within the NCAP would agree. Instead, I'll go to Georgia. Georgia, please go ahead.

GEORGIA OSBORN: Yeah. I'm interested in what John has to say about it, because what I might be concerned about is if you're concerned that something is, if it smells like DNS and it's this, then it wouldn't, if we're going to give advice that if it smells like DNS enough, then no, then my concern would be that other blockchain or alternative namespaces might argue that then they are not DNS enough for them to pass, and they could potentially effectively argue that. So I don't know. I'm interested in what John has to say, because I think that's a good point there.

JOHN LEVINE: My guess is they will try to have it both ways, because experience suggests that. But if you look at, say, what3words, which has three strings of letters separated by dots, even though it superficially looks like it might be a domain name, they're not used like domain names, and they don't have the structure of domain names. So I would say that even though they are at some very superficial level

similar, that doesn't count. On the other hand, people are coming up with browser plugins, and you can put them after the slash in a URL, which you can do with .onion, and I think you can do with .wallet. Warren, do you know?

WARREN KUMARI I mean, there's many different ways that people have integrated stuff.

JOHN LEVINE Yeah. I mean, they're going to argue whatever is most favorable to their business plan. I think we can come up with some reasonable criteria, like have they encouraged people to implement them in ways that make them look like domain names in the context where users use domain names? You know, do they claim you can put them in a, do they claim you can type them into a browser bar or an email address and stuff like that?

RICK WILHELM Thank you, John. Thank you, Georgia. I see Suzanne in the queue. Suzanne, please go ahead.

SUZANNE WOOLF Sure, thanks, Rick. There's a point that I think, like, the NCAP group and a lot of folks that work with domain names day to day are very comfortable with and forget that it is not always clear to the rest of the word, which is that domain names and the rules for forming

domain names exist entirely separately to the protocol of DNS for resolving them into other things.

So it really is completely legit to have domain names that are not used by DNS. And that's a distinction between how domain names are used and how the DNS protocol functions that is it's a very technical point and it's very obvious to people that work with the technology a lot, but I think it also has operational and policy implications that are not always clear. So I wanted to make sure that was on the table.

RICK WILHELM: Thank you, Suzanne. Warren, please go ahead.

WARREN KUMARI: Yeah, actually, that's a really good point from Suzanne. I mean, the lead singer for the Black Eyed Peas has apparently officially changed his name to Will.i.am. Clearly that's not supposed to be a domain name, but you can call yourself that if you like. We're not, sadly, potentially, we're not in charge of whatever people use with a dot in the middle. It would make our life easier if we were. But going back to the sort of earlier bit, I have views on what should happen for things where there's been a collision between blockchain and people using a name in another namespace.

My views aren't important. I think the important bit is that there is clarity to people who are applying and clarity ahead of time on what ICANN and the TRT and the community panel and people do,

because otherwise we're going to end up again in the situation of making things up on the fly and lawsuits and similar. Like you said I could have my name and I can't have my name, here's a lawsuit. Or somebody else applied for my name and I want it now, here's another lawsuit. And minimizing drama. And I think Joe is probably next.

RICK WILHELM Got two fingers and a full hand actually from Joe. Joe, go ahead.

JOE ABLEY Borderline flip it response, but will.i.am is in fact a domain name. It is in the DNS and it does correspond to will.i.am as well.

RICK WILHELM Sweet. Very good. Thank you. Thank you, Joe. Which hat were you wearing there, was that your fan hat or?

JOE ABLEY I think it was my annoy Warren hat. It's the one I normally wear.

RICK WILHELM That hat is well worn in the fullest meaning of the double entendre there. Warren made a very good point there about it's most important to applicants so that they have clarity. I would yes and that comment and say it's also important to applicants that choose not to apply because the most people in our experience, most

people that apply for a label will not just apply for one label, they'll apply for multiple and they're going to make decisions about what is inside of their budget based on all sorts of things.

They may choose to not apply for certain ones based on their perceived risk of other applicants and things like that. It's important both to applicants for a label and to those that not to apply for a particular label. Regardless, the rules of the game need to be clear to everybody that chooses to either engage or not engage in a particular label. I think that's good.

We were talking a little bit about, Russ very importantly brought up guidance to the TRT. That one thing that I think that we need to be very careful about is respecting what the NCAP has already said, and really being very careful about just how we respect that text, which a lot of work went into it and we want to be really, I think, not looking like we're changing something that was already published, but really look at amplifying, clarifying as opposed to rewriting or something like that.

It goes without saying, but I think it's important to be said for everybody within earshot that we're not here trying to crack open NCAP and issue an update to it any more than RIDE is not at all talking about undermining the ICP-3 route. This is all within the confines of the ICP-3 route. We're within the confines of the NCAP publication and it's all about working within that stuff.

We're also not trying to be interfering with what the next round IRT has been accomplishing over the many months. We're trying to

complement and enhance that work in order, as Warren, said to avoid tears of disappointment metaphorical, we hope, or perhaps real. So just wanted to make sure that everybody understood all that. I think it's obvious, but that those things also always bear clarity. Let me see if there's any hands moving some stuff out of the way. I don't see any hands in the room or anything like that.

I think we've talked about some of the NCAP mechanisms. We talked about some of the key risks. I think Warren brought up a couple of them. Anybody else who want to bring up any key risks facing the next round from this standpoint not in general? Important to categorize it, or think about any other areas related to this outline that we've got here. Obviously, we're going to come through with some sort of findings or recommendations, but in terms of the two key middle sections are the NCAP mechanisms and the key risk. Does anybody have any suggestions about other key sections of the document that as we've been sitting here thinking about this and talking about it, that they'd like to be adding to the document, or something like that?

We view this thing so far as a more of a prose document as opposed to a data-oriented document. I'm not seeing us gathering a bunch of data on this. I think this is more of a qualitative document as opposed to a quantitative document. So just for clarity on that too. But if there are differing opinions on that, certainly happy to take them. Must be brilliantly said, no doubt. All right, good. Okay, very good.

So our timeline on this is we don't have the defined timeline yet within the RIDE team. Right now we're not establishing a separate, we sort of, I hate the term, made the executive decision to not try and establish a new team for this, but we're just, hijacking isn't normally used in a positive sense in the SSAC, but we're hijacking the RIDE apparatus in order to put out this comment document, because forming a new group on the tight timeframe that we're looking at is not entirely practical. So we're going to be hijacking, and thank you, Russ, for the comment in the chat. We're going to be hijacking the RIDE apparatus to do this.

The comment is closed for submission on July 23rd, which means we're going to be needing to wrap it up in the high teens for final cosmetic edits. I'm not giving an exact date because we haven't entirely consulted with staff, which means that we're going to be, it's in relatively early July, it's going to have to go out for SSAC review, which doesn't leave a whole lot of time. So if you're interested in participating in this, please do stick your hand in the air and be attending RIDE calls. We're going to get an outline going and start to be doing some drafting and things like that.

There will not be a lot of time for faffing about, as the term goes, I think. I don't think that's entirely profane. I think that's okay to sign an ICANN meeting, hopefully, otherwise I'll be hauled out of here. But we're going to really have to get after it. So this meeting is designed that if there are people with big concerns, please air

them, but I think we've gotten a fair bit of good input and such. Yeah, please Danielle.

DANIELLE RUTHERFORD

So I've been taking notes on the parts of the applicant guidebook because I feel the next steps are Warren, you've got the concerns about the community priority evaluation. We need to get those parts of the AGB out to the work party members for you to read and evaluate is this clear enough, because that's the thing that applicants will be looking at to know what can I expect when I submit my application. Is there any other things from staff that we can do to prepare the work party to get this draft out?

RICK WILHELM

Thank you for that. I think that we will probably go straight into getting a Google doc going and throw the outline into there. I plan to next week start putting pen to paper, metaphorically, and start typing away and start getting some stuff in place on some things so we can get some text to be commented upon and probably be asking some people to submit text, as we say in the IETF, and contribute some stuff. So yeah, we'll be having to get after it because there just isn't a whole lot of time to mess around. So yeah, that'd be great.

Very good. Thank you, Warren, for that contribution, which keeps me far away from the ombuds for anyone who doesn't know the etymology of the term. Georgia was not put off, so I thought I was

on safe ground. So very good. All right. Does anybody have any other questions, comments, concerns, contributions, or other ideas?

Going once, going twice. We ran for about an hour, which is the standard length of a working party meeting. As a responsible working party chair, we do not take any more time than we require. So you're getting back five minutes left in your work party slot. This is what keeps work party chairs in your good graces and makes you want to come back.

WARREN KUMARI Technically, this ends at five.

RICK WILHELM You're already five minutes back. But I run work party meetings for an hour in my head, and so I run on a 60-minute clock.

SUZANNE WOOLF Another way to look at it is that we've given ourselves more than enough to do, so the meeting must be over.

RICK WILHELM That is another way to look at it. All right. That's all we got. Thank you all for coming. I look forward to chatting with you. If you have any concerns, questions, comments, please find me in the hallway, and we'll let you all go. We can shutter down.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]